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### Nomenclature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Asset density in the vicinity of the event of explosion ($/m^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHP</td>
<td>Analytic hierarchy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>Absolutely more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Area under the damage radius (m^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCM</td>
<td>Accelerated reliability centred maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVD</td>
<td>Average demand during lead time (Time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVLT</td>
<td>Average lead time in days (days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Alternative's weight of sub criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>Booked labour costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>British Petroleum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bp</td>
<td>Financial loss of the facilities in terms of explosion or fire ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BpC</td>
<td>Bottleneck penalty cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consequence of the failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBM</td>
<td>Condition-based maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>Consistency index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_h</td>
<td>Cost of delay charges per unit ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>Corrective maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_m</td>
<td>Corrective maintenance cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_MT</td>
<td>Time required completing corrective actions (hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_pa</td>
<td>Value of damaged production ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Consistency ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_sd</td>
<td>Cost of damaged parts due to failure of another part ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_sp</td>
<td>Cost of spare parts ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_oh</td>
<td>Cost of out-house maintenance ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_wp</td>
<td>Cost of cleaning non-hazardous and hazardous materials ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C_wp</td>
<td>Waste disposable cleaning cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Damages cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dch</td>
<td>Delay charges ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D_d</td>
<td>Daily demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td>Domino effect analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFT</td>
<td>Due fine time ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>Design of maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPD</td>
<td>Drilling and production equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Equally important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOQ</td>
<td>Economic order quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETA</td>
<td>Event Three Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVM</td>
<td>Eigenvector method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Failure frequency scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Frequency factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAHP</td>
<td>Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGI</td>
<td>Finished goods inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMECA</td>
<td>Failure mode effective and critical analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTA</td>
<td>Fault tree analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F_p</td>
<td>Probability of failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Growth factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZOP</td>
<td>Hazard analysis and operability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Hc$</td>
<td>Holding cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIRA</td>
<td>Hazard and identification and ranking analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$IM$</td>
<td>Importance factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$SE</td>
<td>Impact on safety and environmental factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>Lower bound value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Lc$</td>
<td>Legal fines in case of environmental damages ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOR</td>
<td>Likelihood of risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_T$</td>
<td>Lead time (h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>Middle bound value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Maintenance cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MC$</td>
<td>Maintenance cost factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDM</td>
<td>Multi criteria decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MDT$</td>
<td>Mean down time between failures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>Maintenance management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNV</td>
<td>Mean of the normalised values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTBF</td>
<td>Mean time between failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTBM</td>
<td>Mean time between maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTTR</td>
<td>Mean time to repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRO</td>
<td>Maintenance, repairs and operations inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Maintenance significant items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$MUT$</td>
<td>Mean up time between failures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>Number of orders placed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGM</td>
<td>Normalised geometric mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>Operational availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Oc$</td>
<td>Order cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEM</td>
<td>Original equipment manufacturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_F$</td>
<td>Operational flexibility factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$O_I$</td>
<td>Operational impact factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORA</td>
<td>Optimal risk analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P$</td>
<td>Physical age of the equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDI</td>
<td>Population density in the vicinity of the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD1</td>
<td>Number of people within the ratio of impacted area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDF1</td>
<td>Population distribution factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIRP</td>
<td>Point inspection and regular repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{LC}$</td>
<td>Production losses cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Preventive maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{MC}$</td>
<td>Preventive maintenance cost ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA</td>
<td>Probabilistic risk assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_{RP}$</td>
<td>Probability of replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QFD</td>
<td>Quality function deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTY</td>
<td>Quantity of the spare parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Risk Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Risk based maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIM</td>
<td>Risk-based inspection and maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCM</td>
<td>Reliability centred maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGBI</td>
<td>Reliability growth based inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMI</td>
<td>Raw material inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROP</td>
<td>Reordering point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPN</td>
<td>Risk priority number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRCM</td>
<td>Reliability and risk Centred maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIL</td>
<td>Safety integrity level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Service level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{mh}$</td>
<td>Maintenance personnel hourly rate (h/$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>Strongly more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{oh}$</td>
<td>Operator's hourly rate (h/$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Safety stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>Expected time between orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>Turnaround maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBM</td>
<td>Time-Based Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFN</td>
<td>Triangular fuzzy number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{ip}$</td>
<td>Time spent by maintenance personnel in carrying out preventive action (hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TM</td>
<td>Team Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$TMC$</td>
<td>Total maintenance cost (h/$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{su}$</td>
<td>Machine set up time (hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{tc}$</td>
<td>Time spent by the maintenance personnel to repair failure (hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{ti}$</td>
<td>Production time loss excluding setup machine time (hrs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>Upper bound value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UDA$</td>
<td>Unacceptable damaging level ($m^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UFL$</td>
<td>Level of an unacceptable financial loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$UFR$</td>
<td>Unacceptable fatality rate (person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V$</td>
<td>Number of damaged production by barrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VED</td>
<td>Vital, Essential and Desirable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSMI</td>
<td>Very strongly more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_a$</td>
<td>Weight of performance loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_b$</td>
<td>Weight of financial loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_c$</td>
<td>Weight of human health loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_d$</td>
<td>Weight of environment loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIP</td>
<td>Work-in-process inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_{MC}$</td>
<td>Weight of main criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_{SC}$</td>
<td>Weight of sub criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>Number of maintenance personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>Number of operational personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z$</td>
<td>Number of standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Department's income due to one barrel ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_d$</td>
<td>Standard deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_{LT}$</td>
<td>Standard deviations for lead time in days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\pi$</td>
<td>Production cycle time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abstract

Maintenance concerns abound as companies strive to increase production while guaranteeing safety, flow assurance and equipment reliability. Therefore, optimisation of the maintenance process is essential to increasing the productivity of the equipment as well as decreasing the maintenance expenditure. Thus, this research is aimed at proposing an integrated framework to optimise the major maintenance activities at strategic and operational levels including spare parts control and risk assessment within the petroleum industry.

In this research, the selection of the maintenance optimum policy for equipment within petroleum industry is dealt with at strategic level through multi criteria decision making techniques (classic and fuzzy analytic hierarchy process FAHP). At the operational level, a cost optimisation mathematical model is proposed to balance the costs of failure of a unit during operation against the cost of preventive maintenance to ensure preventive maintenance activities are kept at minimum possible cost without compromising the utilisation of equipment's performance.

Furthermore, an integrated approach between spare parts management and preventive maintenance activities is developed to create a cost effective method and ensuring the availability of parts in the stock while carrying out preventive maintenance. A risk assessment model for equipment within the petroleum industry is developed to handle the likelihood of risk and its consequences. A mathematical equation is developed to predict the likelihood of risks and identify the optimum inspection interval. In addition, set of modified mathematical equations to evaluate consequences of risk and weighing the severity of risks in specific areas is developed.

The findings of this research indicate that the proposed FAHP will clearly guide the practitioners in selecting the optimum maintenance policies at strategic level by the consideration of the related criteria and the possible alternatives for petroleum equipment. The results from the proposed mathematical model for scheduling preventive maintenance activities showed promising results in terms of cost effectiveness, reliability and availability of equipment without compromising the Inherent safety of the equipment. The integration between preventive maintenance intervals and the control of spare parts provided the petroleum companies with predictable movement of parts at the right time and hence minimises the cost of inventory. The developed equation for the consequences of risk can be used to evaluate the level of risk under different combination of sets of weight which suit the situation under consideration.
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Chapter One

Introduction

This chapter is divided into six sections. The first section presents an introduction to the thesis and the second section deals with the historical background of the petroleum industry and maintenance. The third section briefly describes the problem definition and the forth section lists the thesis's aims and objectives. The last two sections respectively present the structure of the thesis and the conclusion.
1.1 Background

The contemporary business environment has raised the strategic importance of the maintenance function within organizations which have significant investment in physical assets (Tsang 2002). The performance and competitiveness of manufacturing and production companies is dependent on the reliability, availability and productivity of their production facilities (Coetzee, 1997, Madu, 2000, Fleischer et al. 2006, Muchiri et al. 2011). Therefore, maintenance function needs to meet the overall target of the organization and transform business priorities into the maintenance priorities. Within many large-scale plant-based industries, maintenance costs can account as much as 40% of the operational budget and therefore improving maintenance effectiveness is a potential source for making financial savings (Eti et al. 2006).

The oil and gas industry is a competitive market which requires a high performance in plants that can be translated into high availability, reliability and maintainability for equipment. Today, the expectations of high reliability and availability of equipment are so high that drives the necessity of optimising maintenance activity (Calixto 2012). The cost of maintenance in oil and gas production is the third largest cost within the production which necessitates the optimisation of this function (El-Jawhari and Collins 2014). Nevertheless, the catastrophic consequences of any failure within such industry compel the maintenance to avoid the occurrence of the failure. The difficulty to balance between both reliability and availability of equipment on one hand and minimising the cost of maintenance on the other hand while creating a safe environment is a great deal to the petroleum industry. Aissani
et al (2009) indicated that in some petroleum sectors such as "petroleum refineries average downtime can reach 10% of the production time, and refineries are often used only at 60% of their capacity. Thus, important financial gains and safety improvements can be affected by optimising maintenance tasks".

Various books and literature present different types of maintenance system and it has been observed that some technical and terminologies such as strategy and policy are used in different context and places to mean the same thing, so the author feels the need to define them both as they are used frequently in this thesis:

- **Policy**: Means the type of maintenance (corrective or preventive).
- **Strategy**: Means the philosophy to select the policy such as reliability-centred maintenance.

### 1.2 Historical Background of Petroleum Industry and Maintenance

#### 1.2.1 Petroleum Industry

Oil has been used for purpose of lighting for thousands of years in areas where oil is found in shallow reservoirs. However, it was not until 1859 that "Colonel" Edwin Darke drilled the first successful oil well, for the sole purpose of finding oil (Devold 2013). These wells were shallow wells by modern standards, often less than 50 meters, but could give quite a large production.

Soon oil had replaced most other fuels for mobile use. Despite the early attempts at gas transportation, it was not successful until after World War 2 with the development of welding techniques.

Today oil and gas are produced in different parts in the world. However, massive challenges are faced by the petroleum industry with growing
environmental issues and restrictive laws as well as the challenges of sustainable energy and their remarkable challenging prices.

1.2.2 Maintenance

In the early days of the petroleum industry, maintenance was performed as "necessary evil" but over the time, the role of maintenance becomes more recognizable. The need for providing better services with the petroleum industry as any other industries requires the development of maintenance programme. The first recognized policy was corrective maintenance or run to failure policy.

The second generation of maintenance was the preventive maintenance in the form of the periodic and the last generation is predictive maintenance or condition maintenance. Different philosophies have been developed to run these policies such as reliability centred maintenance (RCM) and risk based maintenance, which will be extensively discussed in the thesis.

1.3 Problem Definition and Research Questions

The petroleum industry is a sensitive industry when it comes to maintenance and its recognized role in terms of added value to the production line. The reason for this sensitivity is the high demand of controlling the high reliability and availability of equipment and the catastrophic consequences of failures in such industry.

The general conception of the function of maintenance is to prevent the failure of occurrence, which is correct to some extent. However, to clearly identify the role of maintenance, considerations to the reasons of failure, which might include the faulty designation, abuse of equipment by the
operator and as a sequence of imperfect maintenance planning should be analysed. Therefore, the role of maintenance is to create a programme that utilizes the equipment productivity, to minimise the interruption to the production line and within the least spending.

In the petroleum industry, maintenance plays a significant role to bring the assets reliability and availability into a desirable predefined level while decreasing the expenses. In order to explicitly understand the problem the author summarizes it in the following questions:

1. What are the major activities that should be included within the integrated maintenance framework?

2. What is the most appropriate maintenance philosophy that can comprehensively lead to the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy?

3. What is the most suitable methodology to recognize the optimum maintenance intervals?

4. As the spare parts have a big portion of the maintenance's cost, what is the most appropriate approach to optimise the spare parts inventory used for maintenance?

5. Finally, risk assessment is one of the major activities with the petroleum industry and, therefore, how can it be improved to reflect the likelihood and consequences of the failures?

Solving these problems demands a successful cooperation between maintenance department and other involved departments such as inventory department. To optimise the maintenance within the petroleum industry,
generic integrated framework is proposed and the next section discusses the main aim and objectives of building the framework.

1.4 Aims and Objectives

1.4.1 Aim

The principle aim of this research is to develop an integrated framework that optimises major maintenance activities at strategic level, operational level, inventory control and risk assessment within the petroleum companies in order to maximize availability, reliability, and safety of assets while minimizing the cost of maintenance.

1.4.2 Objectives

In order to achieve the aim stated above, the following objectives will be undertaken to optimise the major maintenance activities within petroleum industry:-

- Development of a strategic maintenance policy for petroleum industry which covers the whole area of the field by using classic and fuzzy analytical hierarchy process to identify criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives that can lead to the optimisation of maintenance policy's selection.

- Development of a mathematical model for the operational level to identify the optimum interval at which the preventive maintenance activities should be carried out (schedule of preventive maintenance policy).
• Development of an integrated approach between maintenance and inventory management to control the availability and the level of spare parts required at the time of maintenance activities.
• Development of a risk assessment model that guides the maintenance on assessing the risk for the petroleum equipment.

1.5 Structure of the Thesis

This section outlines the structure of the thesis including a summary of each chapter. It provides guidance to the reader to understand the direction of the study and know the sequence and placement of various concepts.

1.5.1 Chapter One: Introduction

The author provides the reader with an introduction to the research focus, the aims and objectives and the context of the study. In addition, the chapter provides the reader with the problem definition and the research questions that interested the author to carry out this research.

1.5.2 Chapter Two: Literature Review

Chapter two comprehensively covers related literature review regarding maintenance generally and within the petroleum industry. It includes the various strategies for the selection of the maintenance policies and different methods for the scheduling of preventive maintenance activities. Moreover, the chapter provides literature review related to the inventory management and existing frameworks for controlling the policy of spare parts as well as insights to models and frameworks for controlling maintenance within the petroleum industry. The assessment of risk is covered including the importance and the role of the assessment of risk within the petroleum
industry. Finally, the conclusion is drawn and the research gaps are emphasised.

1.5.3 Chapter Three: Research Methodologies and the Proposed Integrated Framework

The third chapter demonstrates concisely each methodology used to optimise a certain activity within the proposed integrated maintenance framework. As the major maintenance activities are targeted to be optimised, each activity's method will be outlined and later in corresponding chapters, these methods will be extensively illustrated. The proposed integrated maintenance framework is then presented with an outline of the relevant terminologies that are used such as, optimisation and the required data.

1.5.4 Chapter Four: Maintenance Strategic Level

In this chapter, the problem of the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy is presented. The proposed model for the selection of the maintenance policy within the petroleum industry is defined and the application of different classic analytic hierarchy "Pairwise Matrix Evaluation" methods is demonstrated. Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process is applied and compared at the end of the chapter to the results calculated from classic AHP including sensitivity analysis.

1.5.5 Chapter Five: Maintenance Operational Level

Chapter five demonstrates the proposed mathematical model for the optimisation of preventive maintenance scheduling intervals. The mathematical model is explained and the developed equations are extensively illustrated. The implications of the proposed mathematical model
are demonstrated and at the end of the chapter, the author draws the conclusion of the applied method.

1.5.6 Chapter Six: An Integrated Approach between Preventive Maintenance and Spare Part Control

Chapter six illustrates the integrated approach between maintenance intervals and spare parts control. It discusses the relationship between the maintenance intervals and the movement of spare parts. A case study is presented to show the impact of the integrated approach on the inventory level with different assumptions of lead-time.

1.5.7 Chapter Seven: Risk Assessment Model for Petroleum Equipment

Chapter seven presents the proposed risk assessment model for equipment within the petroleum industry. A development of risk equation is presented to assess the likelihood of the risk besides qualitative risk assessment. The consequences of the risk are also evaluated as a loss on four main areas including system performance loss, financial loss, human health loss and environment loss.

1.5.8 Chapter Eight: Conclusions, Contribution to knowledge and Future Work

Chapter eighth summarizes the conclusion of the thesis and the outline of the proposed methodologies and contribution to knowledge within the thesis are discussed. The recommendations for future work that are related and extended from this work are advised.
1.6 Conclusion

In this Chapter, an introduction to the petroleum industry and maintenance's importance were provided. The historical development of the petroleum industry and maintenance philosophy were discussed to understand the nature of such competitive industry. The definition of the problem, the aims and objectives were discussed to highlight the main target of the thesis. The structure of the thesis in terms of chapters was outlined to simplify it for the readers. The next chapter will deliver literature review and latest developments in maintenance and the related topics associated with the framework.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

This chapter provides a comprehensive background to the maintenance within the petroleum industry. The definition of maintenance, its policies and its role within the petroleum industry are extensively demonstrated. The literature review also covers topics that are related to the selection of maintenance policy, determining the optimum maintenance interval, spare parts control and risk assessment within the oil and gas field.
2.1 Introduction

Contemporary business environment has raised the strategic importance of the maintenance function in organizations that have significant investment in physical assets. The high cost proportion of maintenance in operation costs within manufacturing and production industries has drawn attention to the importance of planning and controlling of maintenance actions to minimize the operational costs.

The aim of this chapter is to present a comprehensive and yet concise literature review of the major areas that related to maintenance in general and within the petroleum sector in particular. The notion for this chapter is to provide the readers of this thesis with a background of the relevant topics to provide a better understanding of the contribution suggested by the author.

The chapter starts with a background of maintenance management within the oil and gas industry, including the history of maintenance, the current existing strategies to select maintenance's policy and the methods used to select the time of conducting maintenance overhauls where the majority of the maintenance actions are carried out. This chapter extends to explain inventory management and relevant topics such as inventory control, economic reorder point and safety stocks. Another aspect covered within the literature review is risk assessment within the petroleum industry and different methodologies used to estimate the likelihood and the consequences of the risks.

2.2 Definition of Maintenance

The term maintenance can be defined as all actions appropriate for retaining an item/part/equipment in, or restoring it to a satisfactory condition (Dhillon
Marquez (2007) defined maintenance management (MM) as all activities of the management that determine maintenance objectives or priorities assigned and accepted by the management and maintenance teams, "strategies" defined as the management methodology to achieve maintenance objectives, and responsibilities and the implementations means such as maintenance planning and maintenance control. Adebimpe et al (2015) extended on the definition of maintenance and its actions that includes the repair of broken equipment, the preservation of equipment conditions and the prevention of their failure. This ultimately reduces production losses and downtime and also reduces environmental and associated safety hazards. Due to the increasing pressure of high competition and stringent environmental and safety regulations, maintenance has shifted from being perceived as a "necessary evil" to being recognized as an effective tool for increased profitability. Maintenance has become an integrated part of the production process rather than a supporting or peripheral activity. Developing effective and optimum maintenance strategies and models has thus become a subject of research in both academic and industry areas.

2.3 Maintenance Policies

Tremendous change have occurred in engineering since the industrial revolution, but perhaps the most dramatic changes have occurred in the last sixty years (Parida and Kumar 2006). As a result of these changes as well as the growth of the complexity of assets, maintenance management has developed to maintain the plant's more complicated machinery with respect to the type of industry and the overall target of that industry. Another
Important reason of the development of maintenance is the demand on productivity, availability, quality, safety and environment (Arunraj and Maiti 2007). Maintenance can be categorised into different classifications according to its actions. Maintenance can mainly be classified into two types: Corrective Maintenance (CM) and Preventive Maintenance (PM) (Waeyenbergh and Pintelon 2004; Li et al., 2006). Planned maintenance could be time-based or condition-based (Duffuaa et al., 1998). Each plant's assets or equipment can be associated with one or more maintenance policy throughout its lifecycle (Hossam et al 2003).

The management system of Point Inspection and Regular Repair (PIRR) is regarded as the present core of maintenance and management for onshore and offshore oil field equipment, which mainly adopt corrective maintenance (CM), Time-Based Maintenance (TBM) and Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM) (Perrons et al 2013 and Doostparast et al 2014).

2.3.1 Corrective Maintenance (CM)

In the case of CM policy, an item is allowed to fail before maintenance is implemented. CM is still being used until today due to the fact that CM can be useful and add value to the plant under certain criteria such as the criticality of the machine and the effect of the failure (Waeyenbergh and Pintelon, 2002). Balasaheb and Milind (2012) mentioned that CM is the first and the basic policy that appeared in the industry. CM is also referred to as, failure based maintenance, breakdown maintenance or run to failure strategy.

2.3.2 Preventive Maintenance (PM)

PM refers to the action of maintenance implemented to prevent the occurrence of failure (ETI et al 2006). Basically, the notion of this policy is to
predict the wear and tear or life of equipment by using different approaches to prevent failure from taking place. In general, the amount of equipment failure can be reduced if the preventive maintenance strategies are correctly selected (Balasaheb and Milind 2012). Most common forms of PM are time-based maintenance (TBM) and condition-based maintenance (CBM).

2.3.2.1 Time-Based Maintenance (TBM)

In this policy, maintenance is scheduled in advance to prevent failure. It focuses on preventing failures through replacing components at particular time. It assumes that the machine component’s life is predictable, and maintenance is based on hours of run or calendar time elapsed. This is suitable for repeatable degradation modes, wear process for example. In this policy replacement or repair is carried out at a fixed time after the installation of a facility, which is generally independent of its condition. The time period used to construct a maintenance schedule can be either calendar time or component running time (Ahmad et al 2011).

2.3.2.2 Condition Based Maintenance (CBM)

Maintenance decision is made depending on measured data. Vibration monitoring, lubrication analysis, thermography, visual inspection and ultrasonic testing are commonly used approaches to collect data (Mobley 2002). Based on the data analysis, whenever the monitoring level value exceeds the normal the component is either repaired or replaced. The use of CBM may lead to considerable reductions in production cost, capital investment and increments in the quality rate, profits, and market share. However, limitations in data coverage and quality reduce the effectiveness
and accuracy of the condition-based maintenance strategy (Alnajjar and Alsyouf 2003).

2.4 The Role of Maintenance

"The primary objective of planned maintenance is the minimization of total cost of inspection and repair, and equipment downtime (measured in lost production capacity or reduced product quality)" (Mann et al 1995).

Luxhøj et al (1997); Pradhan and Bhol (2006) stated that the importance of maintenance to industry can be measured by:

- Accounting of the total maintenance cost.
- Percentage of maintenance cost to total production cost or capital cost in assets.
- Total number of personnel working with maintenance or percentage of maintenance personnel to total number of production personnel.
- Possible consequences for lack of maintenance: financial, environmental, human, equipment damage.

Bevilacqua and Bragliab (2000) described the role of maintenance in some industries and how it is the second highest or even the highest element of operating costs. As a result, in only 30 years it has moved from almost nowhere to the top of cost control priority.

According to Utne et al (2012), scheduled and unplanned shutdowns such as repairs, overhauls, replacements and require parts to shutdown are the major contributor for the expenses to oil drilling platforms and processing plants. Apart from these long period maintenance activities, shorter types of planned and unplanned shutdowns are also cause for production loss and revenue loss. Tang et al 2015 outlined the unreasonable maintenance policies,
surplus or insufficient maintenance, exorbitant maintenance costs and increasing failure frequency, which have caused a great influence to production safety and economic cost in the oil and gas exploitation process.

2.5 Maintenance Policy Selection Problem

Effective maintenance management involves a multidisciplinary approach where maintenance is viewed strategically from the overall business perspective to translate those priorities into maintenance tasks. Estimating the best set of maintenance policies for different failure modes is a hard and complex task. This selection requires the knowledge of various factors such as safety aspects, environmental problems, costs and budget constraints, manpower utilization, mean time between failure (MTBF) and mean time to repair (MTTR) for each piece of equipment (Bertolini and Bevilacqua 2006). Oil and gas companies as any other companies are in favour of optimisation of maintenance, to provide the highest availability of equipment with minimization of the running maintenance cost with respect to environment and safety (Azadeh et al 2009).

Maintenance management process can be divided into two main levels: strategic level "including the definition of the policy to be implemented" and operational level "considers the implementations of the strategy" (Márquez 2007). In addition to that Márquez (2007) stated that strategic level is normally neglected by the maintenance department which leads to the probability of selecting inappropriate maintenance policy for a machine. Hong et al (2012) acknowledged that the wrong selection of the optimal maintenance policy leads to the increase in failure rate and also affects the productivity of the production line.
Different approaches and philosophies have been implemented to manage maintenance on the strategic levels within the oil and gas companies such as Reliability centred maintenance (RCM) and risk based maintenance (RBM). Each approach has its uniqueness and priorities to deal with managing maintenance. In the following section, explanations of the most applied approaches to manage maintenance on the strategic level are described.

2.5.1 Reliability-Centered maintenance (RCM)

Reliability-centred maintenance (RCM) was first developed within the aircraft industry and later adapted by several other industries and military branches (Rausand 1998). Reliability-centred maintenance (RCM) is an engineering framework that enables the definition of a complete maintenance regime and as the name indicates, reliability is the main point (Selvik and Aven 2011). RCM is a well-established analysis method for preventive maintenance planning. As its name indicates, reliability is the main point of reference for the planning of maintenance. However, consequences of failures are also assessed. RCM is one of preventive maintenance strategies to incorporate new understanding to the ways equipment fail (Deshpande and Modak 2002). The methodology has been available in the industry for over 30 years, and has proved to offer an efficient strategy for preventive maintenance optimisation. RCM is a technique initially developed by the airline industry that focuses on prevention of failures whose consequences are likely to be serious (Selvik and Aven 2011).
2.5.1.1 Reliability Centered Maintenance Phases

The RCM analysis process focuses on the functions of plant and equipment, the consequences of failure and measures to prevent or cope with functional failure. Moubray (1997) identified the steps to implement RCM including determining key functions and performance standards, determining possible function failures, determining likely failure modes and their effects, selecting feasible and effective maintenance strategies, scheduling and implementing selected strategies, and optimising tactics and programs. Selvik and Aven (2011) summarised the phases of RCM methodology by the following three phases.

- Identification of Maintenance Significant Items (MSI).
- Assignment of suitable PM tasks for the MSI.
- Implementation and update of the PM tasks.

Moubray (2000) suggested that due to the time consuming nature of the classical failure mode effective and critical analysis (FMECA), in many places only critical equipment are analysed by RCM method. Rausand (2008) stated that RCM has significant start-up costs associated with staff training and equipment needs, as well as savings potential is not readily seen by management which can be a huge disadvantage of using RCM. Selvik and Aven (2011) stated that one of the shortcomings of RCM is traced to the limited assessments of risk and uncertainties. Jagathy and Deepak (2013) suggested that refineries and process plants find it difficult to adopt this standardized methodology of RCM mainly due to the complexity and the large amount of analysis that needs to be done, resulting in a long drawn out implementation, requiring the services of a number of skilled people.
2.5.2 Risk Based Maintenance (RBM)

Krishnasamy et al (2005) defined RBM as the selection of maintenance policy depending on the assessment of the risk. Dey (2001) developed a risk based model that reduces the amount of time spent on inspection and to reduce the cost of maintaining petroleum pipelines. He used Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to identify the factors that influence failure on specific segments and analyzed their effects by determining probability of risk factors and the severity of failure is determined through consequence analysis. Accordingly he suggested the inspection time and the maintenance type for the pipeline.

Tixier et al (2002) listed and identified different risk analysis methodologies, and categorized them from diverse references into deterministic, probabilistic, and combination of deterministic and probabilistic approaches. The main aim of this methodology is to reduce the overall risk that may result as the consequence of unexpected failures of operating facilities (Khan and Haddara, 2004). They divided RBM methodology into four modules: identification of the scope, risk assessment, risk evaluation, and maintenance planning. Dey et al (2004) used risk-based maintenance model to select specific inspection and maintenance method for specific section in line with its probability and severity of failure for oil and gas pipeline in the Gulf of Thailand. Their work came to generate guidelines for planning the pipeline maintenance program (Arunraj and Maiti, 2007). The inspection and maintenance activities which are planned using RBM are prioritized on the basis of quantified risk caused due to failure of the components, so that the total risk can be minimized. The high-risk components are inspected and
maintained usually with greater frequency and thoroughness and are maintained in a greater manner, to achieve tolerable risk criteria. They classified three categories of the method (deterministic, probabilistic and deterministic and probabilistic) into qualitative, quantitative and semi-quantitative and identified the risk-based maintenance methodology to consist of six modules which are - hazard analysis, likelihood assessment, consequence assessment, risk estimation, risk acceptance and maintenance planning.

2.5.3 Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM)

Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) refers to finding of the best solution or decision to a problem from all of the feasible alternatives in the presence of multiple, usually conflicting, decision criteria. Priority-based, outranking, distance-based and mixed methods could be considered as the primary classes of the current methods. The MCDM techniques generally allow to structure the problem clearly and systematically. With this characteristic, decision makers have the possibility to easily examine and scale the problem in accordance with their requirements (Işıklar and Büyüközkan 2007). Cinelli et al (2014) stated that in their comparison study between MCDM tools "the review has shown that there is not a clear agreement among different authors concerning some comparison criteria". Therefore, the selection of a certain MCDM tools to fit the problem under investigation is an essential step to ensure the utility of each tool. Velasquez and Hester (2013) and Cinelli et al (2014) presented an analytical comparison study of multi-criteria decision making methods including the strengths and weakness of each method as shown in table (2-1).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Analytic Hierarch Process (AHP)            | • Availability of software with good graphical capabilities  
• Clear hierarchy structure.  
• Use of qualitative  
• Possibility of trades of between criteria  
• Rank reversal can occur                                                                                                                  | • The use of rigid scale might not reflect uncertainty                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Analytic Network Analysis ANP              | • Applicable in the case of strong horizontal interrelationship between sub-criteria                                                                                                                     | • It requires a large amount of questionnaire to fill in.  
• It might be too complicated                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Multi Attribute Utility Theory (MAUT)      | • Availability of software  
• Takes uncertainty into account  
• Can incorporate preferences.                                                                                                                    | • Limited graphical capabilities  
• Needs a lot of input  
• Preferences need to be precise  
• Not flexible in terms of trade-offs between criteria  
• Possibility of re-evaluating results if new information becomes available is limited                                                                 |
| Case-Based Reasoning (CBR)                | • Not data intensive  
• Requires little maintenance  
• Can improve over time  
• Can adapt to changes in environment                                                                                                            | • Sensitive to inconsistent data  
• Requires many cases                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
| Goal Programming (GP)                      | • Capable of handling large-scale problems  
• Can produce infinite alternatives                                                                                                               | • It’s ability to weight coefficients  
• Typically needs to be used in combination with other MCDM methods to weight coefficients                                                                                                                             |
| Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality (ELECTRE) | • Takes uncertainty and vagueness into account                                                                                                                                                      | • Its process and outcome can be difficult to explain in layman’s terms  
• Outranking causes the strengths and weaknesses of the alternatives to not be directly identified                                                                                                             |
| Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment of Evaluations (PROMETHEE) | • Easy to use;  
• Does not require assumption that criteria are proportionate                                                                                         | • Does not provide a clear method by which to assign weights                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Technique for Order Preferences by Similarity to Ideal Solutions (TOPSIS) | • Has a simple process  
• Easy to use and program  
• The number of steps remains the same regardless of the number of attributes                                                                 | • Its use of Euclidean Distance does not consider the correlation of attributes  
• Difficult to weight and keep consistency of judgment                                                                                                                                                                     |
2.5.4 Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP)

The analytic hierarchy process (AHP) is a structured technique for organizing and analysing complex decisions, based on mathematics and psychology. It was developed by Thomas L. Saaty in the 1970s and has been extensively studied and refined since then (Wind and Saaty 1980). Saaty (1982) discussed the application of AHP and mentioned that the selection of maintenance policy for a pipeline to be a team effort which require a group of people to make the decision.

Saaty (1990) stated that AHP not only helps the analysts to arrive at the best decision, but also provides a clear rationale for the choices made as well as enables the analyst to measure consistency. (AHP) (Torfi et al 2010). Decision-making becomes more sophisticated since the selection methods have different level of preferences in mentioned criteria (Shaverdi and Barzin 2012).

Bevilacqua and Braglia (2000) mentioned the main steps of Analytic hierarchy process AHP that Saaty had identified:

2.5.4.1 Step 1: Model the Hierarchy Structure:-

This is done by including the main goal at the top, followed by the main criteria, sub criteria and alternatives. Understanding the nature of the industry is important to identify the elements of each level.

2.5.4.2 Step 2: Establish Priorities among the Elements of the Hierarchy

This is performed by making a series of judgments based on pairwise comparisons of the elements. Vidal et al (2011) explained that the weights
determine the importance of alternatives' utilities in the context of specific criteria.

2.5.4.3 Step 3: Check the Consistency of the Matrix

The AHP enables the analysts to evaluate judgements with the consistency ratio (CR). The judgements can be considered acceptable if consistency ratio is less than 0.1 ("10%"), and if it is more than 10% then the matrices which have the expert's judgments are not acceptable and should be carried out again. Saaty (1977) has proposed a consistency index (CI), which is related to the eigenvalue method (Ishizaka and Labib 2009).

2.5.4.4 Step 4: Pairwise Matrix Evaluation

Once a judgement matrix has been developed, a priority vector to weight the elements of the matrix is calculated. Several methods for deriving local priorities ("the local weights of criteria and the local scores of alternatives") from judgment matrices have been developed. Wang et al (2007) listed some of the pairwise matrix evaluation method:

- Mean of the normalised values (MNV).
- The normalised geometric mean (NGM).
- The Eigenvector Method (EVM).

2.5.4.4.1 Mean of the Normalised Values (MNV)

This method is considered to be the oldest method (Ishizaka and Lusti 2006). The method consists of three main steps as followed:

1. Summation of the elements of the column $j$
All the elements of the column \( j \) of the matrix are summed up as shown in equation (2-1) (Ishizaka and Labib 2009). In this case, the comparison of the alternatives \( i \) and \( j \) is given by \( P_i/P_j \)

\[
\frac{P_i}{P_j} + \frac{P_2}{P_j} + \frac{P_3}{P_j} + \ldots + \frac{P_n}{P_j} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i}{P_j} \tag{2-1}
\]

Where:-

\( i \) and \( j \) are any alternatives of the matrix.

\( p_i \) is the priority of the alternative \( i \).

2. Normalization of the column \( j \)

In this step, the normalized value is calculated by dividing the comparison resulted from step one by resulted column's sum (equation 2-2).

\[
\frac{P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} \times \frac{P_j}{P_j} = \frac{P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} \tag{2-2}
\]

3. Mean of row \( i \): In the last step to obtain the priorities from the comparison matrix, the mean of each row is calculated applying equation (2-3).

\[
\left( \frac{P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} + \ldots + \frac{P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} \right) \times \frac{1}{n} = \frac{np_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} \times \frac{1}{n} = \frac{p_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_l} \tag{2-3}
\]

2.5.4.4.2 The Normalized Geometric Means (NGM)

In this approach, an alternative measure of the Priority which is formed by taking the root of the product matrix of row elements divided by the column's sum of row geometric means as shown in equation (2-4) (Ishizaka and Lusti 2006).

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left( \ln(a_{ij}) - \ln \left( \frac{P_i}{P_j} \right) \right) \tag{2-4}
\]
Where:-

\( a_{ij} \) is the comparison between \( i \) and \( j \) and \( P_i \) is the priority of \( i \).

NGM method is applied to the collected data and to deal with the comparison matrixes to compare its outcomes with other methods applied. The priorities from the main criteria matrix: "cost, availability, reliability and safety" are calculated with the use of NGM to demonstrate the methodology.

1 - Building the comparison matrix with respect to the upper level.

2- Equation (2-5) is applied to calculate the geometric mean for each row \( p \)

\[
p = \sqrt[n]{a \cdot b \cdot c \ldots n}
\]

2.5.4.4.3 The Eigenvector Method (EVM)

The idea of a priority vector has much less validity for an arbitrary positive reciprocal matrix \( A = (a_{ij}) \) than for a consistent and a near consistent matrix (Saaty, 1997). A positive \( n \) by \( n \) matrix is reciprocal if \( a_{ij} = 1/a_{ij} \) (Saaty 2003).

It is considered to be consistent if \( a_{ij} a_{ik} = a_{ik}, i, j, k = 1, \ldots, n \). From \( a_{ij} = a_{ik}/a_{jk} \) we have \( a_{ij} = a_{ik}^{-1} \) and a consistent matrix is reciprocal.

The custom is to look for a vector \( w = (w_1, \ldots, w_n) \) in which the matrix \( w = (w_i/w_j) \) is close to \( A = (a_{ij}) \) by minimizing matrix (Saaty 2003).

2.5.4.5 Step 5: Sensitivity Analysis

The last step of the decision process is sensitivity analysis, where the input data are slightly modified in order to observe the impact of this on the results. This allows checking how the outcome changes depending on changes in criteria weights. If the ranking does not change, the results are said to be robust. Expert Choice allows different sensitivity analyses, where the main difference is the various graphical representations (Ishizaka and Labib 2009).
2.5.5 Implementation of AHP for Maintenance Policy Selection

Generally AHP has been implemented in different sectors of industry as a support tool to the decision makers to select the most suitable decision. Bevilacqua and Braglia (2000) described the use of Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) for selecting the best maintenance strategy for an important Italian oil refinery.

They created the hierarchy scheme (figure 2-1) and considered different alternatives of maintenance strategies to improve the effectiveness of the methodology. Sensitivity analysis was coupled with AHP technique and they arrived at the conclusion that AHP technique makes it possible to approach the decision making problem in a comprehensive way while taking several factors into account. In comparison, this capacity is more difficult to obtain when using conventional methodologies such as FMECA.

AHP is able to manage a large number of possible alternatives in an efficient way and it can integrate both qualitative and quantitative information. With AHP a direct quantitative judgement of the relevant maintenance factors is not necessarily required by the maintenance manager.

The pairwise comparisons are preferred by the manager when several intangible criteria have to be treated, as is the case with maintenance selection. In addition, AHP is the only known MCDM model that can measure the consistency of the decision maker and its procedure is readily available in decision-making software packages from several commercial software sellers.
Figure 2-1: AHP for Maintenance in Oil Refinery (Bevilacqua, and Braglia 2000)

In 2004 Dey et al used pipelines data, collective experiences of the pipelines operators, existing knowledge base, analytic hierarchy process (AHP), a multiple criteria decision making technique and weight methods to develop a risk-based inspection and maintenance model for offshore pipelines in the Gulf of Thailand, aiming to reduce the consequences of failure.

Bertolini and Bevilacqua (2006) proposed a combined AHP with goal programing GP model. In particular, in the model described here the AHP analysis provides the priority vector of the possible maintenance policies (corrective, preventive and predictive) for each failure type revealed. The use
of AHP allows defining a three level hierarchical structure: the top level represents the goal of the analysis (in this case the maintenance policy definition), the second level is related to the relevant criteria used (occurrence, severity and detectability), the third level defines the possible alternatives.

Dawotola et al (2009) proposed a combined Analytic Hierarchy process (AHP) and Fault Tree Analysis (FTA) to support the design, construction, inspection and maintenance policy of oil and gas pipelines by proposing an optimal selection strategy based on the probability of failure and consequences of failure. They combined AHP and FTA into a model and their methodology comprised of implementation of Analytic hierarchy process followed by a Fault Tree analysis. AHP is used in the decision making to estimate the likelihood of an event, by establishing relative importance of each contributing factors, while Fault Tree Analysis is directed at the important failure criteria identified by AHP.

Dawotola et al (2010) proposed a decision based method for risk management of oil and gas pipelines. The method is based on a Multi Criteria Decision Analysis (MCDA) framework, utilising an Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) to prioritise and optimise oil and gas pipeline's inspection and maintenance. After the implementation of their work on three pipelines in Nigeria, they found that the highest risk factor on pipelines was that of the activity of third party.

Achilla et al (2015) presented AHP model for the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy for petroleum pipeline. Four types of maintenance policies were considered (corrective, time based, condition
based maintenance and design of maintenance (DOM). DOM was considered as one of the alternatives which is a method to minimise the maintenance interval through the span life of the pipeline. Different factors were considered such as corrosion, external interference, operational defects and natural hazards. Their results showed that CBM was the most suitable policy for the pipeline and they believe that their mode is applicable.

2.5.6 Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (FAHP)

The key idea of fuzzy set theory is that an element has a degree of membership in a fuzzy set (Ayağ and Özdemir 2006). The FAHP methodology is designed to an alternative selection and justification problem by integrating the concept of fuzzy set theory and hierarchical structure analysis (Özdañoğlu and Özdañoğlu 2007).

Timothy (2010) also recognized that human assessment on qualitative attributes is always subjective and thus, imprecise. Therefore, a conventional AHP seems inadequate to capture decision maker's requirements explicitly. In addition to that, fuzzy systems are very useful in a situation involving high complex systems. The use of fuzzy methodology allows the decision maker to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative data into the decision model.

Kabir and Hasin (2011) listed more reasons of selecting FAHP over AHP and how integrating fuzzy sets with AHP can overcome some of these classic AHP limitations:

1. The AHP method is mainly used in nearly crisp decision applications.
2. The AHP method does not take into account the uncertainty associated with the mapping of one's judgment to a number.
3. A decision maker's requirements on evaluating alternatives always contain ambiguity and multiplicity of meaning that cannot be emphasized by conventional AHP.

AHP breaks down a complex decision by considering all the relevant and available solutions to arrive at the most suitable decision. However, it does not consider cognitive factors of human judgement (Sarfaraz, et al. 2012). Sharma and Yu (2014) stated that Fuzzy AHP is the extension of Saaty's theory and many researchers have proved that fuzzy AHP shows more sufficient description in decision-making process compared to the classical AHP method.

2.5.6.1 Applications of FAHP

FAHP has been implemented in different sectors to assist decision-makers to arrive at the most appropriate decision. The earliest work in fuzzy AHP appeared in Laarhoven and Pedrycz (1983), which compared fuzzy ratios described by triangular membership functions. They applied their extended method on the selection of candidates for a vacancy and they concluded their study by agreeing that FAHP has a positive add-value to support the decision-makers. Chengzhong (1984) proposed another method, which is the altered gradient eigenvector method, to derive the priority by the idea that the information of pairwise comparison of elements can be represented by an upper triangular matrix, and proved that the result is the same as that of the Eigenvector method in the case of consistency. Ruoning and Xiaoyan (1992) presented extend FAHP, starting from the viewpoint of actual applications of AHP, considering the method of group decision-making in complex systems and the fuzziness of judgment in a
pairwise comparison of projects. They constructed the fuzzy judgment matrix by using a set-valued statistics method on a continuous judgment scale and proved that every element of the fuzzy judgment matrix can be represented by a positive bounded closed fuzzy number. They demonstrated their theory by applying it on three selected colleges to evaluate their standard of running a school. Chang (1996) demonstrated the applications and the detailed step of FAHP using a triangular fuzzy number on the same example Laarhoven and Pedrycz (1983).

Kwong and Bai (2002) applied the Fuzzy AHP to determine the importance of customer requirements in quality function deployment (QFD). They used the triangular fuzzy number (TFN) instead of conventional AHP and listed the advantages of using the fuzzy sets over classic sets as follows:

1. The preference of using fuzzy AHP over conventional AHP because of the nature of human judgement in the comparisons of customer requirements which is rather fuzzy in nature.

2. The adoption of fuzzy number can allow the design team of QFD to have freedom of estimation regarding the overall customer satisfaction.

Wang et al (2007) used the fuzzy AHP for the selection of maintenance strategies in a power plant - Hangzhou Pro-Energy Heat and Power Co. Generated framework was used to show the criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives (figure 2-2) and using the fuzzy sets the comparison matrix was established. Results showed that the predictive maintenance strategy was the most suitable for boilers.
Peng et al (2007) proposed that the FAHP model for optimum integrity maintenance decision-making for oil and gas pipeline is based on the assessment of the quantity of risk and distinguished the high-risk pipes with unacceptable risk level. Four criteria were considered, they are: to include person factors, fieldwork difficult degree, field management and environment condition to impact the pipeline maintenance. The model which was aimed to establish the most suitable measurement to enhance the maintenance system concluded that for the best selection of measurement, a team-work to decide the measurement is preferred than be decided by only the maintenance manager.

Tang et al (2015) stated that due to the previous maintenance decision-making process without using the mathematical model and decision-making
theory, there were some undesirable phenomena and problems during the maintenance and management for oil and gas drilling and production equipment (DPE). They presented a framework for making maintenance decisions for DPE to restrain safety accidents and economic losses in the oil and gas exploitation process. They summarized four categories influence factors, including eight influence factors to evaluate the importance level of the DPE. Eight influence factors were regarded as the evaluation indexes and their scoring criteria were defined to quantify the result of subjective evaluation. The evaluation model calculating the importance level of the DPE was established based on the AHP method. They divided the DPE into three categories: Class A, B and C, based on their importance level values.

2.6 Scheduling the Maintenance Interval

The majority of the maintenance tasks within the petroleum industry are carried out on intervals which are also referred to as overhauls. In terms of levels, this task is also referred to as the maintenance operational level. The main aim of maintenance affairs on the operational level is to develop a cost-effective and adaptable approach to optimise the maintenance schedule. Different techniques have been developed to obtain the best time interval to apply the maintenance policies to avoid a long shutdown.

Robert and Escudero (1983) presented the exact solution of the exact formulation of the scheduling of the plant maintenance personnel which they described as a typical of integer linear programming problem that required large number of variables, equations and inequalities. Reeves (1993) defined heuristic techniques which seeks good (near-optimal) solutions at a reasonable computational cost without being able to guarantee
either feasibility or optimality. He described the types of heuristic methods as: genetic algorithms, taboo search and simulated annealing. These techniques are capable of handling more real-world problem than what a specific algorithm can do and is useful for searching the optimal interval of performing the maintenance. However, there are some drawbacks associated with heuristics techniques, they are:

- The techniques are considered as study of errors (Asadullah and Kundi 2013).
- Heuristics techniques are costly because it requires domain expertise (Nielsen 1994).
- These techniques are not suitable for finding low-priority problems.

Percy and Kobbacy (1997) proposed a rolling horizon approach that "takes a long-term tentative plan as a basis for a subsequent adaptation, according to information that becomes available on the short term. This yields a dynamic grouping policy that assists the maintenance manager in planning maintenance intervals".

Duffuaa and Al-Sultan (1999) has classified maintenance planning and scheduling into two major categories. The first category is: scheduled maintenance, which includes preventive and routine maintenance and then scheduled overhauls and corrective maintenance. The second category is unscheduled maintenance or emergency breakdowns. The first category can be planned and scheduled easily, but the second category is stochastic in nature and it causes disruption to the maintenance schedule. They proposed a stochastic programming model for scheduling maintenance personnel. The model maximises the number of completed jobs in a given horizon and
minimises the expected reserved manpower and any other shortages. They believed that unlike scheduling in production, the maintenance schedule becomes immediately out of date as soon as an emergency job is received. This necessitates a revision in the schedule and that may create a backlog in the system. They identified the data needed for their model which integrated the deterministic and the stochastic components of the scheduling problem.

Cassady et al (2001) proposed an interesting system structure to optimise maintenance activities on an operational level. They divided systems into subsystems and classified these subsystems further into identical components. Their assumption for each system, subsystem or component was only one of the two states: either they functioned properly or failed. They aimed to select the right maintenance decision for which the alternatives are: minimal repair and replacement of failed or functioning component. Their model was the extension of mathematical programming models.

Saad et al (2004) proposed a mathematical model to obtain an optimal maintenance interval considering the cost of failure of a unit during operation against the cost of planned/preventive maintenance introduced. They calculated the total maintenance cost and in turn to identify an optimum time interval for maintenance activities which is an intelligent mathematical model considering the costs of equipment's maintenance and its reliability.

Krishnasamy et al (2005) implemented risk based maintenance (RBM) methodology which comprised of four modules: Identification of the scope, risk assessment, risk evaluation and maintenance planning. Using this methodology, one is able to estimate risk caused by the unexpected failure as a function of the probability and the consequences of failure. Critical
equipment can be identified based on the level of risk and on a pre-selected acceptable level of risk. Maintenance of equipment is prioritised based on the risk, which helps in reducing the overall risk of the plant.

Leou (2006) summarised the generator maintenance scheduling problem which determines the period for which units should be taken offline for planned maintenance over the course of one or two-year in order to minimize the operating cost or increase the system reliability. The most well-known methods that the particular industry of power plants relies on were listed, they are: integer programming, branch-and-bound, decomposition methods, dynamic programming, knowledge-based models, simulated annealing method, probabilistic approach and artificial intelligence method. He introduced the genetic algorithm and simulated annealing method to overcome some of what he said as a short coming of the previous mentioned methods and applied the proposed method to a power plant in Taiwan arriving at the conclusion that this minimum cost solution can be found under a condition of sufficient spinning reserve.

Marquez (2007) suggested that it is possible to solely depend on the recommendations of the manufacturer to plan maintenance actions and interventions if users can justify that these recommendations are appropriate for their operational use. On the other hand, manufacturer is usually unable to anticipate factors such as, issues of consequences of failure, safety considerations, regulatory requirements, availability of resources and unique environmental conditions which require a suitable structure framework to plan and manage maintenance activities.
Khalil et al (2009) created a mathematical approach that takes into consideration the stochastic nature of equipment failures to develop an integrated-cost optimisation maintenance model for industrial equipment, based on a balance between preventive maintenance and corrective maintenance costs. They argued that the behaviour of the system may change considerably for many reasons which can be unrelated to technical issues. They believe that most existing models attempted to use distributions of historical data to represent the system are inconvenient because they could change modes due to reasons that may not directly be related to the machines. In order for them to adopt a mathematical model, they made some assumptions that involved acceptable accuracy in reflecting reality to determine the problem.

Ahmad et al (2011) stated that the most of PM interval is based on experience or original equipment manufacturer (OEM) recommendations. Consequently, the benefits from PM are not fully obtained because the current machine state is not considered. They proposed that mathematical models (also known as maintenance models) are various tools of maintenance management to solve particular maintenance problems.

Cui et al (2013) highlighted that organisations adopt several forms and combinations of maintenance strategies to ensure efficient performance of their facilities. Despite the strategies adopted, there comes a time when the entire facility is shut down for maintenance and project jobs. This is referred to as turnaround maintenance (TAM). The study focused on the managerial skills needed for conducting the TAM perfectly. Their research concluded that, "It was evident that for TAM project to be managed successfully, appropriate
management skills are necessary by the team managers (TM) and the TAM management team”.

2.7 Maintenance Framework within the Petroleum Industry

Ahmad et al (2011) stated that Framework (management model) is defined as a guideline, procedure or step-by-step process used to plan or decide for something. The development of a maintenance framework may borrow some ideas from literature and apply some analysis tools from statistical and mathematical theories. Generally, the framework is used to solve particular problems in a systematic way. Therefore, the framework is more practical method to assist engineers and technicians in making decisions. Defining and understanding the problem accurately is the first important step of the proposed model. Their proposed general structure for maintenance constituted from three main steps which are, problem definition, evaluation current machine condition and maintenance decision methods respectively.

Mirghani (2001) proposed a costing framework with the objective of providing reliable, relevant, and timely information about actual costs and the cost efficiency of planned maintenance jobs. The proposed framework includes direct materials, direct labour and support services costs. The traceability criterion is used for assigning direct materials and direct labour costs to planned maintenance jobs. The framework is targeted to serve the estimation of standard costs of a planned maintenance job element by element and in total, reflecting an expected level of cost efficiency and to accumulation of the actual usage of maintenance resources (inputs) at standard prices. In addition to that, facilitating responsibility accounting for maintaining resources and facilitates management by exception by directing management's
attention to cost variances that are worthy of their attention, providing a sound basis for the appropriate managerial action(s).

Selvik and Aven (2011) proposed a framework for Reliability and Risk Centered Maintenance (RRCM) and applied it within the offshore oil and gas industry. The main features of the framework are illustrated below (figure 2-3), which shows a process defined by seven boxes of assessments to determine the PM programme. They believe that their framework assists in optimising the preventive maintenance activities by collaborating the conception of RCM and RBM.

![Figure 2-3: RRCM Framework (Selvik and Aven 2011)](image)

Dawotola et al (2012) proposed a maintenance framework for pipeline system based on risk (figure 2-4). Their proposed framework was particularly suitable for repairable systems and for components whose failures are noticeable. The optimisation process inherent in the proposed framework consisted of the following six steps: probability of failure estimation, determination of consequences of failure, estimation of risk of failure, calculation of risk reduction, calculation of total cost function and determination of cost optimal inspection frequency of the pipeline in a preventive maintenance policy.
Jagathy and Deepak (2013) presented a new model, accelerated RCM (A-RCM), to prolong periods of operation without shutdown in the petroleum refineries. The model attempted to avoid the shortcoming of classical RCM by ensuring faster implementation as well as simplifying the process of implementation. They identified the minimum requirement for the new model
to follow in order to arrive at preventive maintenance schedules, predictive maintenance recommendations and design changes as:

1. The process should consider the existing maintenance practices and outcomes.
2. All failure modes that are reasonably likely to occur must be considered.
3. Critical equipment needs more intensive analysis.
4. The model should provide results quickly.
5. The results should be measurable at a macro-level.
6. The new model should integrate with the existing practices.

They suggested that the A-RCM model and process provide refineries with a comprehensive tool for accelerated improvement in reliability.

This section covered some of the most important maintenance frameworks that are implemented within the petroleum industry. The next section deals with the inventory management and spare parts control.

2.8 Inventory Management and Spare Part Control

Inventories can be described as goods or materials which are kept for a time, to be used only when they are needed either during an operational process or for the fulfilment of a customer demand (Krajewski et al, 2012). According to Drury (2013) inventory refers to materials kept in stock which are used to fulfil and meet any future demands of consumers.

Inventory management has become an important focus area for researchers due to the development of production processes and the increasing demand for spare parts (Jingjiang and Zhendong 2012). Spare parts inventory management plays an essential role in determining the level of inventory and
operation of the equipment, not to mention the proportion of returns while reducing the risk of recession stock.

Keth, et al (1994) stated that the basic pre-requisite for the successful management of inventory relies on the management considering three important issues, which are:

- The certainty of whether a part to be stocked or not. Whether the purchase order should be released.
- The quantity which should be requested.

This was supported by Bošnjaković (2010), who believed that the quantity to be retained should also be determined for the successful management of inventory.

The management of maintenance of spare parts is not an easy task, as keeping too much inventory can have an effect on the business’s cash flow. On the other hand, failure to provide the required quantity at the right time may have a huge negative impact on all the operational processes (Aronis et al 2004). Although the goals of reducing inventory and the availability of spare parts appear to be two inverse targets, by using an advanced inventory management and a specialised information system, it is possible to accomplish this goal.

Hua et al. (2007) pointed out certain properties and needs which makes spare parts management vary from other types of inventory at several points:

- A high quality of service is required as a lack of spare parts could result in significant financial loss. Indeed, as spare parts demand can be very intermittent and complicated to predict, it is essential to keep
a very large number of items in stock, with the cost of such items often at a high price.

- The unavailability of historical data regarding spare parts demand is another challenge which can make demand forecasting difficult.

The main aim of any inventory management system is to attain sufficient service level whilst minimising the inventory investment and administrative costs. This essentially means that the inventory management should aim at striking equilibrium between costs, which results from the acquisitions, and retention of the required spare parts inventory and consideration of the availability of the inventory. In addition to that, purchasing cost, item cost and holding cost must also be considered, as much as operation shutdown cost is considered (Bevilacqua et al 2008).

Liao and Rausch (2010) highlighted that in order to successfully manage and control the manufacturing process, management should be able to forecast and prevent process breakdown.

Schroeder et al (2011) stated that certain authors have indicated some important factors when it comes to inventory management such as: the demand for spare parts associated with preventive maintenance may be specific to a certain extent. The demand for majority of the items will be unpredictable and unsteady. The decline in the age of goods during their life cycle and the complexities of the production processes will lead to an increased risk of obsolescence for certain items, as well as the addition of new items to the inventory.
2.8.1 Inventory Cost

Inventory cost is the most important and decisive factor when it comes to determining inventory level and the reordering point. The inventory cost can be further be broken down into four sections as shown below (Evans, 1997). Syntetos (2009) reasoned the importance of controlling inventory to the cost associated with the retention of stock.

The inventory cost can be classified into four types - unit price, ordering cost, holding cost and stock-out cost. The criticality reflects how the potential unavailability affects the safety of the people and environment, the costs of downtime and the quality of the processes (Aronis et al, 2008).

2.8.1.1 Unit Cost

This can be defined as the amount of money a company needs to pay to suppliers in order to acquire a product or a spare part. While Evans (1997) believed that the majority of product prices can remain invariable, Waters (2008) argued that comparing item price can be very difficult as each vendor offer will differ from the other in terms of price, quantity discount, delivery, payment method and so on.

2.8.1.2 Ordering Cost

This includes all costs associated with the purchase order, irrespective of the amount ordered. It comprises of the cost and time spent on generating and sending the purchase request, evaluating supplier quotations, expediting and following up shipments, transportation expenditure, receiving and inspecting orders and payment procedure costs.
2.8.1.3 Holding Cost

It takes into account all the charges associated with storing items and includes all warehouse operation activity expenses such as: handling materials, picking and packing items, monitoring inventory level, the cost of operating and maintaining warehouse equipment and insurance.

2.8.2 Economic Order Quantity (EOQ)

Waters (2008) stated that "because of the ease of application, its capability to be used as a guide in many different situations, and its flexibility, the use of EOQ is widely encouraged". According to Heizer and Render (2014) the EOQ model (equation 2-6) is a well-known technique used to control independent demand but it based on a number of assumptions.

$$EOQ = \sqrt{\frac{2DOc}{Hc}}$$  \hspace{1cm} 2-6

Where:-

$D$ Demand.

$Oc$ Order cost for each order.

$Hc$ Holding cost for each item yearly.

2.8.2.1 Reordering Point (ROP)

One of the basic principles of inventory management is when a new purchase order should be released, in a simple inventory system, where the demand and the lead time are constant. This can be determined by multiplying the daily demand by lead time (Heizer and Render 2014). However, in reality, demand and lead time are not always invariable due to uncertain demands and lead time. Therefore, organisations must retain more
units to be used in combating any unexpected demand or overdue shipments; a process also known as safety stock.

2.8.3 Safety Stock

Safety stock (SS) can be defined as the quantity of stock which is preserved in order to protect against the demand uncertainty (Reid and Sanders 2005). Thus, this stock can be used if the demand is higher than expected or the replenishment cycle takes more time than expected (Bowersox et al 2013).

2.8.4 Probabilistic Model and Safety Stock

Heizer and Render (2014) defined three different probability models which can be implemented to calculate the ROP.

2.8.4.1 Variable Demand and Constant Lead Time

\[ ROP = (A_{VD} \times L_T) + Z \times \alpha_d \]  \hspace{1cm} 2-7

Where:
- \( A_{VD} \) Average demand during lead time.
- \( L_T \) Lead time.
- \( Z \) Number of standard deviations.
- \( \alpha_d \) Standard deviations of demand during lead time.

2.8.4.2 Constant Demand and Variable Lead Time

\[ ROP = (D_d \times A_{VLT}) + Z \times D_d \times \alpha_{LT} \]  \hspace{1cm} 2-8

Where:
- \( D_d \) Daily demand.
- \( A_{VLT} \) Average lead time in days.
- \( \alpha_{LT} \) Standard deviations lead time in days.
2.8.4.3 Variable Demand and Lead Time

\[ ROP = (A_D \times A_{LT}) + Z \times \alpha_{LT} \]

2.8.5 Spare Parts Classification

Gopalakrishnan and Banerji (2013) defined spare parts as a part which is similar to the one which must be replaced because of wear and tear sustained during the operating life of the equipment. Classification of items is very important when it comes to helping management identify important items and facilitating the demand forecasting process and inventory control (Bacchetti and Saccani 2012). Determining the level of spare parts inventory primarily depends on the classification of spare parts (Jingjiang and Zhendong 2012). In addition to that, Millstein et al (2014) believed that inventory performance can be managed and observed more effectively if inventory strategies fit best within a group of items instead of each individual item.

ABC classifications developed by General Electrical in the 1950s to control their inventory is one of the most used classifications based on cost criteria (Guvenir and Erel 1998). ABC classification is a well-known approach and it has been used widely in many different industries (Ramanathan, 2006; Molenaers et al 2012). Keskin and Ozkan (2012) stated that in order to apply this method, items should be annually arranged in descending order with regard to money usage and then calculated by multiplying the item price by the annual demand.
VED analysis is another recognized spare part classification that is based on the criticality of an item. "V" stands for vital items without which a hospital cannot function, "E" for essential items without which an institution may function but it can affect the quality of the services and "D" stands for desirable items, unavailability of which will not interfere with the functioning (Gupta et al 2007).

2.8.6 The Role of Spare Parts Inventory in Oil Industrials

Oil and gas industry usually rely on very expensive equipment and the consequences of downtime are very costly which may require immediate maintenance. The system downtime period will be longer if a critical spare part is not available, and thus managing these parts becomes a principal task when it comes to ensuring sustainability in their operation and reducing downtime for such equipment (Louit et al 2011). In order to stay competitive, companies must also find new ways to make the most out of their assets. Therefore, ensuring uptime and safety, mitigating risks and reducing costs are considered essential for equipment availability and maintenance (Thakur 2014). A sufficient quantity of spare parts is vital when it comes to supporting and strengthening the operational capacity of the production equipment, although keeping too much inventory does not eliminate the risk of equipment failure. In order to maximise production without prejudice to the safety of operating, oil and gas companies must ensure the long-term integrity of their equipment.
2.8.7 Spare Parts Inventory Features

Spare parts can be divided into two categories, which are: repairable and non-repairable parts. Repairable parts are parts that can be swapped into new ones and sent to a repair centre, so these parts are technically and economically repairable (Hadi-Vencheha and Mohamadghasemi, 2011). On the other hand, non-repairable parts are those which are not technically or economically repairable, in a failed situation, these defective parts will be replaced by a new one and scrapped (Driessen et al, 2014).

Spare parts represent one of the fundamental elements when it comes to supporting the maintenance process. Determining the demand for spare parts is an essential key for supporting and strengthening the operational capacity of the production equipment (Hu et al, 2013). Additionally, the unavailability of spare parts can have a negative impact on operational performance, while the cost associated with critical purchase orders is also very high (Liao and Rausch, 2010). The importance of spare parts inventory stems from its direct role in determining the level of inventory and operation of the equipment and the proportion of revenues as well as the risk of obsolete stock (Chen et al, 2010).

2.8.8 Spare Parts Demand

Spare parts inventory differs from other industrialised inventories in a number of ways. The role of spare parts inventories is to keep equipment in an effective condition. The policies which dictate the level of spare parts inventories will be impacted by the function of equipment, the equipment's condition and the type of maintenance required (Kennedy et al, 2002).
(Chu et al, 2008) believed that managing enormous spare part inventories with equivalent attentiveness cannot be accomplished. Whilst extra inventory is objectionable from a management viewpoint, in contrast, not stocking a sufficient number of spare parts at the right time may lead to a malfunction in the production process, as well as result in loss of revenue and significant costs.

One of the main requirements when it comes to successful spare parts inventory management is accurate demand forecasting (Vasumathi and Saradha, 2013). The challenges faced by management relate to the inability of traditional forecasting methods to provide an accurate categorization of demand (Porras and Dekker, 2008). This is due to the fact that usage of spare parts is often irregular. If the cost of failure associated with not keeping certain parts is too high, this could result in an increase in the amount of stored spare parts (Scala et al, 2014). The nature and features of spare parts demand, such as unpredicted demand, obsolete items, slow moving and risk cost cannot be easily calculated as handling such inventory can be very complex and difficult (Wahba et al, 2012).

2.8.9 Integrated Spare Parts and Preventive Maintenance Models

Maintenance relies heavily on the availability of spare parts to reduce the equipment downtime and to allow the system to perform its anticipated functions (Luxhøj et al, 1997). Destombes et al (2009) emphasizes on the importance of spare parts demand and their connection to maintenance requirements.
Kaio and Osaki (1981) examined the situation where spares inventory ordering policy and replacement age are jointly optimised. The proposed model was built into two main assumptions, which are, the original unit, in which a spare part is replaced after delivery even if the original is still operating and the second assumption that the spare part is put into an inventory until the original unit fails. Their work ignored the importance of trade-off between maintenance-related costs and inventory-related costs.

Kabir and Al-Olayan (1994, 1996) further extended the analysis to the case of multiple units in service and the possibility of holding more than a single unit of inventory and emphasised on the importance of considering the relation between the spare part and time aged maintenance.

Chelbi and Daoud (2001) discussed an optimal periodic replacement and spare parts provisioning strategy. The proposed strategy was completely defined once the replacement period (T), the replenishment cycle (R) and the ordering point were determined (S). The optimal strategy (T, R and S) aimed to minimise the total expected cost (replenishment cost of spare parts inventory management cost) per unit over an infinite span of time. A computation procedure was proposed to generate from the mathematical model, the optimal preventive replacement period and the optimal spare equipment threshold level.

Vaughan (2005) stated the importance of spare parts for plant and equipment and their expensive cost to keep in inventory as well as the imperative availability of spare parts for the maintenance when needed, in order to avoid costly plant shutdown or equipment unavailability. A dynamic programming characterization was presented for a spare parts ordering policy. The model
investigated that demand for spare parts arises from two sources, random failure of units in service and bulk replacement at regularly scheduled preventive maintenance intervals.

Liao and Rausch (2010) stated that although both condition based maintenance (CBM) and spare part inventory control have been studied extensively, their integration has not been studied well. They proposed a joint production and spare part inventory control strategy driven by CBM for a piece of manufacturing equipment with a critical unit. The first stage minimizes the base-stock level “S” that satisfies the specified stock-out probability and the resulting base-stock level is then used as a known quantity in the second stage, to determine the optimal preventive maintenance. They believe that the proposed joint decision-making strategy should be able to significantly reduce the total operating-cost in today’s production processes as a new spare part inventory control and production paradigm driven by condition based maintenance.

Van Horenbeek et al (2013) reviewed relevant work and classified them based on the combination of maintenance policy (block-based, age-based, and condition-based) and inventory policy (periodic review and continuous review). Jiang et al (2015) stated that maintenance is the main source of spare parts consumption and spare parts are the pre-condition for performing maintenance. They explained that conducting too frequent maintenance may result in more spares consumption, but less maintenance may increase the risk of system downtime.

On the other hand, the shortage of spares postpones the maintenance procedures and may increase equipment downtime but excess of spares
involves extra expenditures. They emphasized on the importance of
determining the frequency of maintenance, the ordering time and the
quantity of spare parts. They classified joint optimisation models into
simulation models and mathematical programming models and criticized
the simulation models for being random and each round of simulation
generates a different process. They proposed joint optimisation model of
block replacement and periodic review inventory policies for a multi-unit
system under the influence of deteriorating inventory. The model
considered the lead time to be constant and to choose the reorder points
at equidistant points in time to bring the inventory level up to the maximum
inventory level.

2.9 Risk Assessment

According to the British Standard Institute (BSI 2000) risk is the “uncertainty
inherent in plans and the possibility of something happening that can affect
the prospects of achieving business or projects goals”.

Reynolds (1996) stated that risk assessment may be quantitative or
qualitative in nature. Quantitative risk assessment is done by the estimation
of frequency and its consequences. Quantified risk assessment is only
appropriate where it is reasonable and practicable. Reasonable in terms of
the cost (it should not be high compared with the value of solving the
problem) and practicable in terms of the availability of information and data
(Carter et al, 2003).

ISO (2009) defined the risk assessment process as the overall process of
defined risk as "the considered expected loss or damage associated with the occurrence of a possible undesired event".

Tixier et al (2002) identified 62 methodologies for risk analysis and assessment and separated these methods into three different phases (identification, evaluation and hierarchisation). These methodologies were further classified in terms of input data into seven different classes (plan or diagram, process and reaction, products, probability and frequency, policy, environment, text, and historical knowledge). The methods were then ranked into six classes based on the combination of four usual criteria (qualitative, quantitative, deterministic and probabilistic) and finally, the output data is classified into four classes (management, list, probabilistic and hierarchisation). The shortages of the mentioned methods were identified and the most important feature of the shortages was identified as, more general the methodology is, the less it takes into account the specificities of the studied case, and on the contrary, if the methodology is too specific it will be less transposable to another case.

IPCS (2004) believes that risk assessment is the first component of risk analysis and it is a process that comprises of four main steps: Identification of hazards, hazards characterization, exposure assessment and risk characterization.

Maylor (2010) stated that the majority of risk management activities rely on qualitative data which is obtained based on people's perceptions of risk levels. The qualitative data can be presented on a grid with two axes: probability and impact (Low, medium and High). The qualitative risk
assessm en t process is considered to be comparable to the quantitative risk assessment process.

Merna and Al-Thani (2011) believed that the quantitative approach of risk assessment tends to locate absolute value ranges together with probability distribution for the outcome and therefore, involves more sophisticated analysis facilitated by the use of computers.

Yoe (2011) defined risk assessment as the process of estimating (evaluating) the risks associated with different expected hazards, opportunities to gain risk management options. The reason for involving "opportunities" falls under the belief that if opportunities are not recognised, this situation is going to be considered as a loss. He divided risk assessment into two main types: qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative risk assessment is characterised by its lack of dependency on the numerical expressions, this implies that the qualitative risk assessment approach relies on risk characterizations or classifying risks into descriptive categories such as high, medium and low.

2.9.1 The Importance of Risk Assessment within Petroleum Industry

Petroleum industry is one of the industries that is considered to be associated with hazardous and high risk due to the fact that there are a considerable amount of flammable, toxic and explosive substances being processed and stored within the facility. Risk assessment, therefore, becomes vital and necessary for all the equipment and components of the petroleum industry.

Khan et al (2001) defined the science of risk assessment (RA), which has emerged in recent years with ever-increasing importance as a process that includes both qualitative and quantitative determination of risks and their
social evaluation. The key aspects of accidents in chemical process industries which addressed within RA were mentioned as:

a) Forecast of accidents: This is aimed at creating opportunities to rectify problems before any harm can occur.

b) Consequences analysis of likely accidents.

c) Development of managerial strategies for “emergency preparedness” and “damage minimization.”

Griggs (2011) stated that one of the worst catastrophic disasters in the US history was the blowout of British Petroleum (BP)’s Macondo well in the Gulf of Mexico which took place on April 20, 2010. As a result of this 11 people were killed, while several others were severely injured. It also affected the livelihoods of many fishermen as well as many marine animals were also destroyed in the tragedy.

RPS Group (2011) stated that over the last three decades there have been a considerable number of catastrophic accidents occurring every 2-3 years on an average, associated with the petroleum offshore operations. Therefore, the assessment of risks with the petroleum industry is vital in order to mitigate the risks and create a safe environment.

Ambituuni et al (2015) indicated the importance of the risk assessment within the petroleum sector and reported that accidents involving transportation of petroleum products by road have been associated with high frequency of occurrence and high safety consequences in developing countries. Using Nigeria as case example, 2318 accidents approximately were analyzed involving truck tankers from 2007 to 2012 with a tailored risk assessment framework.
2.9.2 Risk Assessment within Petroleum Industry

There are different risk-based approaches reported in literature ranging from the purely qualitative to the highly quantitative methods. Many authors have used probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) as a tool for maintenance prioritization.

Arendt (1990) proposed that risk assessment approach integrates reliability and consequence analysis, and attempts to answer the following questions in order to assess the risk:

- What can go wrong?
- How can it go wrong?
- How likely is its occurrence?
- What would be the consequences?

Balkey and Art (1998) developed a methodology, which includes risk-based ranking methods, beginning with the use of plant PRA for the determination of risk-significant and less risk-significant components for inspection and the determination of similar populations for pump and valve in-service testing. This methodology integrates non-destructive examination data, structural reliability/risk assessment results, PRA results, failure data and expert opinions.

Khan and Abbasi (1998) proposed a methodology for risk assessment named Optimal Risk Analysis (ORA). ORA involved four steps: hazard identification and screening, hazard assessment (both qualitative and probabilistic), quantification of hazards or consequence analysis and risk estimation (figure 2-5).
Different techniques such as hazard and identification and ranking analysis (HIRA), hazard analysis and operability (HAZOP) and probabilistic hazard assessment were used for each step.

Figure 2-5: Simplified Block of Optimal Risk Analysis (Khan And Abbasi 1998)

Culp (2002) suggested that petroleum industry embraces a conventional undifferentiated risk management approach which can be categorized into three main sequential stages:

1. Risk Analysis: Which is the stage when risky events are identified.
2. Risk Assessment: In this stage, the frequency and consequences of the previously identified risks are determined.
3. Risk control: In this phase, risk is managed by selecting the right procedure.
Khan et al (2001) demonstrated the applicability of a new risk assessment methodology ORA (optimal risk analysis) in conducting risk assessment of a typical petrochemical industry. ORA aimed to reduce the costs and time required by conventional risk assessment methodologies, without compromising on the desired level of accuracy and precision. Domino effect analysis (DEA) procedure was proposed to forecast accidents and their impacts.

Out of the two main phases of risk-based maintenance, Arunraj and Maiti (2007) described the importance of the risk assessment as the critical and foremost important phase, as the maintenance decisions are going to be made with the assessed risk as centre. The proposed risk assessment involves identifying potential threats, estimating their likelihood (number of events/time interval), and estimating the consequences (impact/event). The combination of these estimates represents the risk (impacts/time interval) associated with the activity being evaluated.

Bertolini et al (2009) reported the application of the risk-based inspection and maintenance (RBI&M) method to two specific stages in the maintenance activities of the refineries. The panel of experts developed heuristic methods in order to apply RBI&M procedure to the two cases allowing the refinery to minimize the overall risk taking into consideration the limits in terms of time and budget (in turnaround case) and of human resources (in the management of work orders). One of the main steps of the proposed RBI&M was the risk analysis and assessment which was built mainly on three factors (probability, exposure and consequences) to determine the overall risk.
Cigolini and Rossi (2010) identified different stages in petroleum supply chain in terms of safety equipment, operational risks, plants and processes and agreed that no specific risk management approach has been dedicated for each specific stage. They stated that the most popular forward techniques in petroleum industry to assess the risk are:

1. The Hazard Checklist: This technique is based on performing plant analysis to verify whether risky events identified in previous risk analysis or other similar plants could occur.

2. Event Three Analysis (ETA): This technique facilitates the ability to determine the consequences of a potential risk based on safety equipment and procedures adopted in the plant.

3. Fault Three Analysis (FTA): This technique helps in risk identification process by associating the consequences to the primary risky events.

Anvaripour et al (2013) suggested that the assessment of risk (R) considered for each asset was: \[ R = F \times C \]

Where: \( F \) is the frequency factor or number of failures in a certain time period (year) and \( C \) is a consequence of the failure measured as follows:

\[ C = (O_I \times O_F) + M_C + I_{SE} \]  \hspace{1cm} 2-10

Where:

- \( O_I \) Operational Impact factor.
- \( O_F \) Operational Flexibility factor.
- \( M_C \) Maintenance Cost factor.
- \( I_{SE} \) Impact on Safety and Environmental factor.

The classifications of scales for ranking the different assets were established as follows:
• The failure frequency scales (F) were classified from 1 to 4, according
to the number of failure occurrence per year.

• The five scales assigned to operational impact (OI) range from
immediate plant shutdown to no significant impact on operations.

• The maintenance cost (MC) factor was classified into three scales.

• Six scales were allocated to impact on safety and environment (ISE)
with respect to the magnitude of impact on the safety and environment.

Hauge et al (2015) characterised the uncertainties associated with the risk
assessments and some of the surrounding debates. The study arrived at the
conclusion that all aspects of risks should be considered when it comes to
uncertainty. They explained the implications of the uncertainties including the:

1. Potential values embedded in the risk assessments.

2. Lack of validity of quantified worst-case scenarios and their
probabilities and impacts.

3. Limited prospects of filling addressed knowledge gaps.

4. How risk assessments restrict the debate on what issues and
uncertainties are considered relevant.

The assessment of the risk within the petroleum industry is an essential
activity due to the importance of the activity in terms of preventing the
occurrence of the risk and adding value to the system by improving the
reliability of the system.

2.10 Conclusion and the Knowledge Gap

Chapter Two covered the literature review of topics related to maintenance in
general and of the petroleum industry in particular. The chapter covered the
aspects of the strategies that were implemented to select the maintenance
policies based on reliability and risk. Some work has been presented with regards to the use of AHP for the selection of the maintenance policies within the petroleum industry (Section 2.5). The literature shows that there is no general framework for the selection of maintenance policies, but instead the proposed AHP frameworks were targeting a specific sector and equipment, most of which was for pipelines.

The operational level was covered within the literature (Section 2.6) and some work has been presented to attempt to schedule the activities of the preventive maintenance within different fields and within the petroleum industry. However the existed mathematical models do not take into account the major maintenance costs which related to the nature of the petroleum industry.

The inventory management and spare parts control was outlined in section (2.8) and some of the integrated spare part and PM models were highlighted to optimise the movement of spare parts. However, most of the models did not utilize the optimised time of maintenance interval and connect it to the spare part leading time.

The risk assessment within the petroleum industry is a major activity to ensure avoidance of undesirable activities. Qualitative and quantitative methods were demonstrated in section 2.9 to assess the likelihood of the risks involved and their possible consequences. Due to the importance of risk assessment, further investigation is necessary to look into the possibility to improving the assessment method of the likelihood of the occurrence of the failure and enhancing the existing methods of estimating the consequences.
In order to bridge the identifiable gaps, an integrated framework is proposed to manage the major maintenance activities within the petroleum industry (Chapter Three). The framework consists of four major activities. Generic AHP model is presented to identify the criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives that lead to the optimum selection of the most suitable maintenance policy (Chapter Four). Proposed mathematical model is presented to contain all the major related costs of maintenance for the petroleum equipment to arrive at the identification of the optimum intervals (Chapter Five). An integrated approach between preventive maintenance and spare parts control is proposed in Chapter Six. A proposed model for the assessment of the risk within the oil and gas industry is demonstrated in Chapter Seven to enhance the safety reliability of the system.
Chapter Three

Research Methodologies and the Proposed Integrated Maintenance Framework

Chapter Three will be covering the various methods that will be applied to optimise each major activity and is divided into two main sections. The first section covers concisely each selected methodology for the optimisation of a certain activity. The second part covers the proposed integrated maintenance framework.
3.1 Introduction

The challenges associated with the maintenance in general and specifically within the petroleum industry were introduced in the literature review in Chapter Two. Different strategies are available for maintenance management to assign the most suitable maintenance policies either based on the importance of reliability or risk. Different approaches and models are also available to select the time of carrying out the maintenance activities (maintenance interval).

The challenge of assessing risk in terms of likelihood and consequences has been given considerable time by researches and different techniques (qualitative and quantitative) were discussed with the literature review. Inventory management is another aspect of concern within the petroleum companies, as the spare parts of some of the equipment is very expensive and running out of stock leads to the disturbance of the operations of maintenance and consequentially stopping the entire production line.

In order to optimise major maintenance activities, the main objectives of maintenance have to be identified and maintenance has to be defined as a function that crosses to other departments to enhance the efficiency of the entire operation system. To bridge the gap between the current status of maintenance performance and the expected vision to improve the maintenance function, a guiding principle that covers the major activities of maintenance is required (Márquez, 2007).

3.2 Research Methodologies

To optimise the maintenance activities within the petroleum industry, an integrated framework is proposed in this study. The framework links the
The major activities associated with maintenance within the petroleum industry and each of these activities are further optimised in order to add value to the optimisation of the entire framework. Four main activities have been identified within the scope of maintenance:

- Maintenance strategic level.
- Maintenance operational level.
- Inventory management.
- Risk assessment within the petroleum industry.

### 3.2.1 Maintenance Strategic Level

On this level, the focus is to decide on the selection of the most appropriate policy for equipment maintenance. In other words, the question that needs to be answered on this level is what policy should be assigned into equipment or its parts. Deciding on the most appropriate policy for equipment maintenance within the petroleum industry is a sophisticated matter, since the maintenance program must combine technical requirement with firm's managerial strategy. The technical aspect can generally be summed up in having healthy equipment and the managerial aspect is generally concerned with having the production running smoothly so the necessity of the availability of equipment.

Different approaches have been developed and discussed extensively within the literature review which can be summarized into the following:

- Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM).
- Risk Based Maintenance (RBM).

Each method has its own techniques and advantages. However, in a multi equipment industry, such as the petroleum production line, reliability,
availability and risk vary from upstream, midstream and downstream stages and it also differs from one equipment to another. This variation requires a multi criteria decision making (MCDM) technique in order to ensure the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy.

Wang et al (2007) suggested that plants are equipped with various machines, which have different reliability requirements, safety levels and failure effect. Therefore, it is obvious that an appropriate maintenance program must define different maintenance strategies for various types of machines which will lead to an acceptable level of reliability, availability of production facilities and avoid unnecessary investment in maintenance. One of the most outstanding MCDM approaches is the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP) (Torfi et al, 2010). In this research, classical and fuzzy AHP are applied to optimise the selection of maintenance policies at strategic level for equipment within the petroleum industry.

Figure (3-1) presents the proposed steps to be followed in order to arrive at the selection of the alternatives (maintenance policies). A broad explanation of each of the steps is covered in chapter 4. However, the main steps for classical and fuzzy AHP are listed as followed:

3.2.1.1 Building the Hierarchy Structure

In this step, the decomposition of the entire problem is constructed. Identifications of the main criteria that influence the selection of the maintenance policy, sub-criteria impact on each of the main criteria and of alternatives (possible maintenance policies) are established in this step.
3.2.1.2 Collection of the Data

After building the hierarchy structure, a pairwise comparison is set to obtain the preference between each two nodes with respect to the higher node. A questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent out targeting academics and industries to fill in the pairwise comparison.
3.2.1.3 Aggregation of the Collected Data

Once the data from the questionnaire are collected, the geometric mean is used to aggregate the collected data.

3.2.1.4 Building the Comparison Matrix

Different comparison scales are available to translate the linguistic preference to numbers to build the matrix. The scale is identified while building the questionnaire to the advantage of the correct scale preference. Each matrix represents the pairwise comparison between certain factors with respect to the upper node.

3.2.1.5 Consistency

In this step, the consistency of each matrix is measured. Once the weights have been allocated for each criterion and recorded, a consistency check has to be performed.

3.2.1.6 Pairwise Matrix Evaluation Methods

Different derivation methods of the matrix are available for the classic AHP. In this work three methods will be applied and compared to each other:

- Mean of the Normalised values (MNV).
- Normalised Geometric Mean (NGM).
- Eigenvector Mean (EVM).

3.2.1.7 Sensitivity Analysis

The purpose of this analysis is to study the reflection of the changes in the preference between the criteria and sub-criteria onto the prioritization of the alternatives (maintenance policies).
3.2.1.8 Fuzzy AHP

The reason of applying FAHP is that the use of fuzzy logic represents the uncertainty in the translations of expert's judgment. It follows almost the same steps of AHP as above, but the difference is to use the triangular fuzzy number (TFN) scale either to translate the linguistic preferences or to convert the rigid numbers into fuzzy values.

Applying AHP and its different derivation methods and fuzzy AHP using the TFN scale is expected to provide the maintenance team on the strategic level with the method of selecting the most appropriate maintenance policy within the petroleum industry.

3.2.2 Maintenance Operational Level

Once the most appropriate maintenance policy is assigned to the equipment/parts, the maintenance team moves to another task which is the determination of the most optimum time for maintenance intervals. The operational level, deals with the problem associated with the optimum time to perform preventive maintenance.

Different techniques have been developed to obtain the best time interval to perform preventive maintenance, to avoid a long shutdown or short mean time between maintenance, which were discussed in the literature review.

In this study, development of total maintenance cost is proposed and all major relevant costs for both corrective and preventive actions are identified for the petroleum industry to optimally select the most suitable maintenance interval.

The proposed mathematical model is built mainly on the following:
• Identifying the associated costs in case of the occurrence of unplanned maintenance where corrective actions are required.

• Identifying the costs associated with the preventive actions.

• Calculating the probability of failure which will be later multiplied by the identified corrective costs.

• Calculating the survival factor and multiplying it with the preventive costs.

Figure (2-3) demonstrates the hierarchy of the proposed model which will be extensively demonstrated in Chapter 5.

3.2.3 Inventory Management

Within the identification of the associated costs of maintenance, spare parts are estimated to have a high portion of maintenance's cost, which leads to the conception of the necessity of optimising this major activity within petroleum companies. The role of spare parts inventories is to keep equipment in an effective condition. Spare parts represent one of the fundamental elements when it comes to supporting the maintenance process. As such, determining the demand for spare parts is the key in supporting and
strengthening the operational capacity of the production equipment. The system downtime period will be longer if a critical spare part is not available and thus, the management of these parts has become a principal task in terms of sustaining their operation and reducing downtime for such equipment.

Maintenance as a function has to impact positively on the inventory management or the management of spare parts. The optimisation of spare parts is important so that the maintenance will have the required parts for the maintenance interval and simultaneously avoiding the over stock of spare parts, which influence negatively on inventory department and the entire company.

The intended methodology for optimising the spare parts is to evolve an integrated approach between maintenance requirements and spare parts inventory to find a mechanism, which can help in determining the required quantities of spare parts, as well as the compulsory time limit.

The majority of the maintenance activities within the petroleum industry are conducted preventively based on time. Therefore, the proposed integrated method for optimising the spare parts is to optimise the preventive maintenance intervals and linking it to the inventory department, which will be broadly discussed in Chapter 6.

3.2.4 Risk Assessment

The operational activities in oil and gas industry comprises of many hazardous scenarios and risky events associated with them. The production line with oil and gas industries store and process a large amount of flammable and explosive materials, which in return could lead to
environmental disasters, human fatalities, injuries and losses in production and assets. Therefore, risk assessment management support the decision-makers to manage these risks and also take proper actions to reduce and mitigate them.

As part of the integrated maintenance framework to optimise the maintenance activities and because the nature of the petroleum industry enforces the need for identifying convenient way of estimating the risk that may occur as consequences of the failure, a quantitative and qualitative model is proposed.

Khan and Haddara (2003) identified four impacted areas as consequences of the failure occurs which are:

- System performance loss.
- Financial loss.
- Human health loss.
- Environment loss.

A mathematical model is presented in Chapter 7 to estimate the likelihood of risk. The consequences of the risks are assessed in the four above-mentioned areas. The system performance loss is assessed using the scheme for system performance function. A mathematical presentation has also been proposed to estimate the financial losses within the petroleum industry and to measure the consequences on human health. The environmental loss is calculated by adopting the approach developed by Khan and Haddara (2003). A diagram will be proposed showing the steps that should be taken in order to support the maintenance team to decide
whether to take an immediate action or postpone it to the next maintenance interval.

3.3 The Proposed Integrated Maintenance Framework

Framework is defined by the Oxford Dictionary as, "An essential supporting structure of a building, vehicle, or object". In general, a framework is a real or conceptual structure intended to serve as a support or guide for building something that further expands the structure into something useful. In computer systems, a framework is often a layered structure indicating what kind of programs can or should be built and how they would interrelate.

Some computer system frameworks also include actual programs, specify programming interfaces or offer programming tools for using the frameworks. A framework may be for a set of functions within a system and how they interrelate; the layers of an operating system; the layers of an application subsystem; how communication should be standardized at some level of a network; and so forth. A framework is generally more comprehensive than a protocol and more prescriptive than a structure.

An integrated framework is an analytical tool with several variations and contexts. It is used to make conceptual distinctions and organize ideas. Strong conceptual frameworks capture something real and do this in a way that is easy to remember and apply (Ravitch and Riggan, 2011).

Figure (3-3) demonstrates the high level diagram showing the main connections between the levels. It shows the each level and its main target and the links to another levels and activities.
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Risk Assessment
During this activity the assessment of likelihood of risk and its consequences are assessed ensuring that equipment will be serving as attended until next maintenance interval.

Strategic Level
The main target on this level is to select the most optimum policy by implementing classic/fuzzy AHP. Most of the maintenance actions are predetermined to be preventively.

Operational Level
On this level, the maintenance team decide on selecting the most appropriate time interval to conduct preventive maintenance where the majority of maintenance actions are implemented.

Risk Assessment
During this activity the assessment of likelihood of risk and its consequences are assessed ensuring that equipment will be serving as attended until next maintenance interval.

Inventory control
As discovered that the cost of spare parts contributes highly in the cost of maintenance, a optimisation of spare parts are investigated on this activity.

Figure 3-3: A Diagram showing the main connections Between Levels

3.3.1 Optimisation
The definition of optimisation in the Oxford online dictionary is, "the action of making the best or most effective use of a situation or resource". In mathematics, computer science and operations research, mathematical optimisation is the selection of a best element (with regard to some criteria) from some set of available alternatives. In this work, the optimisation of the entire maintenance activity is administered through the optimising the major activities of maintenance.
The optimisation of the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy for equipment or its parts will be achieved by the comparison of the criteria, sub-criteria and available alternatives on the strategic level.

The scheduling of the maintenance activity will be conducted by mathematical programming. As the optimisation of a problem is to find the values of the variables that minimize or maximize the objective function, the proposed mathematical model will be seeking the optimum interval where the lowest cost can be achieved.

As the inventory of the spare parts is one of the main costs of the maintenance, an integrated approach will be proposed to seek the minimization of the cost of the spare parts inventory and its availability for the maintenance tasks.

The estimation of the risks within the petroleum fields is one of the main outputs of the maintenance and accordingly, a proposed mathematical model will be delivered to assess the likelihood of the risks and its estimated consequences. To achieve this target, a risk estimation model will comprehensively include or road map these proposed equations.

Figure (3-4) demonstrates the proposed integrated maintenance framework. The sequence of the proposed framework is to start with the strategic level and then move to the operation level. When the activities within these two levels are optimised, then the inventory spare parts and the risk assessment are optimised.
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- Build the hierarchy structure
  - Identification of criteria and sub-criteria
  - Selection of the maintenance policy
    - TBM
    - CBM
    - CM

- TMC
  - Maintenance intervals
    - Appropriate time
      - NO
      - Yes
        - Schedule maintenance
          - Likelihood of risk
            - Consequences of risk
              - Tolerable Risk to maintenance interval

- Determine the maintenance intervals per year
- Determine the required spare parts
  - EOQ
  - ROP
  - SS

- Keys:
  - CBM: Condition Based Maintenance
  - CM: Corrective maintenance
  - EOQ: Economic Order Quantity
  - ROP: Reordering Point
  - TBM: Time based Maintenance
  - TMC: Total Maintenance Cost
  - SS: Safety Stock

Figure 3-4: Proposed Integrated Maintenance Framework
3.3.2 Information

There are certain types of data and information that will be needed to validate the methodologies and ensure the practicality of the integrated framework. The type of data and information and its sources are listed below:

1. The input data for AHP which will be collected using a questionnaire, targeting academics and industrial staff involved within the petroleum industry, operations and maintenance personnel.

2. Preventive and corrective maintenance costs: The targeted case study (Petroleum Company) records and the advices of maintenance management team will be used to gather this information.

3. The history of the maintenance intervals and failure data: This will be obtained from the manual recommendation and maintenance log books.

4. Inventory of spare parts: This will be obtained from the inventory department records including the movement of spare parts including costs such as holding and ordering cost.

3.3.3 Integration

The maintenance strategic level, operation level, spare part management and risk assessment will be integrated as the recognised major activities within maintenance. To facilitate the thesis for the readers, each major activity will be discussed in individual chapters including the methodology which will be used to optimise the activity and its application.

3.3.4 Output

The output and integrations of certain activities will be validated by applying each proposed mathematical method and the results will be discussed at the
end of each chapter. The selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy will be examined on the strategic level to ensure the suitability of the decision, while considering all related criteria by applying AHP/Fuzzy AHP method.

Optimisation of maintenance interval will be investigated by developing a mathematical programming method. A joint approach between maintenance intervals and spare parts control, to create cost optimisation approach, will be developed. Assessing the likelihood of risk through a mathematical model and evaluating the consequences of the risk will be carried out to validate the safety of the petroleum equipment.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, an overall description of the methodologies that will be used to optimise each major activity associated with the maintenance function and the proposed integrated framework was presented. Four methodologies will be used for each activity. Classical and fuzzy AHP will be applied in order to arrive at the optimum maintenance policy selection (Chapter Four) and a mathematical model will be developed to identify the optimum maintenance intervals as the majority of PM actions are based on time within the petroleum industry (Chapter Five). An integrated approach will be presented to optimise spare parts management (Chapter Six) and a set of equations will be either adapted or developed to optimise risk assessment within the petroleum industry (Chapter Seven).
The proposed integrated framework was introduced and the relevant terminologies were defined in this chapter to facilitate it for the readers to follow the forthcoming chapters and steps to optimise the major maintenance activities.
Chapter Four

Maintenance Strategic Level

This chapter covers the selection of maintenance policy (strategic level) within the petroleum industry. The creation of the model is proposed with its hierarchy structure and application of classic/ Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process is demonstrated. At the end of the chapter, a comparison between the various derivation methods and their response to the changes in consistency is illustrated.
4.1 Introduction

The selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy leads to the arrival at the optimisation of the entire operation of maintenance. Analytic hierarchy process (AHP) is considered as one of the most used methods of multi-criteria decision-making (MCDM) (Wang et al 2007). In oil and gas industry, diversity of machines align along the production line from upstream, midstream and to downstream. Therefore, different levels of reliability and availability of equipment is required. Moreover, their likelihood and consequences vary from machine to machine, which showcases the importance of analysing and questioning the selection of maintenance policy to enhance the overall system's productivity.

The selection of the maintenance policies is considered to be a complex matter and a trade-off between criteria is required to achieve the optimum maintenance selection. Decomposition of the structure of the hierarchy within AHP assists to identify the main criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives that impacts the selection of maintenance activities.

Classical AHP which refers to the handling of the matrix by the use of rigid numbers or the translation of linguistic preferences into rigid numbers is demonstrated within this chapter. Different methods of derivation of the priorities such as mean of the normalized values (MNV) and normalized geometric means (NGM) are applied on the collected data to investigate and compare the priorities. Eigenvector method (EVM) corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of the pairwise comparison matrix is used in this study and is considered to be one of the most popular approaches for deriving the weights associated with different entities (Lin and Lu, 2012). Fuzzy analytic
hierarchy process is implemented and compared to the classical AHP methods at the end of this chapter. The rest of this chapter covers the problem modelling, "the hierarchy structure", weights derivation and aggregation using the classic AHP (different methods) and fuzzy AHP. Sensitivity analysis is performed to compare the sensitivity of each method and conclusion is drawn at the end of the chapter.

4.2 Hierarchy Structure for Optimum Maintenance Selection

The role of maintenance function has to be clearly defined to lead to the right selection of maintenance policies. The function of the machine, its required reliability, availability and consequences of failure has to be identified so as to avoid the wrong selection of maintenance method and causing less disturbance to the operations. In order to arrive at the selection of the most convenient maintenance policy within the oil and gas industry, identification of the criteria that impact the decision is vital of which the alternatives "time-based maintenance, condition-based maintenance and corrective maintenance" are selected. Maintenance policy selection is a hierarchy structure which includes the main target, criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives as presented figure (4-1). The proposed model was surveyed to arrive at the final version represented in Appendix (A).

Four main criteria have been identified (cost, availability, reliability and safety) and each of these criteria have identified factors (sub-criteria), which impact the main factor. Each main criterion and its sub-criteria are listed and defined in the following section:
4.2.1 Cost

Costs are incurred to keep equipment and its parts in a good condition. This main criterion influences the maintenance management decision on the policy that will be associated with the machines as each policy has
consequently different expenditure. Five major costs have been identified that contribute to the cost as main criterion:-

4.2.1 Manpower

The number of technicians needed in order to carry out each type of maintenance policy.

4.2.2 Spare parts

Spare parts are an essential sub criterion as the portion of their cost in terms of part cost and holding cost is one of the largest within the maintenance department.

4.2.3 Production Loss

This sub-criterion considers the loss of production as a consequence of failure and the stoppage while performing certain maintenance policy.

4.2.4 Production Damage

It indicates to the possibility of damaging the production due to the failure and damaged production is considered irreparable.

4.2.5 Computerized Maintenance: - "E-Maintenance"

Indicates the cost of the hardware "computers and sensors" and the cost of the software which is needed for analysing and measuring parameters data when using condition- based maintenance.

4.2.6 Availability

Availability is defined as a measure of the percentage of time the equipment is in an operable state. It can be computed as uptime divided by both uptime
plus downtime (Anderson et al. 2015). The criticality of availability of the asset is a main factor when assigning maintenance policy on the strategic level. Three sub-criteria are identified that influence the availability of equipment.

4.2.2.1 Main Time to Repair (MTTR)

It is the time needed to repair or recover a system from the failure (Fiegler et al. 2013). MTTR includes the time to diagnose the problem, the time to get the technicians and material required on-site and the total time needed to physically repair the equipment and hand it over to the operation department (Khalil et al., 2009).

4.2.2.2 Inherent Availability

Inherent availability considers the availability of the equipment and its importance and criticality to the system that might lead to putting down the system in case of a failure. The equipment is considered to be inherent to the system when, for instance, it has no stand-by equipment.

4.2.2.3 Availability on Demand

In this case, the availability of equipment is based on demand. For example, whether it has a spare system that can take over in case of maintenance or failure.

4.2.3 Reliability

Reliability is another main parameter to be taken into account when planning and managing assets’ maintenance within the oil and gas industry. Reliability in general is a function of time, so pre-defined reliable system is a system
that works as expected within a given time (Meeker and Luis, 2014). In the oil and gas industry, there are machines which require more level of reliability to increase the overall system reliability (Rausand and Vatn, 2004). Three sub-criteria have been identified and listed below.

4.2.3.1 Maintenance Significant Items (MSI)

It is a factor that considers the importance of equipment to the reliability of the system and if the machine would lead to shut down and disturb the process (Cheng et al 2008). Saranga (2002) selected the importance of equipment to the system using the risk priority number (RPN).

4.2.3.2 Accessible to Inspection

Accessibility to inspection indicates the accessibility of equipment and its parts that need to be inspected. The machine becomes reliable when data and information is available for the maintenance team to analyse. Reliability growth based inspection (RGBI) is one of the methods that are used for inspection in the oil and gas industry. This method uses power law analysis methodology to estimate further inspection (Calixto, 2012).

4.2.3.3 Mean Time between Failures (MTBF)

As the name suggests, it is the average time between failures. Márquez (2007) calculated the average mean time by dividing the time of incidents occurred by the number of incidents.

4.2.4 Safety

Safety level within the petroleum industry is considerably high, due to the possibility of risk of failure of some equipment and its catastrophic
consequences (Mearns and Yule, 2009). In order to achieve the safety integrity level (SIL), where hazards can be tolerable, different tools such as hazard and operability analysis (HAZOP), fault tree analysis (FTA) and failure mode effect and criticality analysis (FMECA) can be used to identify the hazard (Andersen and Mostue, 2012). Four factors have been identified that impact safety as main criterion which are - likelihood of failure, personnel, facility and environment.

4.2.3.4 Likelihood of Failure

The likelihood of failure considers the possibility of equipment's failure. In other words, it answers the question "how likely is the occurrence of failure?" and in this context, risk can be defined both qualitatively and quantitatively (Khan and Haddara, 2003).

4.2.3.5 Personals

This sub-criterion considers the consequences of the failure on workers, where some machine can hazard environment in terms of failure.

4.2.3.6 Facility

This sub-criterion considers the impact of the failure on the machine itself or consequentially on other machines.

4.2.3.7 Environments

The failure of equipment might have adverse effects such as leakage of poisonous liquid or gas in the surrounding environment.
4.2.4 Alternatives

In this level, three possible alternative maintenance policies are considered as possible maintenance solution and they are listed as follows:-

4.2.4.1 Planned Corrective Maintenance (CM)

Corrective maintenance is the type of maintenance when the machine or part is run till failure. It is selected as planned under certain circumstances such as the failure of certain part would not cause any risk nor any financial losses.

4.2.4.2 Time Based Maintenance (TBM)

TBM is planned preventive maintenance and performed periodically "calendar time, operating time or age" to reduce frequent and sudden failure. Within the petroleum industry, this maintenance policy would be implemented for majority of equipment for periods which are called overhaul or turnaround maintenance time.

4.2.4.3 Condition Based Maintenance (CBM)

CBM is the type of preventive maintenance policy which is performed depending on the condition of the machine. Thus the machine is monitored till it shows signs of degradation and then maintenance is called to take place. Techniques such as vibration monitoring, lubrication analysis and ultrasonic testing are used to monitor the health of the machine.

4.3 Collection of Judgment Data

Collection of data was carried out in order to validate the proposed maintenance policy selection framework. The collection of the data was concerning the pair wise comparison, where the participants would provide
their own judgment to each criterion in comparison to others within the same level. The questionnaire was developed (Appendix B), covering each of the levels of the hierarchy structure and the criteria within each level. Fifty participants from academic and industrial background took part in the research and contributed to complete the questionnaire.

4.3.1 The Judgement Scales

To evaluate the criteria in each level in comparison to other criteria included in the next hierarchy level, scoring is made with the utilization of standard scale provided by the AHP software. Table (4-1) is applied which is adopted from Saaty (Saaty 1994; Malczewski 1999; Saaty 2008; Akinci et al 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intensity of importance</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Equal importance</td>
<td>Two activities contribute equally to the objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Weak importance of one over another</td>
<td>Experience and judgment slightly favour one activity over another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Essential or strong importance</td>
<td>Experience and judgment strongly favour one activity over another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Demonstrated importance</td>
<td>An activity is strongly favoured and its dominance demonstrated in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Absolute importance</td>
<td>The evidence favouring one activity over another is of the highest possible order of affirmation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,4,6,8</td>
<td>Intermediate values between the two adjacent judgments</td>
<td>When compromise is needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 The Generation of the Comparison Matrix

In this section, the matrices are built in each level with respect to the higher level. The inserted values are the sum of the geometric mean which has been collected through a questionnaire. The first matrix is to compare the
main criteria "reliability, availability, safety and cost" with respect to the main goal as shown in table (4-2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>main criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.3 Consistency

Once the weights have been allocated and recorded for each criterion, a consistency check has to be performed. Saaty (1980) suggested the consistency index (CI) to measure the degree of consistency using the following equation:

\[
CI = \frac{\lambda_{max} - n}{n-1}
\]

Where:

\(\lambda_{max}\) Maximal eigenvalue

\(n\) Size of the matrix

Then the consistency ratio (CR) is generated by the comparison of value of consistency index (CI) and random indices (RI):

\[
CR = \frac{CI}{RI}
\]

CR \leq 0.1 can be taken as sufficiently consistent Saaty (1990). Saaty (1977) calculated the random indices (RI) shown in table (4-3). Other researchers have run simulations with similar numbers of matrices such as Lane and Verdini (1989); Forman (1990); Tummala and Wan (1994); Alonso, Lamata (2006) and Ishizaka and Labib (2009) and their random indices are different.
but close to Saaty’s RI. In this work, the consistency is investigated by the use of Expert Choice.

| Table 4-3: Random Indices (Ishizaka and Labib 2009) |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| n         | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10   |
| RI        | 0.58 | 0.9 | 1.12 | 1.24 | 1.32 | 1.41 | 1.45 | 1.49 |

4.4 Pairwise Matrix Evaluation

In this work, Expert Choice software was adopted in order to assess the priorities between the criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives. However, different methods (mean of the normalised values (MNV), normalised geometric Mean (NGM) and eigenvector mean (EVM)) were used to derive the priorities within the comparison matrixes to satisfy and compare it with the outcome of the software and later on with the Fuzzy AHP.

4.4.1 Applications of Mean Normalised Value

To demonstrate the process of the MNV method, the matrix of the main criteria (Table 4-2) is demonstrated as:-

Step (1): Equation (4-3) is applied to calculate the sum of the columns which results into :-(cost =16, availability =2.48, reliability =2.4 and safety = 9.33).

\[
\frac{p_1}{p_j} + \frac{p_2}{p_j} + \frac{p_3}{p_j} + \ldots + \frac{p_n}{p_j} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i}{p_j}
\]
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Where \( a_{ij} \) is the comparison between i and j and \( p_i \) is the priority of i.

Step (2): Equation (4-4) is applied to normalize the columns by dividing each column's values by its sum and the results are listed in table (4-4).

| Table 4-4: The Normalized Value (MNV) |
|------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Main criteria | Cost  | Availability | Reliability | Safety  |
| Cost         | 0.06  | 0.06    | 0.08    | 0.04   |
| Availability | 0.44  | 0.40    | 0.42    | 0.32   |
| Reliability  | 0.31  | 0.40    | 0.42    | 0.54   |
| Safety       | 0.19  | 0.13    | 0.08    | 0.11   |
Step (3): equation (4-5) is applied to calculate the mean value for each row which is the weight of the criterion.

The results of applying MNV method shows that reliability of the equipment comes as the most preferred criterion (reliability = 0.42) followed by availability of the equipment (0.39), safety (0.13) and cost with the least ranking (0.06) as shown in figure (4-2).

\[
\frac{P_i}{\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_i} = P_i \times \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i} = \frac{P_i}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} P_i}
\]

\[4-5\]

Table (4-5) demonstrates the alternative's preference with respect to (cost). After finding the priorities of sub-criteria of the cost, the preference of alternatives is computed for each of them. The preference of the alternatives of sub criterion is then multiplied by the weight of its sub criterion. Each of the alternatives (TBM, CBM and CM) resulted weight are then added together to calculate the weight of each of them with respect to cost.
Table 4-5: Weight of Priorities with Respect to Cost (NMV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Criteria</th>
<th>Sub-Criteria</th>
<th>Local Alternatives Weights</th>
<th>Alternative Weight with Respect to Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cost</td>
<td>Pro-loss</td>
<td>TBM 0.45</td>
<td>TBM=0.5255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-damage</td>
<td>CBM 0.45</td>
<td>CBM=0.3855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spare-parts</td>
<td>CM 0.09</td>
<td>CM=0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men-power</td>
<td>TBM 0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-maintenance</td>
<td>CBM 0.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (4-3) presents the alternative’s preference with respect to cost. Therefore in the case of cost becoming the absolute priority among other criteria TBM would be the most preferred maintenance policy.

Table (4-6) sums the weight of the local and global priorities of the criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives resulted by applying the same steps above of NMV.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria</th>
<th>Local alternatives weight with respect to sub-criteria</th>
<th>Local alternatives with respect to main-criteria</th>
<th>Alternatives global weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost 0.06</td>
<td>Pro-loss 0.494</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.0133, CBM 0.0133, CM 0.00267</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-damage 0.222</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.00599, CBM 0.00599, CM 0.0012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spare-parts 0.16</td>
<td>TBM 0.79, CBM 0.12, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.00758, CBM 0.00115, CM 0.00086</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man-power 0.084</td>
<td>TBM 0.64, CBM 0.28, CM 0.08</td>
<td>TBM 0.00323, CBM 0.00141, CM 0.0004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-maintenance 0.046</td>
<td>TBM 0.43, CBM 0.43, CM 0.08</td>
<td>TBM 0.00119, CBM 0.00119, CM 0.00022</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability 0.42</td>
<td>MSI 0.71</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.13419, CBM 0.13419, CM 0.02684</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATI 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.02646, CBM 0.02646, CM 0.00529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTBF 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.02646, CBM 0.02646, CM 0.00529</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability 0.39</td>
<td>Inherent availability 0.26</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.04563, CBM 0.04563, CM 0.00913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTTR 0.11</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.01931, CBM 0.01931, CM 0.00386</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability on demand 0.64</td>
<td>TBM 0.49, CBM 0.43, CM 0.08</td>
<td>TBM 0.1223, CBM 0.1073, CM 0.01997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety 0.13</td>
<td>Risk likelihood 0.60</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.0351, CBM 0.0351, CM 0.00702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.00819, CBM 0.00819, CM 0.00164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 0.11</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM 0.00644, CBM 0.00644, CM 0.00131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel 0.16</td>
<td>TBM 0.63, CBM 0.26, CM 0.11</td>
<td>TBM 0.0131, CBM 0.00541, CM 0.00229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TBM= 0.47, CBM= 0.439, CM= 0.089
Equation (4-6) demonstrates the steps of calculating the global alternatives weight. Each weight of local alternatives with respect to sub-criteria is multiplied by the weight the sub-criteria and the weight of main criteria which results into small alternatives weights which are then summed up.

Global alternative weight \( G_{AW} = \sum W_{MC} \times W_{SC} \times A_{WSC} \)  

Where:

\( W_{MC} \)  Weight of main criteria.

\( W_{SC} \)  Weight of sub criteria.

\( A_{WSC} \) Alternative's weight of sub criteria.

Figure (4-4) illustrates the prioritisation of the alternatives (maintenance policies) with respect to the main goal by the use of MNV. TBM is the most preferred alternative with global weight (47%), followed by the CBM (43.9%) and CM with the least weight (8.9%).

![Figure 4-4: Priorities of Alternatives Using MNV Method](image)
4.4.2 Application of Normalised Geometric Mean (NGM)

The normalised geometric mean is an alternative measure of the priorities and is formed by taking the root of the product matrix of row elements divided by the column sum of row geometric means. Equation (4-7) is applied to calculate the geometric mean for each row \( p \). The matrix of main criteria is applied and results shown in table (4-7).

\[
p = \sqrt[n]{a \cdot b \cdot c \ldots n}
\]

Where: \( a, b, c \) and \( n \) are the comparison values for each rows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Geometric mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second step is to summarize the results of the criteria of the rows as followed: \( (0.31 + 2.14 + 2.14 + 0.67 = 5.36) \). Finally, normalizing the results to obtain the priorities for the matrix of the main - criteria and the priorities are computed as followed (cost 0.06, availability 0.40, reliability 0.42, and safety 0.12). The same abovementioned steps are followed for the rest of the matrix in order to calculate the global priorities of the alternatives.

Table (4-8) demonstrates the results of applying NGM and shows the weight of the main criteria, sub criteria and global alternative. The local alternative weights are provided with respect to the sub-criteria. The advantage of having the local priorities for the maintenance is to provide them with a predefined solution, for instance, if the circumstances are changed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main criteria</th>
<th>Sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Local alternatives weight with respect to sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Alternative global weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cost 0.06</td>
<td>Pro-loss 0.50</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-damage 0.22</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spare-parts 0.16</td>
<td>TBM 0.81, CBM 0.10, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men-power 0.08</td>
<td>TBM 0.65, CBM 0.28, CM 0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-maintenance 0.05</td>
<td>TBM 0.43, CBM 0.43, CM 0.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability 0.44</td>
<td>MSI 0.71</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td>TBM=0.47045, CBM=0.44167, CM=0.08857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATI 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTBF 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability 0.39</td>
<td>Inherent availability 0.26</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTTR 0.10</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability on demand 0.64</td>
<td>TBM 0.49, CBM 0.44, CM 0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety 0.12</td>
<td>Risk likelihood 0.60</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 0.10</td>
<td>TBM 0.45, CBM 0.45, CM 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel 0.16</td>
<td>TBM 0.64, CBM 0.26, CM 0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure (4-5) presents the global alternative (maintenance policies) priority with respect to main goal (maintenance selection policy) using NGM (TBM 0.47045, CBM 0.44167 and CM 0.08857).

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 4-5: Alternative Preference With Respect to Main Goal (NGM)**

### 4.4.3 Applications of Eigenvector Method (EVM)

This is the original Saaty's approach to derive the priorities from the AHP method. In this work, Expert Choice Software is used which follows the EVM process to generate the weights, priorities and alternatives for the criteria. The following section will demonstrate the steps that were taken to arrive at the prioritization of alternatives using the EVM method.

#### 4.4.3.1 Problem Modelling

In this step, the problem is created on the software, hierarchically from the goal (maintenance optimum strategy) to the main criteria, sub-criteria and then to the alternatives (TBM, CBM and CM).
Figure (4-6) shows the hierarchical view of the problem modelling. Expert Choice provides familiar and a comprehensible interface for users to create the hierarchy. In order to provide comprehensive view of the structure, the alternatives are not expanded for all the sub-criteria, but instead they are expanded for one sub-criterion (maintenance significant Items).

![Hierarchical View of the Entire Structure](image)

**Figure 4-6: A Hierarchical View of the Entire Structure**

### 4.4.3.2 Pairwise Comparisons

At each node of the hierarchy, a matrix is entered for the pairwise comparisons through the use of ratio scale (Kainulainen et al. 2009). The data can be entered by pairwise numerical comparisons (figure 4-7).
4.4.3.3 Consistency

Once the comparison judgment is entered for each matrix, it is possible to check the consistency. The possibility of assessing the highest criteria that contributes to consistency is provided by Expert Choice (figure 4-8).
Figure (4-9) displays the family tree generated by the use of Expert Choice that shows the weights of each criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives. The global alternatives are provided as well and the possibility of generating the local alternative priority is provided by the Expert Choice.

![Figure 4-9: Weights of Main Criteria, Sub Criteria and Alternatives]

Table (4-9) demonstrates the results of the weights for the main criteria, sub criteria and local and global alternatives. Local alternatives for each node sub criteria are displayed and the global alternatives with respect to the main goal (maintenance optimum strategy) are demonstrated.
Table 4-9: Local, Global priorities and Alternatives Weight (EVM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main criteria %</th>
<th>Sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Local alternatives weight with respect to sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Alternative global weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| cost 0.091      | Pro-loss 0.50  | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Pro-damage 0.218 | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Spare-parts 0.159 | TBM 0.731  
CBM 0.188  
CM 0.081  |                                             |
|                 | Man-power 0.077 | TBM 0.649  
CBM 0.279  
CM 0.072  |                                             |
|                 | E-maintenance 0.045 | TBM 0.429  
CBM 0.429  
CM 0.143  |                                             |
| Reliability 0.392 | MSI 0.714  | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  | TBM=0.472  
CBM=0.440  
CM=0.088  |
|                 | ATI 0.143      | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | MTBF 0.143     | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
| Availability 0.362 | Inherent availability 0.258 | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | MTTR 0.105     | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Availability on demand 0.637 | TBM 0.487  
CBM 0.435  
CM 0.078  |                                             |
| Safety 0.156    | Risk likelihood 0.585 | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Environment 0.132 | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Facility 0.132  | TBM 0.455  
CBM 0.455  
CM 0.091  |                                             |
|                 | Personnel 0.151 | TBM 0.631  
CBM 0.258  
CM 0.101  |                                             |
Figure (4-10) demonstrates the global alternatives priority resulting from applying EVM derivation method. The priority of the maintenance policies goes first to TBM with 47.2% followed by CBM with 44% and CM with 8.8%.

![Bar Chart](image)

**Figure 4-10: Alternative Preference with Respect to Main Goal Using (EVM)**

**4.4.4 Sensitivity analysis**

The last step of the decision process within the Expert Choice is the sensitivity analysis, where the input data are slightly modified in order to observe the impact on the alternatives. If the ranking does not change, the results are considered to be robust. Expert Choice allows different sensitivity analyses, where the main difference is the various graphical representations as shown in figure (4-11).

The main criteria preferences were modified slightly at the beginning to ensure that the selection of the alternatives preference was rigid or otherwise the prioritization of alternatives would be focused on understanding the consequences of the changes within the alternatives.
Figure 4-11: Different Sensitivity Analysis Graphs

Figure (4-12) demonstrates the dynamic sensitivity analysis which is one of the available methods of sensitive analysis. In this case, it shows that if the reliability of the equipment was the only important criterion than the CBM and TBM becomes equally important.
4.5 Fuzzy Analytic Hierarchy Process (FAHP)

Figure (4-13) presents the membership function using triangular fuzzy number (TFN). The method computes eigenvectors until the composite final vector is obtained. The final vector of weights (global weight) shows the relative importance of each alternative towards the main goal (Sharma and Yu 2014).

![Figure 4-13: The Intersection between TFNs (Sharma and Yu 2014)](image)

The membership function of TFNs can be described by the following equation (4-8):

\[
\mu_M(x) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x}{m-l} - \frac{l}{m-l}, & x \in [l, m] \\
\frac{x}{m-u} - \frac{u}{m-u}, & x \in [m, u] \\
0, & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \tag{4-8}
\]

The TFN membership is often represented as \((l, m, u)\). Where \(l\) is the lower bound value, \(m\) is the middle bound and \(u\) is the upper bound value. Fuzziness can always be given by its corresponding left and right representation as in equation (4-9) (Prakash, 2003).

\[
\tilde{M} = M^{l(y)}=M^{r(y)} = [l + (m - l)y, u + (m - u)y], y \in [0,1] \tag{4-9}
\]
Where \( l(y) \) and \( r(y) \) represents left side and right side of fuzzy numbers.

TFNs have various operations and only important ones are used in this study.

Two fuzzy numbers \( M_1 = (l_1, m_1, u_1) \) and \( M_2 = (l_2, m_2, u_2) \) have been given as follows (Saad et al 2016):

\[
(l_1, m_1, u_1) \oplus (l_2, m_2, u_2) = (l_1 + l_2, m_1 + m_2, u_1 + u_2) \tag{4-10}
\]

\[
(l_1, m_1, u_1) \ominus (l_2, m_2, u_2) = (l_1 - l_2, m_1 - m_2, u_1 - u_2) \tag{4-11}
\]

\[
(l_1, m_1, u_1) \otimes (l_2, m_2, u_2) = (l_1 \cdot l_2, m_1 \cdot m_2, u_1 \cdot u_2) \tag{4-12}
\]

\[
(l_1, m_1, u_1) \oslash (l_2, m_2, u_2) = (l_1/l_2, m_1/m_2, u_1/u_2) \tag{4-13}
\]

### 4.5.1 Preference Scale

Figure (4-14) shows the triangular fuzzy membership function. The linguistic scale for importance is the various fuzzy sets.

![Triangular Fuzzy membership](Sarfaraz et al 2012)

Different scales are proposed for the conversion scale. Table (4-10) fuzzy AHP is a range of values in order to deal with uncertainties for decision makers (Sarfaraz et al 2012).
Table 4-10: Triangular Fuzzy Conversion Scale (Sarfaraz et al 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Linguistic scale</th>
<th>Importance Intensity</th>
<th>Triangular Fuzzy scale</th>
<th>Importance Intensity</th>
<th>Reciprocal Triangular Fuzzy Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equally important (EI)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1/2, 1, 3/2)</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>(1/2, 1, 3/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakly more important (WMI)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1, 3/2, 2)</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>(1/2, 3/2, 1/1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly more important (SMI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3/2, 2, 5/2)</td>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>(2, 5, 1/2, 2/3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strongly more important (VSMI)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(2, 5/2, 3)</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>(1, 3, 2, 5, 1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely more important (AMI)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5/2, 3, 7/2)</td>
<td>1/9</td>
<td>(2, 7, 1/3, 2/5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppose a triangular fuzzy number $A = a_{ij}$ is expressed as $[l_{ij}, m_{ij}, u_{ij}]$, $i$ and $j = 1, 2, ..., n$, where $l_{ij}, m_{ij}, u_{ij}$ are the lower bound, the mean bound and upper bound of the triangular fuzzy set. In addition, we assume that $l_{ij} < m_{ij} < u_{ij}$ when $i \neq j$. If $i = j$, then $a_{ij} = a_{ii} = (1, 1, 1)$. Therefore, an exact priority vector $w = (w_1, w_2, ..., w_n)^T$ derived from the judgement matrix must satisfy the inequalities.

Chang (1996) provided the following formula to calculate the synthetic value:

$$a^t_{ij} = [a^1_{ij}, a^2_{ij}, a^t_{ij}] , \ i,j = 1,2, ..., n, \ t = 1,2,$$
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'T' is a TFN given by the $t^{th}$ expert, by the formula $k^{th}$

$$M^k_{ij} = \frac{1}{T} \otimes (a^1_{ij} + a^2_{ij} + ... + a^T_{ij})$$

4-15

The synthetic TFN of the $k^{th}$ layer can be derived and the synthetic judgement matrix of the layer total factors towards the $h^{th}$ factor of the
$(k - i)^{th}$ layer can also be obtained. Using the following formula (4-16) we can get synthetic degree value.

$$S_j^k = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k \otimes (\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k)^{-1}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n_k$$  
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The output of this sum $\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k \right)$ is the fuzzy additional operation of n extent analysis values for a particular matrix such that:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k = (\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} l_{ij}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} m_{ij}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} u_{ij})$$  
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The total sum of these $\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k \right)^{-1}$, will lead to the fuzzy addition operation of $N_{ij}^k (j = 1, 2, \ldots, n)$ values such that, the inverse of the vector in equation (4-19) can be shown as follows:

$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k \right)^{-1} = (\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} l_{ij}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} m_{ij}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} u_{ij})^{-1}$$  
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$$\left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} \sum_{j=1}^{n_k} M_{ij}^k \right)^{-1} = \left( \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} l_{ij}}, \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} m_{ij}}, \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^{n_k} u_{ij}} \right)$$  

4-19

Once synthetic values are determined, the degree of possibility on one fuzzy number/synthetic value obtained to be greater than others is obtained as follows:

$$V(M_1 \geq M_2) = \sup_{x \in Y} \left( \min \left( \mu_{M_1}(x), \mu_{M_2}(y) \right) \right)$$  
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$$V(M_1 \geq M_2) = 1 \text{ if } m_1 \geq m_2$$  
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$$V(M_2 \leq M_1) = \mu_{M_1}(d)$$  
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$$V(M_2 \leq M_1) = \frac{l_1 - u_2}{(m_2 - u_2) - (m_1 - l_1)}$$  
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Chang further added, the degree of possibility of $i^{th}$ factor to be greater than others is as follows (Sarfaraz, et al. 2012).
\[ V(M \geq M_1, M_2, ..., M_k) = V(M \geq M_i) \text{ and } (M \geq M_2) \text{ and } ... \text{ and } (M \geq M_k) = \]

\[ \min V(M \geq M_i), \ i = 1,2, ..., k \]

Let

\[ d'(S_i) = \min V(S_i \geq S_k) \]

Hence the Weight Vector given by equation (4-26) (Saad et al 2015)

\[ W' = (d'(S_1), d'(S_2), ..., d'(S_n))^T \]

Where: - \( S_i (i = 1,2, ..., n) \) are \( n \) elements of the matrix. The elements of each column are divided by the sum of that column and the elements in each resulting row are added and the sum is divided by the number of elements in the row), the normalized weight vectors are obtained as follows (Perçin 2008):

\[ W = (d(S_1), d(S_2), ..., d(S_n))^T, \]

The final weight or global weight of each criterion is obtained by multiplying the criteria with the matrix obtained by calculating each alternative with respect of each criterion.

4.5.2 Converting the Rigid Matrix into Fuzzy Matrix

In the first step, the rigid matrix (table 4-2) is converted into the fuzzy matrix by the use of the fuzzy conversion Scale (4-10). Table (4-11) presents the converted matrix by the use of TFN for the main criteria (cost, availability, reliability and safety) and summarizes the sum of the rows, sum of the columns and the sum of the sum of the columns.

Once the sum of each rows and columns is obtained, the next step is to calculate the synthetic value extend. The synthetic extend of all criteria can
be obtained by dividing lower bound of every row with the higher bound of sum of columns sum, middle bound of row with sum of columns sum and higher bound of the rows sum by lower bound of the sum of column sum.

### Table 4-11: Fuzzy Comparisons Matrices for the Maintenance Main Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Rows Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{5}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 2 &amp; 1 \ \frac{3}{2} &amp; \frac{5}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 2 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 \ \frac{5}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 2 \ \frac{5}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>(1.7, 2.5, 3.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 5 \ \frac{5}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{2}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{2}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 3 \ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>(4, 6, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 3 \ \frac{5}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{2}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{2}{2} &amp; \frac{1}{2} &amp; \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 3 \ \frac{2}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>(4, 6, 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 3 \ \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 2 \ \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 2 &amp; 1 &amp; 2 \ \frac{5}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1 &amp; 1 &amp; 3 \ \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{2} \end{array} ]</td>
<td>(2.4, 3.67, 5.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Sum</td>
<td>(5, 7, 9)</td>
<td>(1.83, 3.06, 4.5)</td>
<td>(1.8, 3.3, 4.33)</td>
<td>(3.5, 5.16, 7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Column Sum: (12.13, 18.22, 24.83)

#### 4.5.2.1 Synthesis

\[
\begin{align*}
S_{\text{Cost}} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} 1.7 & 2.5 & 3.67 \\ 24.83 & 18.22 & 12.13 \end{array} \right] &= (0.068, 0.137, 0.302) \\
S_{\text{Availability}} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} 4 & 6 & 8 \\ 24.83 & 18.22 & 12.13 \end{array} \right] &= (0.161, 0.329, 0.660) \\
S_{\text{Reliability}} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} 4 & 6 & 8 \\ 24.83 & 18.22 & 12.13 \end{array} \right] &= (0.161, 0.329, 0.660) \\
S_{\text{Safety}} \left[ \begin{array}{ccc} 2.4 & 3.67 & 5.17 \\ 24.83 & 18.22 & 12.13 \end{array} \right] &= (0.097, 0.201, 0.426)
\end{align*}
\]

Once synthetic extend is determined the degree of possibility of fuzzy number/synthetic value obtained to be greater than other can determined by the following equations (4-23)–(4-25).

Synthetic values calculated for maintenance main criteria are shown below.
Comparison of $S_{\text{cost}}$ with other synthetic values:

$$V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Availability}})$$

Mean value of cost (0.137) is not greater than mean value of availability (0.329) and lower bound of cost (0.068) is not greater than upper bound of availability (0.660) then, applying equation (4-23):

$$V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Availability}}) = \frac{(l_{\text{Availability}} - u_{\text{cost}})}{(m_{\text{cost}} - u_{\text{cost}}) - (m_{\text{Availability}} - l_{\text{Availability}})} = \frac{(0.161 - 0.302)}{(0.137 - 0.302) - (0.329 - 0.161)} = 0.42$$

$$V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Availability}})$$

Considering $S_{\text{Reliability}}$ has exactly the same value as $S_{\text{Availability}}$ so the same above calculation is applied which result into the same value of comparing ($S_{\text{cost}} \geq S_{\text{Availability}}$) which lead to $V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Reliability}}) = 0.42$

$$V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Safety}})$$

Mean value of cost is not greater than mean value of safety and lower bound of cost is not greater than upper bound of safety then, apply equation (4-23):

$$V(S_{\text{cost}} < S_{\text{Safety}}) = \frac{(l_{\text{Safety}} - u_{\text{cost}})}{(m_{\text{cost}} - u_{\text{cost}}) - (m_{\text{Safety}} - l_{\text{Safety}})} = \frac{(0.097 - 0.302)}{(0.137 - 0.302) - (0.201 - 0.097)} = 0.76$$

Comparison of $S_{\text{Availability}}$ with other synthetic values because the mean value of availability is greater than the mean value cost and safety and equal to the value of reliability so we follow equation (4-21):
The mean value of reliability is equal to the mean value of availability and greater than the mean values of both cost and safety. Therefore, equation (4-21) is applied for reliability as followed:

\[ V(S_{Reliability} = S_{Availability}) = 1 \]

\[ V(S_{Reliability} > S_{Cost}) = 1 \]

\[ V(S_{Reliability} > S_{Safety}) = 1 \]

Comparison of \( S_{Safety} \) with other synthetic values; because the mean value of availability is greater than the mean value cost and safety and equal to the value of reliability so we follow equation (4-21):

\[ V(S_{Safety} > S_{Cost}) = 1 \]

Mean value of safety is not greater than mean value of availability and lower bound of safety is not greater than upper bound of availability, and therefore equation (4-23) is applied:

\[ V(S_{Safety} < S_{Availability}) = \frac{(l_{Availability} - u_{Safety})}{(m_{Safety} - u_{Safety}) - (m_{Availability} - l_{Availability})} \]

\[ = \frac{(0.161 - 0.426)}{(0.201 - 0.426) - (0.329 - 0.161)} = 0.67 \]

\[ V(S_{Safety} < S_{Reliability}) \]

Mean value of safety is not greater than mean value of reliability and lower bound of safety is not greater than upper bound of reliability, and therefore equation (4-23) is applied. As the synthetic value of reliability is equal to
availability the same comparison with availability is performed and result into

\[ V(S_{\text{Safety}} < S_{\text{Reliability}}) = 0.67. \]

Comparison of all the synthesis values of main criteria (cost, availability, reliability and safety) is performed and the minimum value of each element is taken into account and the sum of each element are divided by the sum of the column which will give the priority of that element in the level. Then the normalized value can be obtained as per equation (4-26):

\[ W' = (0.42, 1, 1, 0.67)^T \]

The next step now is to use equation (4-27) to normalizing the above value and the weights can obtain as follows:

\[ W_{\text{Cost}} = \frac{0.42}{3.09} = 0.14 \]

\[ W_{\text{Availability}} = \frac{1}{3.09} = 0.32 \]

\[ W_{\text{Availability}} = \frac{1}{3.09} = 0.32 \]

\[ W_{\text{Safety}} = \frac{0.67}{3.09} = 0.22 \]

\[ W_{\text{Main Criteria}} = (0.14, 0.32, 0.32, 0.22)^T \]

The abovementioned steps are applied to the rest of the matrixes that represents the pairwise comparison between the nodes with respect to the other node. Table (4-12) demonstrates the weights of criteria, sub criteria and local and global alternatives. The weight of the global alternatives is calculated and it is as followed (TBM=0.4, CBM=0.39 and CM=0.22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Criteria %</th>
<th>Sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Local Alternatives Weight with Respect to Sub-criteria %</th>
<th>Alternative Global Weight %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cost 0.14</td>
<td>Pro-loss 0.33</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td>TBM = 0.40, CBM = 0.38, CM = 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-damage 0.26</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spare-parts 0.21</td>
<td>TBM 0.626, CBM 0.20, CM 0.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men-power 0.14</td>
<td>TBM 0.454, CBM 0.426, CM 0.119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-maintenance 0.07</td>
<td>TBM 0.34, CBM 0.34, CM 0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>MSI 0.468</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ATI 0.267</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTBF 0.267</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Inherent availability 0.40</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTTR 0.26</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability on demand 0.34</td>
<td>TBM 0.43, CBM 0.39, CM 0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Risk likelihood 0.35</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environment 0.2</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility 0.23</td>
<td>TBM 0.389, CBM 0.389, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personnel 0.22</td>
<td>TBM 0.43, CBM 0.34, CM 0.223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure (4-15) demonstrates the outcomes of preferences in alternatives and their priorities with respect to the main goal (maintenance optimum strategy) by the use of FAHP. TBM is the first preferred priority with respect to the main goal with 40%, CBM comes second with 2% difference from TBM and the least preferred alternative (CM) comes last with 22%.

![Bar chart showing preferences](image)

Figure 4-15: Alternative Preference with Respect To Main Goal (TFN)

### 4.6 Correspondence of Pairwise Matrix Evaluation Methods to Zero Consistency of Main Criteria Matrix

In this section, the sensitivity analysis is performed for all the applied derivation methods (MNV, NGM, EVM and TFN) by the selection of one matrix and equally adjusting the preferences and study the impact of this adjustment on the prioritization of alternatives across the four derivations methods. The main criteria matrix is selected (table 4-2) and the consistency of this matrix is measured by Expert Choice (Consistency = 0.04).

Table (4-13) presents the priority of the main criteria (cost, availability, reliability and safety) for the four applied methods (MNV, NGM, EVM and
TFN) and the prioritization of the alternatives (TBM, CBM and CM) with respect to main goal (maintenance optimum policy).

Table 4-13: Criteria's Weight and Alternatives for Pairwise Matrix Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivation methods</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MNV</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>TBM= 0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM=0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CM=0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>TBM=0.469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM=0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CM=0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVM</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.362</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>TBM=0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM=0.440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CM=0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFN</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>TBM=0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CBM=0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CM=0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The matrix of main criteria is adjusted by the use of Expert Choices function to arrive at 0.0 consistency. There are different scenarios that lead to the consistency to arrive at 0.0 within any matrix. The scenario which considered in this case study is the preference of the main criteria to arrive at the same preference that is obtained by FAHP, where reliability and availability are equally important.

The advantages of adjusting the main criteria matrix to have equal importance of availability and reliability are to studying the impact of this preference on the prioritization of the alternatives for the four methods. In addition to that, it allows studying the impact of the consistency's adjustment on FAHP and its derivation method TFN and how it would react to the adjustment.

The two main criteria preference (reliability and availability) have the same preference (32%) after applying TFN despite the fact that in the input rigid matrix there were slightly favoured preference towards reliability over
availability. Therefore, the author wants to study the impact of the change in the matrix's consistency on both the classic methods (MNV, NGM and EVM) and on the conversion mechanism to TFN of the main criteria as well as the alternatives prioritization. Table (4-14) shows the adjusted matrix which has 0 consistency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>main criteria</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Availability</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
<td>1/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4-15) presents the preference of the main criteria with 0.0 consistency matrix and consequentially the impact of this adjustment on the prioritization of maintenance policies (TBM, CBM and CM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Derivation methods</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Global weight of alternatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MNV                | 0.05     | TBM= 0.465
CBM=0.439
CM=0.0899 |
| NGM                | 0.05     | TBM=0.47047
CBM=0.44171
CM=0.08873 |
| EVM                | 0.083    | TBM=0.472
CBM=0.440
CM=0.088 |
| TFN                | 0.144    | TBM=0.405
CBM=0.381
CM=0.214 |

When the matrix consistency is zero which is the most preferable scenario mathematically, in this case, the reliability and availability would preferably have the same degree of preference towards the cost in the main matrix.
Figure (4-16) demonstrates the comparison between the preference of the main criteria (cost, availability, reliability and safety) as a result of adjusting the consistency to zero value.

The outputs of applying the derivation methods (MNV, NGM, EVM and TFN) show that when the entered data (availability and reliability are equally preferred) are applied, the preference of them is equally distributed.

Figure (4-17) demonstrates the maintenance policy’s priorities resulted from the four derivation methods with respect to main goal (0.0 consistency). The prioritization of the alternatives (maintenance policies) remains the same for all methods in terms of TBM as the most preferred alternative, CBM as second preferred and CM as the least preferred.
The alternative weights resulted from applying MNV remains almost the same in the case of CBM and CM. Whereas, slight change occurs in the weight of TBM which decreases by 0.5% following the change in the consistency (0.04 to 0.0).

The weight of CM and CBM using NGM remains the same with the change in the consistency, while the change of the prioritization of the other alternative TBM is increased by 14.7%.

Figure 4-17: Alternatives Priorities with Respect to Main Goal
The results of weights of alternatives using EVM remains the same despite the changes of the consistency, which is driven by the slight change in the preference in the rigid matrix.

The change in the preference of alternatives by the use of each derivation method following the slight adjustment in the matrix (preference of availability and reliability towards the cost to arrive at 0.0 consistency) is attributed to the way each method is conducted mathematically. NMV relies on the change of rows and the greater the change of the preference in the rows result into the change in the preference. The same conception applies to NGM, which considers the change in the rows and does not take into account the indirect change in the columns for which Saaty (1990) criticized the method, because of its non-conceptual justification for working with a logarithmic scale.

EVM has not shown much changes in the preference of the alternatives following the change of the consistency. This is can be attributed to the fact that EVM consider the indirect and direct change of the preference within the matrix. In other words, considering the change occurs in Table (4-2) and Table (4-14) in order to adjust the consistency, it is noticeable that the difference in the rows is substituted in the columns and due to this reason, the alternatives weight did not change much with EVM.

The preference in alternatives resulted from FAHP remains almost the same with the change of the consistency, which can be accredited to the fact that even when the original entered rigid matrix consistency was 4%, the result of the converted matrix led to equalizing the two main criteria (availability and reliability). Once the matrix was adjusted and both entered values of criteria were equalized (availability and reliability) in the original matrix, the same
results were obtained which can be credited to the mathematical mechanism of the procedure of TFN.

4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the strategic level of the proposed integrated framework and the problem of selecting the most suitable maintenance policy and assigning it to equipment or its parts was discussed. The modelling of the problem using multi criteria decision making method (AHP) was applied and the structure of the criteria and sub-criteria that drive the decision-maker to select a particular maintenance policy and possible alternatives was identified for the petroleum industry.

AHP provided the advantage of considering all the relative factors by breaking out the structure of the hierarchy of the problem and considering all relevant factors associated with the petroleum industry such as reliability, availability, safety and cost. Different derivation methods (MNV, NGM and EVM) of classic AHP were applied and the results of each method have been listed and explained. Fuzzy analytic hierarchy process method was applied to the collected data to study the difference in deriving the weights between rigid methods and fuzzy values and utilize the advantages of TFN, which considers the uncertainty of the translation of the decision-maker's preference.

Sensitive analysis was performed on the four methods by adjusting the main criteria matrix to have 0.0 consistency and the effect of this action on the preference weight of the alternatives was explained. AHP has the advantage of permitting a hierarchical structure of the criteria, which provides users with a better focus on specific criteria and sub-criteria when allocating the weights.
The advantages of using AHP and FAHP was to decompose all possible factors that contribute to the selection of maintenance policies and the possible solutions (alternatives) were clearly notable. It is obvious that any change in the circumstances (weights of criteria and sub-criteria) would result in the change to some extent of the priority within the alternatives, which in this case will assist the maintenance team to respond quickly and more accurately to the change.

In conclusion, this chapter investigated the selection of maintenance policy (strategic level) by the use of AHP and FAHP and discussed the results and the comparison of different derivation methods for arriving at the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy.
Chapter Five

Maintenance Operational Level

In this chapter, the proposed mathematical model is developed and applied on equipment within the oil and gas industry. The relative costs of maintenance within the petroleum industry are identified and defined to arrive at the identification of the optimum maintenance interval for equipment. Applications of the proposed model are applied on minor and major services to validate the mathematical model.
5.1 Introduction

Chapter Four discussed the selection of the most suitable maintenance policy by relying on classic and fuzzy analytic hierarchy process within the oil and gas industry. In the literature review, it is observed that the majority of the maintenance actions are scheduled on time and it is one of the most critical elements that the maintenance department within any petroleum companies are facing. The challenging aspect of the optimisation of preventive maintenance activities is to achieve a high performance in terms of operational availability, reliability, production stability and integrity of assets within the production line and decreasing the overall expenses of maintenance activities.

El-Jawhari and Collins (2014) suggested that the cost of maintenance are typically the third largest expenditure after raw material and energy costs. Moreover, IQPC (2014) stated that a well planned and executed annual shutdown will significantly reduce the risks of unforeseen downtime. Therefore, a mathematical model that considers the representation of the reliability, probability of failure and the maintenance costs is relied upon to optimise the maintenance intervals.

The balance between the costs of preventive and corrective maintenance action within the petroleum industry, taking into consideration the reliability through the presentation of failure probability is the main feature of the proposed mathematical model. This chapter is divided into two main parts:-

- Proposed mathematical model for maintenance scheduling.
- Application of the proposed model within the petroleum sector.
5.2 Proposed Mathematical Model for Maintenance Scheduling

Saad et al (2004) proposed a total maintenance cost equation (5-1) to calculate the total cost of maintenance to obtain an optimum time interval for maintenance activities within the manufacturing industry, which is also an intelligent mathematical model and considers the costs of equipment's maintenance and their reliability. Khalil et al (2009) developed the model and noted that the cost of the different types of maintenance (preventive and corrective) can be evaluated by considering the changes in the value of the actuation time. The increase of the actuation time increases the probability of failure \( F_{\Delta t} \). It is noted that from equation (5-1), an increase in actuation time also increases the cost of preventive maintenance \( P_{mc} \) and decreases the corrective maintenance cost \( C_{mc} \), which means that balancing the two costs will bring the total maintenance cost \( TMC \) to the optimum maintenance interval.

\[
TMC = \frac{(Cmc\cdot F_{\Delta t})+(Pmc\cdot(1-F_{\Delta t}))}{T\cdot(1-F_{\Delta t})} \tag{5-1}
\]

Where:-

- \( F_{\Delta t} \) Probability of failure (%).
- \( P_{mc} \) Preventive maintenance cost ($).
- \( C_{mc} \) Corrective maintenance cost ($).
- \( T \) Time suggested by maintenance (hrs).

5.2.1 Probability of Failure \( F_{\Delta t} \)

In the case of predicting the failure of components, probability distribution will be used. Different types of distributions are available with the use of Arena software which generate the entered data with different distributions and percentage of errors. However, Weibull distribution is mostly used in
reliability model to represent the equipment lifetime (Kelton et al., 2007) which is used in this study and equation (5-2) is the mathematical representation of the $F \Delta t$.

\[ F_{\Delta t} = 1 - e^{-\left(\frac{t}{\beta}\right)^{\alpha}} \]  \hspace{1cm} 5-2

Where:

$\alpha$  Shape parameter.

$\beta$  Scale parameter.

5.2.2 Preventive Maintenance Cost ($P_{mc}$)

Equation (5-3) demonstrates the major preventive maintenance costs. In addition to the rate and number of maintenance personals needed to complete the required work, time required for the completion of the task and the cost of spare parts, the probability of replacement ($P_{rp}$) of spare parts is considered here as well. Different factors lead to slight uncertainty of replacing the targeted parts such as, the condition of the maintained part and the operational hours.

$P_{rp}$ is estimated using the condition of the part through its historical maintenance data and it increases if the historical data shows frequent replacement of the part or if it just requires some lubrication or so on. Because of the high cost of some of the spare parts, adding their cost to the equations is believed to result into different maintenance intervals, which is not the case all the time.

\[ P_{mc} = \left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{sp} \times P_{rp_n} \right) + \left( X_1 \times S_{mh} \times t_{ip} \right) + C_{wp} + C_{oh} \right\} \]  \hspace{1cm} 5-3

Where:-

$C_{sp}$  Cost of spare parts ($\$\$).
\( P_{rp} \)  Possibility of replacing the part (%).

\( X_1 \)  Number of maintenance personnel.

\( S_{mh} \)  Maintenance personnel hourly rate ($/h).

\( t_{ip} \)  Time spent by maintenance personnel in carrying out preventive action (hrs).

\( C_{wp} \)  Waste disposable cleaning cost ($).

\( C_{oh} \)  Cost of out-house maintenance ($).

5.2.3 Corrective Maintenance Costs \((C_{mc})\)

The corrective maintenance cost's parameters are presented in equation (5-4). It is anticipated that the corrective maintenance cost will be more than the cost of preventive maintenance and that can be attributed to many reasons. For instance, corrective maintenance requires more time to identify, mobilise the resources and resolve the failure. In addition, the consequences of this failure on the machine itself, damages to the production and any possible delays and bottleneck at a particular production stage as a result, which always lead to the cost of corrective maintenance \( C_{mc} \) to be realistically higher than \( P_{mc} \).

\[
C_{mc} = \{( \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_{sp_i} \times P_{rp_i} ) + P_{LC} + Dc + B_{pc} + B_{LC} + C_{oh}\} \tag{5-4}
\]

Where:-

\( C_{sp} \)  Cost of spare parts ($).

\( P_{LC} \)  Production losses cost ($).

\( Dc \)  Damages cost ($).

\( B_{pc} \)  Bottleneck penalty cost ($).

\( B_{LC} \)  Booked labour costs ($).
Each of the elements of equation (5-4) is further explained in the following sections:

5.2.3.1 Production Losses Cost (PLc)

PLc presents the possible losses in relation to the stoppage of the production line, considering the time needed to maintain and set up the machine as well as the department income and the production cycle time (equation 5-5) (Khalil et al 2009).

\[
PLc = \begin{cases} 
(t_{ti} + t_{su}) \times \frac{\alpha}{\pi} & \text{at } t_{su} > 0 \\
\frac{t_{ti} \times \alpha}{\pi} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

5-5

Where:

- \( t_{ti} \) Production time loss excluding setup machine time (hrs).
- \( t_{su} \) Machine set up time (hrs).
- \( \alpha \) Department's income due to one barrel ($).
- \( \pi \) Production cycle time (hrs).

\( t_{ti} \) and \( t_{su} \) are considered separately because the time for setting up the machine which includes handing the machine over to the operation might take a long time and consequentially not considering this time would impact on the outcomes of the corrective cost.

5.2.3.2 Damages Cost (Dc)

Dc considers the damages that might occur as consequences of the failure. It also considers legal fines (Lc) imposed by the local authorities in case of environmental damages and the cost of cleaning non-hazardous and hazardous materials as a consequence of a failure which is very pertinent to oil and gas industry. Another additional related cost considered in equation
(5-6) is the cost of sequentially damaged parts/equipment as a consequence of the failure of another part/equipment and therefore the damage costs are represented in the following equation:-

\[
D_c = \{(V \times C_{pd}) + L_c + C_{wd} + C_{sd}\}
\]

Where:-

\(V\) Number of damaged production by barrel.

\(C_{pd}\) Value of damaged production ($).

\(L_c\) Legal fines in case of environmental damages ($).

\(C_{wd}\) The cost of cleaning non-hazardous and hazardous materials ($).

\(C_{sd}\) Cost of damaged parts due to failure of another part ($).

5.2.3.3 Bottleneck Penalty Cost (\(B_{pC}\))

The bottleneck penalty cost emphasises the costs which are related to delay charges. Delay charges illustrate any fines incurred for the reason of delays in delivering the product at the scheduled time.

\[
B_{pC} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{(t_{el}+t_{su})}{\pi} \times C_{pd} & \text{at } C_{MT} < D_{FT} \\
\frac{(t_{el}+t_{su})}{\pi} \times C_{pd} + D_{ch} & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Where:-

\(D_{ch}\) Delay charges, which is further explained in equation (5-9).
5.2.3.4 Delay charges ($D_{ch}$)

$D_{ch}$ as shown in the developed equation (5-9) considers the time required to complete corrective actions and $D_{FT}$.

$$D_{ch} = (C_{MT} - D_{FT}) \times C_{h}$$  

Where: $C_{h}$ Cost of delay charges per unit ($)

5.2.3.5 Booked Labour Costs (BLc)

$BLc$ indicates to the related costs of maintenance labour and operational workers in terms of corrective maintenance (equation 5-10).

$$BLc = (X_{1} \times t_{tc} \times S_{mh}) + (t_{tl} + t_{su}) \times S_{oh} \times X_{2}$$  

Where:-

$t_{tc}$ Time spent by the maintenance personnel to repair failure (hrs).

$S_{oh}$ Operator's hourly rate ($).

$X_{1}$ Number of maintenance personnel.

$X_{1}$ Number of operational personnel.

Therefore, the cost of corrective maintenance ($C_{mc}$) when all the terms are considered is represented in equation (5-11):-
5.2.4 Assumptions Considered for the proposed Model

For the adoption of the proposed mathematical model, a few assumptions have been made to reflect the reality of the problem:

- Spare parts are available on site and the delay time of delivering them is negligible.
- Replacement of the parts depends on their condition.
- All calculations are made in US dollars ($).
- Maintenance technicians are well trained and able to carry out the work.
- Majority of the maintenance actions are carried out by the maintenance department within the company.

5.3 Applications of the Proposed Mathematical Method

Maintenance intervals between planned preventive maintenance services for the oil and gas field equipment are mostly made based on the recommendations of the manufacturer, as contained in their operation and maintenance manuals and followed by the maintenance department. The proposed model is applied on seven Ruston TA Turbines that act as a unit, which is installed in a downstream petroleum company and will remain anonymous for confidentiality reasons. Minor services for each of the Ruston TA Turbine are overtaken after 1500 hours of operation. However, the
historical data and the experience gained over 40 years of running the Ruston Turbine TA, shows that the fuel filter, which is one of the parts replaced in the minor services will start to block at approximately 2000 hours of operation. The major overhaul for the Ruston Turbine carried out on the forth times of the minor overhaul (6000hrs). This service is scheduled to allow the replacement of certain parts and is pushed back for the purpose of carrying out both minor and major overhaul at the same time. The service is therefore cost-effective.

The application of the proposed mathematical model is organised as followed:

1. Calculating $P_{mc}$ for minor services.
2. Calculating $C_{mc}$ for minor services.
3. Computing the total maintenance cost for minor services.
4. Calculating $P_{mc}$ for major services.
5. Calculating $C_{mc}$ for the major services.
6. Computing the total maintenance cost for major services.

5.3.1 Preventive Maintenance Costs ($P_{mc}$) Minor Services

$P_{mc}$ is calculated by the use of equation (5-3). Table (5-1) shows the spare parts costs, the probability of replacement of each part $Prp$ (which is estimated based on the historical data of replacement parts) and the quantity of each of the spare parts (QTY).

$Prp$ of the oil burner was estimated by finding out the number of times that maintenance replaced the part and divided this by the number of maintenance services conducted including the time when the part was not replaced.
Table 5-1: Costs of Spare Parts for Minor Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Prp (%)</th>
<th>Unit Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oil burner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6413.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filter</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaning agent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $c_{sp}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1425.642</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The associated costs of preventive maintenance action for minor services are illustrated in table (5-2) including the number of maintenance personnel required to perform the task and their wages, which may fairly vary from one region to another.

Table 5-2: Preventive Maintenance Costs for Minor Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Value and Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$c_{sp}$</td>
<td>$1425.642$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$x_{i}$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s_{mh}$</td>
<td>$25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{ip}$</td>
<td>18 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{wa}$</td>
<td>$100$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p_{mc}$</td>
<td>$2425.642$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.2 Corrective Maintenance Costs ($c_{mc}$) Minor Service

In the case of CM, the required quantity of each spare part as well as the possibility of replacing each part remains the same (Table 5-1). As a consequence of the failure, however, it would damage the compressor rotor which is a high cost component. In addition to that, the number of maintenance technicians in the case of CM, as well as time required to complete the job is increased. Table (5-3) presents the costs involved in CM actions. All associated costs are substituted in equation (5-10) to extract the corrective maintenance cost for minor services, which is represented at the last row in table (5-3).
Table 5-3: CM Relevant Costs for Minor Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values and Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{sp}$</td>
<td>$1425.642$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{mh}$</td>
<td>$25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{ic}$</td>
<td>66 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{wd}$</td>
<td>$200$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$c_{sd}$</td>
<td>$205,709.14$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{mc}$</td>
<td>$212284.78$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.3 Total Maintenance Cost for Minor Service

The value of $C_{mc} ($212284.78) is multiplied by the probability of failure and the value of $P_{mc} ($2425.642) is multiplied by the survival factor (1 - FΔt) to illustrate the behaviour of both costs. The behaviour of both costs is impacted by the probability of the failure and the survival factor. Figure (5-1) demonstrates the behaviours of $C_{mc}$ towards $FΔt$ and the increase in the corrective cost with time.

![Figure 5-1: The Behaviour of (Cmc x FΔt) for Minor Service](image)
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Figure (5-2) demonstrates the behaviour of the preventive maintenance costs multiplied by the survival factor \((1 - FAt)\). It is notable that \(Pmc\) decrease with the time and this is attributed to impact of the decreased survival factor.

![Graph](image)

**Figure 5-2: The Behaviour of \((Pmc \times (1 - FAt))\) for Minor Service**

Equation (5-1) is applied and the values of \(C_{mc}\) and \(P_{mc}\) for minor services are substituted. Table (5-4) presents the total maintenance cost including \(C_{mc}\) and \(P_{mc}\) and its development within the time (hrs).

Table (5-4) contains two categories: time in hours and the TMC ($/h). It shows the gradual decrease in the total cost of maintenance with time at the beginning of the computation until it arrives into the lowest possible cost. It then starts increasing again to arrive at the highest cost where the probability of the failure is 100% and the survival factor is equal to zero. The lowest maintenance cost occurs at 1848 hours of operation with a minimum cost of 289.45 $/h.
Table 5-4: TMC for Minor Service ($/h)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
<th>Time (hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>2425.692586</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>289.540499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>1213.225684</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>291.820029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>809.945107</td>
<td>2184</td>
<td>300.7210948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>609.723812</td>
<td>2352</td>
<td>315.981478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>491.600037</td>
<td>2520</td>
<td>337.512419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>415.457529</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>365.351488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>364.2822125</td>
<td>2856</td>
<td>399.6332154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>329.7241611</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>440.5717385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>307.2855022</td>
<td>3192</td>
<td>488.4507988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>294.3962589</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>543.6190597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (5-3) demonstrates the behaviour of the total maintenance cost. Total maintenance cost starts at $2425.692586 and gradually drops to the lowest cost (which is considered as the maintenance interval) and increases again following the impact of failure probability increment and the survival factor.

![Figure 5-3: TMC ($/h) for the Minor Service](image)
5.3.4 Preventive Maintenance Costs $P_{mc}$ Major Service

Table (5-5) presents the spare parts prices and the possibility of replacement for each part according to the collected historical data from the maintenance department. These percentages are used to estimate the probability of replacing the parts, according to the historical data of the part movement, and do not represent the probability of the failure.

**Table 5-5: Spare parts Cost for Major Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>$P_{rp}$ %</th>
<th>Unit Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filter lube element</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>470.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igniter plug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>812.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel pump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total $C_{sp}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2180.842</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5-6) illustrates the related costs that involved in PM actions. The cost of PM for major service is obtained by using equations (5-3) and is result to $P_{mc} = $3280.842.

**Table 5-6: Preventive Maintenance Costs for Major Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values and units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_{sp}$</td>
<td>$2180.842$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S_{mh}$</td>
<td>$25$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t_{ip}$</td>
<td>20 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{wd}$</td>
<td>$100$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.5 Corrective Maintenance Costs $C_{mc}$ Major Service

The quantity of spare parts remains the same for the major services planning in the case of corrective actions, but in the case of the occurrence of the failure, the possibility of replacing the listed parts are going to be certain because of the failure (Table 5-7).
Table 5-7: Spare parts Cost for Major Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part name</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>( P_{rp} ) %</th>
<th>Unit Price ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filter lube element</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>470.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igniter plug</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>812.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel pump</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total ( C_{sp} )</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$3456.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The consequences of the failure will certainly lead to the damage of the compressor rotor which costs " $205,709.14 ", and therefore this cost is considered as main element of \( C_{mc} \). Table (5-8) demonstrates the related cost of CM actions and by applying equation (5-11), the total cost of corrective maintenance is calculated ( \( C_{mc} = $214540.66 \)).

Table 5-8: Preventive Maintenance Costs for Minor Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Values and units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( C_{sp} )</td>
<td>$3456.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( X_1 )</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( S_{mh} )</td>
<td>$25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( t_{ic} )</td>
<td>68 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_{wd} )</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( c_{sd} )</td>
<td>$205,709.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.3.6 **Total Maintenance Cost for Major Service**

The corrective and preventive maintenance costs are calculated " $214540.66, $3280.842" respectively. Figure (5-4) shows that the occurrence of corrective maintenance costs less for the maintenance department as the probability of failure at infant age is relatively small (1.13463\( \times 10^{-5} \)) and increases as the part ages to arrive at the maximum price because the probability of the failure reaches 100%.
The survival factor drives the value of $P_{mc}$ at the highest value as the survival factor is at the highest value (100%) at an early life of the part. This is attributed as the cost of carrying out preventive maintenance in early stage and results to costing the maintenance department unnecessary spending considering the high percentage of the survival factor as shown in figure (5-5).
Table (5-9) presents the results of total maintenance cost obtained from applying equation (5-1). The values of TMC are listed to recognize the optimum time interval for the maintenance to be planned (The complete table appendix C). Total maintenance cost for the major activities starts high at 3280.842 $/h, and decreases to reach an interval between the weeks 43-47.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
<th>Time(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
<th>Time(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>3280.842</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>112.7902828</td>
<td>9576</td>
<td>146.0025517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>1093.613978</td>
<td>5208</td>
<td>105.4501135</td>
<td>9912</td>
<td>181.9335769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>656.1681936</td>
<td>5544</td>
<td>99.0463575</td>
<td>10248</td>
<td>231.611416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>468.6908071</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>93.4779416</td>
<td>10584</td>
<td>299.2119455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>364.53526</td>
<td>6216</td>
<td>88.70490222</td>
<td>10920</td>
<td>390.0506423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>298.2517447</td>
<td>6552</td>
<td>84.7516394</td>
<td>11256</td>
<td>510.8842933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2184</td>
<td>252.3586869</td>
<td>6888</td>
<td>81.71630427</td>
<td>11592</td>
<td>670.3091787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>218.697055</td>
<td>7224</td>
<td>79.78638882</td>
<td>11928</td>
<td>879.2977697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2856</td>
<td>192.946391</td>
<td>7560</td>
<td>79.26102628</td>
<td>12264</td>
<td>1151.937923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3192</td>
<td>172.6045316</td>
<td>7896</td>
<td>80.58086886</td>
<td>12600</td>
<td>1506.472669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3528</td>
<td>156.1220148</td>
<td>8232</td>
<td>84.36674377</td>
<td>12936</td>
<td>1966.792191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3864</td>
<td>142.4885045</td>
<td>8568</td>
<td>91.46864358</td>
<td>13272</td>
<td>2564.614456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>131.018363</td>
<td>8904</td>
<td>103.027031</td>
<td>13608</td>
<td>3342.727542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4536</td>
<td>121.2324673</td>
<td>9240</td>
<td>120.5489927</td>
<td>13944</td>
<td>4359.890134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in figure (5-6) the minimum total maintenance cost occurs between the week 43 and the week 46 and the lowest values of TMC occurs at week 45 (7560 hrs). For simplicity, not all data was plotted and to have a clear capture of the decrease and increase of TMC.
5.3.7 Scheduling PM Intervals for Ruston Turbine

The optimum maintenance time for minor service to be carried out was calculated at 1848hrs (11 weeks) and for major services at 7560hrs (45 weeks). For utilization of the resources and decreasing the interruption of operation, major maintenance is recommended to be pushed back and carried out on week 44 (7392hrs) instead of week 45 in order to opportunistically perform the fourth minor maintenance simultaneously with major service's first interval.

5.3.8 The Proposed Model's Cost Effectiveness

The implementation of the proposed mathematical model achieved promising results in regards to identifying preventive maintenance intervals instead of following the manufacturer recommendations.
The current maintenance interval for minor service is scheduled at 1500hrs resulting into the maintenance to be planned for five times a year. The outcomes of the proposed model improves the scheduling of maintenance intervals by shortening the mean time between maintenance (MTBM) into 4 times a year instead of performing maintenance 5 times a year.

The above calculations are made for one turbine, assuming that the other turbine's failure mechanisms are identical. The impact of the proposed model on scheduling the PM activities is highly positive, reducing the total maintenance cost (TMC) on yearly bases. The preventive maintenance is calculated to be $2425.642 for five times a year. Thus, for the seven turbines the total saving comes from $12128.21 to $9702.568 without compromising on the reliability of the equipment (figure 5-7).

![Figure 5-7: Total Cost Saving ($/year) For Minor Service]
The major service for the Ruston Turbine TA is conducted each 6000h according to the current manufacture recommendations. However, historical data shows that the failure of maintained parts occurs at approximately 7500hrs. The outcome of the developed model suggests that maintenance should be carried out at 7392hrs. The model proved that it is possible to extend the mean time between maintenance without impacting on reliability of equipment. Over a period of three and half years, maintenance activities cost for major service are reduced and the total saving of maintenance cost increases to reach $3148.41 (figure 5-8).

![Figure 5-8: Total Cost Saving ($/3.5year) Major Service](image)

The identification of the associated costs with both corrective and preventive maintenance activities have its advantages, besides obtaining the optimum time to maintain equipment. The ratio between preventive and corrective maintenance cost indicates the appropriateness of the selected maintenance
policies for that particular equipment. Higher the ratio of \( \text{Cmc} \) to \( \text{Pmc} \), the more suitable the decision of PM for that particular part becomes from a cost point of view. Otherwise more investigation is needed to be performed with regards to reasons of selecting PM for that part.

Analysis of the cost elements significantly improves the understanding of the main costs of CM and PM. The elements of involved costs suggest that the impact of wrongly selected maintenance schedule harms the equipment in the selected case study and unless stand by turbines are installed, the operational damages would increase the cost of corrective maintenance.

5.3.9 The Impact of the Proposed Model on Operation Availability

Operation availability is the portion time that the equipment is in good condition to fulfil its function (Márquez 2007). Optimising preventive maintenance scheduling has a positive impact on the operational availability (OA) of the equipment. Operational availability of equipment is driven by the mean up time between maintenance and mean down time (MDT) activities equation (5-6).

\[
\text{OA} = \frac{\text{MUT}}{\text{MUT} + \text{MDT}} 
\]

Where:-

\( \text{MUT} \)  Mean up time between failures.

\( \text{MDT} \)  Mean down time between failures.

The percentage of operational availability for the minor services is calculated on the assumption that the current MUT is 1500hrs, and the MDT is equal to the time required to repair the machine (18 hrs). The same MDT is assumed for the proposed OA but the MUT is 1848hrs (figure 5-9).
Figure 5-9: Improved OA for Minor Service

Figure (5-10) which compares current OA and the improved OA for major services with the assumption that MUT is 6000h and 7560hrs for the current and the proposed services respectively, and MDT is equal to the time required to repair the machine (86hrs).
5.3.10 Sensitivity Analysis of the Proposed Model

In this section, the sensitivity analysis is performed to understand the correspondence of the model to the change of preventive and corrective maintenance costs. To validate this analysis, the assumption is made to have the same failure distribution. The two proposed scenarios consider that preventive maintenance cost is equal to the corrective maintenance cost in the first case and the PM cost is higher than CM cost in the second case.

5.3.10.1 Costs of PM and CM Presumably Equal

The sensitivity analysis it applied to examine the response of TMC to the change and to check if the mean time between maintenance increases or decreases following the change. In this assumption, both costs are equal ($212374.7) and the probability of failure remains the same. In this case as shown in table (5-10), the optimum maintenance interval is increased from 11 weeks to 32 weeks (5376hrs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
<th>T(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
<th>T(hrs)</th>
<th>TMC ($/h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>212374.6482</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>13487.25815</td>
<td>5376</td>
<td>8581.25056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>70792.96503</td>
<td>3024</td>
<td>12104.53783</td>
<td>5544</td>
<td>8593.873315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>42481.41434</td>
<td>3360</td>
<td>11041.25085</td>
<td>5880</td>
<td>8749.131326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>30357.01231</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>10220.92015</td>
<td>6216</td>
<td>9065.509272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>23634.97461</td>
<td>4032</td>
<td>9594.662737</td>
<td>6552</td>
<td>9573.112833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>19375.84769</td>
<td>4368</td>
<td>9131.191614</td>
<td>6888</td>
<td>10317.94956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2184</td>
<td>16450.69698</td>
<td>4704</td>
<td>8811.352133</td>
<td>7224</td>
<td>11368.86935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2352</td>
<td>15312.40319</td>
<td>4872</td>
<td>8701.867045</td>
<td>7392</td>
<td>12039.50054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>14334.19075</td>
<td>5040</td>
<td>8625.178427</td>
<td>7560</td>
<td>12828.76195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-10: TMC ($/h) for Minor Services under (PM=CM Costs)
This emphasizes the importance of including the costs of hazards and cleaning the environment within the developed model because if they were not included and the cost of PM and CM were equal, then the consequences of failure would be catastrophic.

5.3.10.2 Cost of PM Higher Than Cost of CM

The second proposed scenario is the case where the PM cost was found to be higher than the cost of CM. The preventive maintenance cost was assumed to be twice as high as that of the corrective maintenance cost ($424749.4) and correspondingly, the optimum interval was increased consequentially (37 weeks) as shown in Figure (5-11).

![Figure 5-11: PM Cost Higher than CM Cost for Minor Services](image)
5.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, the difficulty of scheduling preventive maintenance activities for equipment within the oil and gas industry has been discussed. A development of equations for costs of both corrective and preventive maintenance were also presented. These equations were modified to simulate the major costs involved in the maintenance activities within the oil and gas industry including the probability of replacement the part, fees of delay, cost of environmental cleaning and out-house maintenance cost.

The outcome of the mathematical model shows promising results in terms of reducing the cost of maintenance activities without compromising on the reliability of the assets.

The results were compared to the historical data with regards to the failure history to ensure that the advised maintenance interval time is within enough time as per the possibility of the occurrence of the failure and all obtained results were encouraging. Notable improvement in the operation availability of the equipment is achieved by the implementation of the proposed model in comparison to the current maintenance state.

The sensitivity analysis proved the importance of the developed costs to simulate the real scenario by showing the impact of the changes to the cost of PM and CM. The results showed that higher the cost of PM over the cost of CM, the longer the mean time between maintenance will be.

The logical explanation of the sensitivity analysis suggested that if CM costs were less than PM costs, then it is more likely to run the part to failure. This stresses on the importance of embodying the relevant costs that has been ignored in other models such as the cost of delay.
To sum up, the proposed mathematical model attempted to answer the questions with regards to calculating the optimum time to conduct preventive maintenance and the applications of the model showed improvement in equipment's reliability and availability with decrease in the maintenance expenditures.
Chapter Six

An integrated Approach between Maintenance and Spare Parts Control

Chapter Six presents the integrated approach between optimum preventive maintenance interval and spare parts control. The relation between preventive maintenance and inventory department is demonstrated and as well as the proposed approach including the relevant equations. Applications of the proposed approach are demonstrated to validate the applicability of the approach. The results are finally listed at the end the chapter.
Chapter Six

6.1 Introduction

Chapter (5) dealt with the optimisation of preventive maintenance interval and a mathematical model was proposed and applied to obtain the optimum interval to maintain equipment within the petroleum industry. In this chapter, an integrated approach between spare parts management and preventive maintenance is developed to minimise total inventory cost.

The high cost of spare parts of the equipment within the petroleum industry drives the need for optimisation of the inventory management in the industry. The high responsiveness required due to downtime costs and the risk of stock obsolescence drives the need to address this particular matter (Cohen et al 2006).

Bacchetti et al 2010 stated that Keeping the appropriate stock quantity of spare parts to cover the demand when preventive maintenance is executed and avoiding disturbance to operations due to delay of shortages in spare parts as an important issue. The proposed approach focuses on the integration between the developed mathematical model to optimise preventive maintenance intervals, which is described in Chapter Five and the inventory management for the spare parts to be delivered or stocked to guarantee its availability at the right time to perform maintenance at the planned time.

This chapter is divided into two main sections:-

- Methodology and proposed integrated approach
- Application of the proposed integrated approach
6.2 Methodology and Proposed Integrated Approach

In a bid to accommodate the function of inventory, companies maintain four types of inventories and they are: raw material inventory (RMI), which refers to material used in the production process that has not been processed yet (Eroglu and Hofer 2011); work-in-process inventory (WIP), which refers to material that has been processed but not completed yet; finished goods inventory (FGI), which are the completed items that ready to be sold but still an asset on the company books and finally maintenance, repairs and operations inventory (MRO) which refers to spare parts required to ensure production can be continued (Heizer and Render, 2014).

The nature of the petroleum industry suggests that MRO inventory required to keep the operation running has the highest proportion in terms of cost within the inventory management department. This emphasises the importance of optimising the activity of inventory management and controlling the spare parts to ensure a satisfactory level of inventory for PM requirements. Optimising the spare parts refers to the shortages and overstocking of spare parts which should be avoided to control costs and ensure the security of the capital of the company.

Figure (6-1) demonstrates the proposed integrated approach to optimise and control spare parts. This approach relies on the optimisation of the maintenance interval and obtaining the required information and processes the time between intervals as the lead time to deliver the spare parts by the inventory department. The integrated approach does not consider the spare parts required for the corrective maintenance, it is only applied in the case of planned maintenance activities.
Figure 6-1: The Integrated Maintenance and Inventory Approach

Figure (6-2) presents the description of the process taken to arrive at the determination of economic order quantity, reordering point and the safety stock of spare parts. It demonstrates the relationship between PM optimisation process and its interaction with the process of controlling the spare parts.

![Diagram of inventory management and maintenance processes]

1. Collect Part Failure History
2. Calculate the Probability of Failure
3. Calculate PM and CM Costs
4. Calculate the TMC
5. Determine the Optimum Maintenance Interval
6. Determine the Number of Periods per Year
7. Determine the Quantity Required per Year
8. Calculate the EOQ
9. Calculate the ROP and SS for Different Service Levels

Figure 6-2: Description of Maintenance and Inventory Integrated Approach
Applying the proposed mathematical model, which considers the associated costs of both corrective and preventive activities as well as the probability of the failure to calculate the optimum time interval for each component at which the preventive maintenance should be carried out, preventive maintenance interval is optimised as extensively explained in chapter Five.

Once the Total Maintenance Cost (TMC) is applied and the optimum time to perform preventive maintenance for equipment is obtained, then this interval time is used as the lead time in order to find the economic order quantity (EOQ) (Equation 6-1).

\[
EOQ = \sqrt{\frac{2DOc}{Hc}}
\]

Where:-

- \( D \) Annual demand.
- \( Oc \) Order cost for each order.
- \( Hc \) Holding cost for each item per year.

Different assumptions that translate the actual real scenarios to calculate the reordering point (\( ROP \)) were suggested in the literature review. These assumptions lead to the fact that there are different equations applied to different assumptions.

Three probability models are suggested by Heizer and Rander (2014). The assumption of inconsistent demand is not applicable in this case, as the maintenance demand is assumed to be optimised and the demand should be stable. This results in two applicable assumptions to calculate \( ROP \) of which the first is :- constant demand and constant lead time (equation 6-2):

\[
ROP = D \times L + SS
\]
Spare Parts Control
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ROP  Reorder Point

D  Demand.

L  Lead time.

SS  Safety stock which can be considered as the spare parts required for one service (Heizer and Render 2014).

The second assumption is: constant demand and variable lead time (equation 6-3).

\[
ROP = D_p \times L_p + SS \tag{6-3}
\]

Where:

\( D_p \)  Demand per period.

\( L_p \)  Average lead time in period.

In this case \( SS \) is calculated by applying equation (6-4).

\[
SS = (Z \times D_p \times \alpha_{lt}) \tag{6-4}
\]

Where:

\( Z \)  Service level (Heizer and Render 2014),

\( \alpha_{lt} \)  Standard deviation of lead time in periods.

6.3 The Applications of the Proposed Integrated Approach

The proposed integrated approach is applied on the Ruston TA Turbine (seven equipment acting as a unit) within the oil and gas sector for validation purposes. Five of the seven turbines have to be in full working order to comply with the field requirement. From the history data, there were few occasions where the seven turbines were required to be online to fulfil the company's requirements. The company pursues a maximum and minimum policy for spare part inventory, with the minimum level taken as the reordering point. The order level is the quantity which will return inventory to
the maximum level. One of the company administration inventory policies is to receive ordered inventory every 40 weeks.

The company's current inventory policy in place at the inventory department in regards to the cost of storage and the ordering cost is to add 10% to the purchase price of each item, with 2% and 8% representing the storage cost and ordering cost respectively. Two parts selected are for the minor services while three parts are selected for the major services.

6.3.1 Calculation of the Optimum Maintenance Interval

The proposed mathematical model extensively explained in Chapter Five is applied to calculate the optimum maintenance interval. The outcomes from the model shows that the optimum maintenance interval for a minor service should be performed at every 1,848hrs (11 weeks) and 7,560 hrs for a major service (45 weeks). However, the maintenance interval for major service is pushed backward to week 44 (7,392hrs) instead of week 45 in order to carry out the fourth minor service simultaneously with the major service to utilize all resources and minimise the disruption to the operations.

6.3.1.1 Maintenance's Demand for Spare Parts

In this section, the demand for the needed parts is calculated based on the schedule of the both minor and major services produced by the mathematical maintenance model. The probability of replacement ($P_{rp}$) of the parts is considered in this calculation. The percentages of $P_{rp}$ are estimated from the logbook of maintenance and movement of part within the inventory department (set on the basis of presumed required number by the maintenance and the actual usage of the spare parts).
Table (6-1) shows the probability of replacement for the selected parts and the required annual demand for each part which is calculated by multiplying the quantity per period by the number of periods a year. The quantity per period and the frequency of performing annual overhaul are determined by maintenance department. Part 3 and part 4 are estimated to have 50% and 60% probability of replacement respectfully and these values are observed from the estimated annual demand of maintenance department and the actual request from the inventory department.

For instance, the demand for part (1) from the maintenance department is four for each of the seven machines and the maintenance will be performed 4 times a year resulting in 112 parts needed annually.

Two spare parts are required of part (2) for each of the seven machines to be used during the four minor services, and the annual demand is calculated to be 56. Parts (3) and (4) have probability of replacement of (50% and 60%) respectively and accordingly the actual maintenance demand is 4 parts each. 7 parts are required from the maintenance for part (5) annually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No</th>
<th>$P_{rp}$ %</th>
<th>Demand per Service</th>
<th>Number of Planned Service</th>
<th>Number of Machines</th>
<th>Annual Demand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.2 Calculation of EOQ for Required Parts for Minor and Major Service

The next step is to determine the EOQ and reordering point (ROP) for spare parts involved in both minor and major services. The demand per period is
obtained based on the assumption of stable demand (maintenance requirements are known and constant in terms of quantity for each period).

By determining the number of periods in a year and the annual demand is then calculated by multiplying quantity per period by number of periods.

Table (6-2) presents the spare parts required for the services. The selected spare parts are classified as class (A) according to ABC classification.

Parts (1) and (2) are required for the minor service and parts (4), (5) and (6) are required for the major service. The parts quantity (QTY), maximum (MAX) and minimum (MIN) current policy are listed for comparison with the results of the integrated approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit cost $</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>MAX</th>
<th>MIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Filter element</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cleaning agent</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Igniter plug</td>
<td>812.18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Fuel pump</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Filter lube element</td>
<td>470.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the EOQ and ROP for spare parts for both services (minor and major), determining the number of periods in a year is required. The mean time between maintenance is obtained for the minor services (11 weeks) and maintenance is conducted 4 times a year. The major service of maintenance is conducted every 44 weeks, once a year.

Table (6-3) shows the annual demand for the spare parts, taking into account four periods for parts (1) and (2), and one period for the rest of the spare parts as they are just needed for the major service, which occurs once a year. Equation (6-1) is applied to obtain EOQ, considering the annual demand of parts (1 to 5), un stocked cost, holding cost \((H_c)\) and ordering cost \((O_c)\).
Table 6-3: Calculation of EOQ for Minor/Major Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No</th>
<th>Annual Demand</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Hc 2%</th>
<th>Oc 8%</th>
<th>EOQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>5.2884</td>
<td>21.1536</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>0.4728</td>
<td>1.8912</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>812.18</td>
<td>16.2436</td>
<td>64.9744</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
<td>43.4794</td>
<td>173.9176</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>470.37</td>
<td>9.4074</td>
<td>37.6296</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.3 Determining the Reordering Point (ROP) and Safety Stock (SS)

In this section, the two following two assumptions are applied to the case study:

1. Both lead time and demand are constant.
2. The lead time is variable and the demand is constant.

6.3.3.1 Constant Lead Time \((L)\) and Constant Demand \((D)\)

In this section, the assumption is that the lead time and the demand are constant. Part (1) is taken as a case study from the minor services and part (3) from the major services. Equation (6-2) is applied to calculate the ROP.

6.3.3.1.1 Part (1) Minor Service

The lead time is the time of the optimum maintenance interval which is calculated in (chapter 5) and found to be around 11 weeks (77 days). The annual demand for part (1) is 112 spare parts used four times in a year. Thus, the safety stock is considered to be the spare parts needed for one minor service (28).

Equation (6-2) is applied and values are substituted as followed:

\[
ROP = \left( \frac{112}{365} \times 77 \right) + 28 = 52 \text{ parts}
\]

Table (6-4) captures the movement of part (1), which starts with ordering 30 of this part (1) to follow the economic order quantity calculated in table 6-3 The
balance on hand is assumed to be the reordering point which is 52 and the lead time is MTBM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead time (weeks)</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Receive</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Balance on hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (6-3) demonstrates the expected movement of part (1) for almost 17 years and illustrates a smooth movement avoiding any erratic movement or shortages at time of planned maintenance (Appendix D).
6.3.3.1.2 Part (3) Major Service

The same process is applied to part (3) of which the annual demand is provided by the maintenance team to be 4 parts a year and the safety stock is 4 spare parts as required for one major service: 

\[ ROP = \left( \frac{4}{365} \right) \times 308 + 4 = 8 \]

Figure (6-4) shows the movement of part (4) over almost 17 years. The EOQ is 6 parts for each order as obtained from table (6-3) and the lead time is equal to the maintenance interval of 44 weeks (308 days).

![Figure 6-4: Part (3) Inventory Level Movement under Integrated Approach](image)

6.3.3.2 Constant Demand and Variable Lead Time

In this section, reordering point ROP is calculated with the condition that the lead time is variable. The benefit of applying this condition so that the safety stock can be calculated at different service levels. Once the reordering point is calculated for different services levels, we assume that the receiving is every 40 weeks (the longest of lead time) to compare it with the current MIN/MAX policy.
The data recorded from the movement of the parts required for minor and major services show the variability of the lead time resulting into average of 234.444 days. The average lead time is then divided by the time between maintenance for minor services to calculate the average of lead time per day per period leading to average lead time in period and standard deviation of 3.044733045 and 0.45506052 respectively for minor services. The average lead time is divided by the major the time between maintenance for major services (308 days), resulting into the average lead time in period (0.761183261) and standard deviation (0.11376513) for the major services.

### 6.3.3.2.1 Calculation of ROP for Minor and Major Required Spare Parts

Table (6-5) presents the ROP and safety stock (SS) for the spare parts required to perform the minor services at service level 90%. The following example of calculating \( ROP \) (equation 6-3) for part (1) is provided to demonstrate the applied steps.

\[
ROP = Demand \text{ per period} \times \text{Average lead time for minor services} + \text{safety stock}
\]

\[
ROP = 28 \times 3.044733045 + \text{safety stock}
\]

\[
= 85.252 + \text{safety stock}
\]

Equation (6-4) is applied to calculate the safety stock (SS) required for service level 90%. \( Z=1.28 \).

\[
SS = 1.28 \times 28 \times 0.45506052 = 16
\]

\[
ROP = 85.252 + 16 = 102
\]

In order to validate the accuracy of the use of periodic demand to calculate the ROP, the calculations are also made for the annual demand with the
longest lead time (40 weeks) to reordering point annually. The reason for the
use of the longest lead time is to simulate the worst case scenario.

\[ ROP = \text{daily demand} \times \text{the longest lead time} + \text{safety stock} \]

\[ = \left( \left( \frac{112}{365} \right) \times 280 \right) + 16 = 102 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-5: ROP and SS for Spare Parts (1) And (2) With SL 90%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor service parts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-6) demonstrates \( ROP \) and \( SS \) for the spare parts required for the minor
services with service levels (SL) 95% and 99.99%. It is obvious that the higher the
service level is the greater the number of safety stock.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-6: ROP and SS for Spare Parts (1) And (2) With SL (95% and 99.99%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-7) demonstrates the demand per period \( (D_p) \) for the parts required
for the major services (3, 4, and 5), the reorder point \( ROP \) and the safety
stock \( SS \) at different service levels (SL). It is noted that the safety stock
increases with the increasing of the required services level. Whenever the
safety stock is calculated to be less than one the recorded value is to be
rounded up to one. The average lead time in period (0.761183261) and
standard deviation (0.11376513) is substituted in equation (6-4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-7: ROP and SS for Spare Parts Used in Major Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.4 Application of the Integrated Approach with Restricted Lead Time Policy

In this section, the current inventory policy (maximum (MAX) and minimum (MIN) policy) is demonstrated for some of the spare parts and compared to the integrated approach with the company's conditions under the restricted receiving time. The expected number of orders placed ($N$) and the expected time between orders ($T$) are calculated using equation (6-5) and equation (6-6) respectively (Heizer and Rander 2014).

\[
N = \frac{\text{Annual Demand}}{\text{EOQ}} \tag{6-5}
\]

\[
T = \frac{\text{Number of working days}}{N} \tag{6-6}
\]

The number of working days is assumed to be 365 days. Table (6-8) demonstrates the number of orders and the time between orders for the spare parts for both minor and major services. The annual demand of part (1) is 112 and EOQ = 30 resulting to ($N = 4$ and $T = 13$). The ROP and EOQ for part (2) are 56 and 21 respectively leading to $N = 3$ and $T = 17$. For parts (3, 4 and 5) the number of orders is calculated to be one and the time between orders is calculated to be 52 weeks. However, it is considered to be 40 weeks because the company receives spare parts in 40 weeks instead of 52 weeks.

Table 6-8: Number of Orders $N$ and Time between Orders $T$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$T$ (weeks)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.4.1 Part (1) Filter Element (Minor Service)

Table (6-9) shows the historical movement of part (1) and demonstrates the shortage occurs in week 90 in the second year which was (-8), despite the fact that the annual average of filters in the stock is higher in comparison with average annual inventory with service levels at 90%, 95% and 99%. That resulted from applying the integrated approach (see Table 6-10). This can be attributed to the number of maintenance that occurred in the second year, which is more than the first year and because of the prolonged of the lead time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Receive</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Balance O/H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory average</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inventory average</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-10) illustrates a significant reduction in the inventory level and a smoother movement of the spare parts. Reordering point for part (1) is calculated and added to the safety stock quantity which resulted differently at different service level.
A small shortage is predicted to occur a few times towards the end of the second year at 90% SL, which can be avoided by increasing the annual demand or by increasing the order for the second year. No shortage in parts is predicted to occur at service levels 95% and 99.99%, which can be the solution as well to avoiding the shortage with SL 90%.

Table 6-10: Movement of Part 1 under Different Service Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Receive</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>On Hand</th>
<th>On Hand</th>
<th>On Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average inventory first year</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average inventory second year</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4.2 Part (2) Cleaning Agent (Minor Service)

Table (6-11) demonstrates the movement of part (2) under the current policy (MAX/MIN) and at week 81, the maintenance faced shortage of spare parts leading to interrupting the operations of maintenance. The average inventory level of part (2) for the first year is 39.14 and 36.28 for the second year.
Table 6-11: Part (2) Movement under the Current MAX/MIN Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Receive</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Balance on hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (6-5) captures the movement of part (2) under the current policy (MIN/MAX). It is obvious that the level of inventory of the part is erratic and result in 6 parts shortages in week 81.

Table (6-12) demonstrates the three service levels 90%, 95% and 99.99% for part (2). No shortages are recorded in inventory and the average inventory level at SL 90% and 95 % is less than the average inventory level of the current MIN/MAX policy.
Table 6-12: Part (2) Inventory Movement under Different Service Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>N = 3, T = 17 Weeks</th>
<th>SL 90% SS=8</th>
<th>SL 95% SS=11</th>
<th>SL 99.99% SS = 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average first Year</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Inventory second year</td>
<td>27.45</td>
<td>29.45</td>
<td>44.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4.3 Part (3) Plug igniter (Major Service)

Table (6-13) presents the movement of part (3). No shortages in part (3) were recorded under the current MAX/MIN policy. The average of inventory level is 8 and 10 parts respectively for two years.

Table 6-13: Part (3) Movement under Current MAX/MIN Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Balance on hold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average first year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average second year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-14) shows the inventory level of part (3) at SL 90%, 95% and 99.99%. The average annual inventory were decrease when applying the
proposed integrated approach in comparison to the movement of the part under MAX/MIN policy.

Table 6-14: Part (3) Movement under Different Service Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Receive</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>On hand</th>
<th>On hand</th>
<th>On hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average first year</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average second year</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average third year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4.4 Part (4) Pump Fuel (Major Service)

Table (6-15) demonstrates the movement of part (4) under MIN/MAX policy and it shows no shortages in inventory of part (4) for three years.

Table 6-15: Part (4) Movement under Current MAX/MIN Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Balance on Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average first year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average second year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average third year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table (6-16) presents the inventory movement of part (4) under the proposed integrated approach and it shows that average inventory with SL 90% and 95% is less than the average of inventory in the case of MAX/MIN policy.

Table 6-16: Part (4) Movement under Different Service Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>weeks</th>
<th>order</th>
<th>receive</th>
<th>issue</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>SL90% SS=1</th>
<th>SL 95% SS=1</th>
<th>SL 99.99%, SS = 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average first year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average second year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average third year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3.4.5 Part (5) Element Filter Lubol (Major Service)

Figure (6-6) demonstrates the inventory level for part (5) over three years and its erratic movement and shortage of parts clearly happening and will delay performing the maintenance on time.

Figure 6-6: Inventory Level of Part (5) (MIN/MAX Policy)
Table (6-17) shows the movement of part (5) under the policy selected by the company, which is the MAX/MIN policy. Shortage was recorded for this part during week (108).

**Table 6-17: Part (5) Movement under Current MAX/MIN Policy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>balance on hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average inventory first year 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average inventory second year 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average inventory third year 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6-18) demonstrates the application of the integrated approach under three service levels (90%, 95% and 99.99%) for three years with no shortages occur for the maintenance demand.

**Table 6-18: Movement of Part (5) Under Different Service Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SL90% SS=1</th>
<th>SL95% SS=1</th>
<th>SL 99.99% SS = 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weeks</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Receive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average first year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average second year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average third year</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure (6-7) demonstrates the inventory level of part (5) and its movement for three years. No shortage in demand is predicted and generally, the movement of the part is not erratic.

![Inventory Level of Part (5) with SL (90%, 95% and 99.99%)](image)

**Figure 6-7: Inventory Level of Part (5) with SL (90%, 95% and 99.99%)**

### 6.3.5 Comparison of inventory Level and Movement of Part (1) Under Different Inventory Policies

In this section, a comparison for part (1) movement is conducted to understand the impact of the integrated approach. The comparison is set to compare between the movement of part (1) under three situations:-

- MAX/MIN policy which is the current inventory policy for the case study.
- The application of the integrated approach with the variable lead time.
- The application of the integrated approach in an optimum condition.
Figure (6-8) presents the movement of part (1) within two years under MAX/MIN inventory policy. The inventory department faced a difficulty of supplying the maintenance demand and shortages occurred towards the end of the second year.

![Figure 6-8: Part (1) Movement under MAX/MIN Policy](image)

Figure (6-9) shows the movement of the part (1) for eight years under the proposed integrated inventory policy with conditions of restricted lead time.

It is obvious that the inventory level drops down gradually as the service levels reduced from 99.9% to 90%. Part (1) experiences shortage in supplying the maintenance's demand on week 77 under SL 90%, whereas the first shortage of part (1) occurs at week 143 with SL 95%. Under the service level 99.99, the supply of part (1) required for maintenance interval is provided without shortage until week 221. Because of advised prolonged lead time by the company the part movement deceases with the time and the recovery of the inventory level seems to be impossible.
Figure 6-9: Movement of Spare Part (1) with Different SL for 8 Years

In comparison with figure (6-3) which demonstrates the expected movement of part (1) under the integrated policy with the lead time is equal to the time between maintenance intervals for almost 17 years. It illustrates a smooth movement avoiding any erratic movement or shortages in time of planned maintenance.

Figure (6-10) shows the annual average inventory of part (1) for 17 years. The calculations show that the highest annual average occurs at year 13 with 49.4 and the least average occurs at year 11 with 32.1 parts. In contrast, the current inventory policy MIN/MAX showed that the average inventory for part (1) was 116.9 and 78.5 for two years respectively. Whereas the results of applying the integrated model on the selected company (case study) which required variable lead time showed improvement in comparison with MIN/MAX policy. However, because of the lengthy of the lead time suggested by the company,
shortages would occur as shown for some parts over the years especially with low service level (90%). The author would advise the company to avoid the shortage of the parts by follow these steps:-

- Increase service level in order to insure no shortage occurs.
- Select the suitable order quantity which meet the expected inventory level that covers the services in the future.

![Graph showing annual average inventory level of part (1)](image)

**Figure 6-10: The Annual Average Inventory Level of Part (1)**

### 6.3.6 Comparison of the Cost Effectiveness of Inventory Policies

To calculate the effectiveness of the proposed integrated model, the average of annual balance on hand inventory of MAX/MIN policy is compared against the proposed approach with its different service levels.

Table (6-19) demonstrates the used spare parts for two years and their costs. The parts, item cost, average balance on hand and the total cost of each of the spare parts is provided for two years under the MAX/MIN policy.
Table 6-19: Total Parts Cost for Year 1 and 2 under MAX/MIN Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part NO</th>
<th>Item cost ($)</th>
<th>average balance on hand</th>
<th>Total cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>30910.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>39.14</td>
<td>925.2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>812.18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6497.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15217.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>470.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3292.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall total parts cost in year 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part NO</th>
<th>Item cost ($)</th>
<th>average balance on hand</th>
<th>Total cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>23136.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>36.28</td>
<td>857.6592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>812.18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8121.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15217.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>470.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3762.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Overall total parts cost in year 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (6-11) presents the average cost of the spare parts under the MIN/MAX policy for year one ($56843.7876) and Year two ($51096.9592). It is notable that, the shortages in parts mostly occurred within the second year under the MIN/MAX inventory policy, which can be attributed to the lengthy of the lead time to deliver once the request of spare part is established.
Most of the shortages occurred for the spare parts that involved in the minor service. The reason of the shortages is attributed to the frequency of carrying the minor services within the leap of one receiving order. For instance, the frequency of the preventive maintenance activities is assumed to be conducted every 9 weeks following the manufacturer recommendations. In the first year the spare parts were issued 5 times and in the second year the spare parts were issued 6 times which drops the overall inventory cost.

Table (6-20) illustrates the average balance on hand and the total cost of parts with the service levels 90%, 95% and 99.99% respectively. It is noticeable that the higher the service level the higher the total cost of spare parts which can be attributed to the increase of safety stock leading to the increase of the balance on hand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part No</th>
<th>Item cost ($)</th>
<th>average balance on hand</th>
<th>First year</th>
<th>Second year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SL90%</td>
<td>SL95%</td>
<td>SL99.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>264.42</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3</td>
<td>812.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 4</td>
<td>2173.97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 5</td>
<td>470.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total parts cost</td>
<td>$38381.26</td>
<td>$39956.59</td>
<td>$52170.68</td>
<td>$18817.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (6-12) demonstrates the total cost of the inventory for year (1) and year (2) for the spare parts at different service level 90%, 95% and 99.99%.

The difference in the total cost (for year 1 and year 2) within the same service
level is attributed to the lengthy of the lead time and the frequency of issuing the spare parts. The balance on hand is assumed to start at the reordering point and because of the lengthy lead time, the level of inventory does not recover back to the original level.

![Bar chart showing parts cost for two years with SL (90%, 95% and 99.99%).](image)

**Figure 6-12: Parts Cost for Two Years with SL (90%, 95% and 99.99%)**

In comparison between the average cost of the MIN/MAX policy and the proposed integrated approach, it is obvious that the highest cost of parts is associated with the MAX/MIN current policy. Whereas, the highest inventory cost recorded from applying the proposed approach occurs at 99.99% service level followed by 95% service level and the least inventory cost occurs at 95% this due to the level of safety stock required for each service level.
6.4 Conclusion

The availability of spare parts is imperative for the success of sustainable maintenance operations. The risk of shortages in supplying the maintenance department with the required spare parts on time could result in costly operation stoppages while overstocking can lead to additional inventory's costs. This chapter presented the proposed integrated approach between the optimised maintenance intervals and the inventory management of spare parts to minimise total inventory cost and provided answers to two most important questions, which are "How much to order?" and "When to order?".

The high cost of spare parts within the petroleum industry and the need for rapid responses due to high downtime costs and the risk of stock obsolescence drive the need to address this particular matter. The outputs of the model of optimising the maintenance interval processed to the inventory management for the spare parts to be ordered ensuring sufficient stock for regular maintenance to be performed. The calculated optimum maintenance intervals were used as a reference point to optimise the spare parts' EOQ and ROP. The applications of the proposed integrated approach achieve promising results that can be summarised as follows:-

- Reducing the holding cost of the spare parts.
- Smoothening the reordering cycle while guaranteeing the availability of spare parts at the required time needed by the maintenance department.
- Avoiding erratic movement of the spare parts.
• Providing the possibility of predictability of future movement of spare parts and allowing the treatment of any shortage expected by altering either the safety stock or the EOQ.

• Decreasing the overall cost of inventory by decreasing the total annual average of the spare parts.
Chapter Seven
Risk Assessment Model for the Petroleum Equipment

This chapter covers the risk assessment for equipment within the petroleum industry. A mathematical model is proposed to estimate the likelihood of risk (LOR) and advice the optimum time of inspection for machines and their parts within the industry. The impact of the consequences of the risk is evaluated for equipment within the petroleum industry and modified equations are proposed for system performance and financial loss. Applications are provided to demonstrate the validity of the proposed equations.
7.1 Introduction

As discussed in Chapter Five, the purpose of "operational maintenance level" is to plan and identify the most optimum maintenance intervals from the perspective of reliability, availability and cost reduction. However, unpredictability or uncertainty of the occurrence of the failure and its undesirable consequences demand more risk assessment and inspection for two main reasons:

1. To enhance the system's reliability in order to prevent the possibility of the occurrence of failure and eliminate the consequences of the risk by means of ensuring that the equipment would serve as attended or planned till the next maintenance interval.

2. To prioritise the job orders according to the overall risk evaluation.

In order to enhance the reliability of a system, inspection interval would be planned to ensure that the equipment's reliability would meet the expectation of the planned preventive maintenance. Inspection frequency is determined according to risk exposure, which can be used to avoid any unacceptable risk (Chang et al 2005).

To estimate the probability of the risk for equipment and to provide guidelines for the inspectors, a mathematical equation is developed. Four main areas are considered to evaluate the consequences of the risk which are "performance, financial, human and ecology loss". The proposed risk assessment model is applied on two case studies for the purpose of validation and the results show a promising improvement in estimating the
The rest of the chapter is organized mainly as:-

- Architecture of the proposed model
- The likelihood of risk and an explanation of derivation of the mathematical equation.
- Consequences of the failure and developed equations for evaluation of risk impact on the above mentioned four areas.
- Applications of the proposed model.

7.2 Architecture of the Proposed Model

In this chapter, incorporation of modified models and a newly developed equation is proposed in order to assess the risk. The proposed model is expected to enhance estimation of the risk and its consequences instead of the conventional method that considers the multiplication of the likelihood by consequences, which can be misleading. The proposed risk assessment model relies on the use of both qualitative and quantitative methods.

Figure (7-1) demonstrates the description of the proposed model of estimating the risk for equipment within the petroleum industry and the steps are illustrated as follows:-

7.2.1 Likelihood Assessment

In this step, an estimation of the probability of failure occurrence is performed by qualitative and quantitative means to build generic conception that consider the majority of the facilities within the petroleum industry.
7.2.1.1 Qualitative Assessment

Probabilistic failure analysis is conducted using the fault tree analysis (FTA). The use of FTA along with components' failure data and human reliability data, enables the determination of the frequency of occurrence of an accident. The top event is identified based on the detailed study of the
process, control arrangement, and behaviour of components of the unit/plant. A logical dependency between the causes leading to the top event (failure) is developed in this stage.

7.2.12 Quantitative Assessment: Likelihood of Risk (LOR)

Quantitative analysis is conducted to estimate the probability of the occurrence of the risk. In order to validate the proposed risk estimation model, a degree of acceptance of risk has to be set up against the estimated risk. The developed proposed mathematical model (Likelihood of Risk (LOR)) is based on the assumption that the risk depends exponentially on time $P$, where $P$ is the physical age of the equipment and $d$ is the design age of part/machine.

The assumption is that risk depends exponentially on time $P$:

$$Risk \propto P$$

Where;-

$P$ Physical age of equipment.

$$Risk(P) = F(\Delta P) G^P d$$  \hspace{1cm} 7-1

Where, G is a positive growth factor of the risk and the time required for risk to increase by one factor of G. $F(\Delta P)$ is the probability of the failure of the part/machine.

$$Risk (P + d) = F(\Delta P) G^{P+d} d$$  \hspace{1cm} 7-2

Where:-

d The designed life of equipment or parts.

$$Risk (P + d) = F(\Delta P) G^P d^d$$  \hspace{1cm} 7-3
Therefore, if \( d=0 \) and \( G>1 \) then LOR (P) has exponential growth. Thus formula (7-3) can be written mathematically as:

\[
\text{LOR} = F(\Delta P) e^{\frac{p}{\Delta t}}
\]

Where:

- LOR: likelihood of risk, \( F_{\Delta P} \): the probability of failure.

Bertolini et al (2009) proposed classification of the occurrence degree of the failure to be compared to the outcomes of probability of the failure \( F_{\Delta t} \) as shown in table (7-1). He relies on the Cumulative Weibull distribution model to generate \( F_{\Delta t} \). However, in this work, the same classification is applied but will be allocated to LOR instead of using the \( F_{\Delta t} \). For example, comparing the likelihood of the risk between two equipment at a particular point in time \((P)\) would have to follow these steps:

1. Calculating the likelihood of risk (LOR)
2. Comparing the outcomes of LOR for the equipment with the classification shown in table (7-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Key Word</th>
<th>Absolute value of ( F_{\Delta t}/\text{LOR} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Very Unlikely</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Likely</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.2 Consequences assessment

The objective of this phase is to estimate the consequences of failure and its contribution to the system to prioritize equipment and their components on the basis of their undesirable contribution to the system. Consequence analysis involves assessment of likely consequences in the case that a failure scenario does materialize. Khan and Haddara (2003) identified four impacted
areas where consequences of the failure have to be evaluated which are:

- System performance loss ($A$), financial loss ($B$), human health loss ($C$) and environmental loss ($D$). Mathematical presentation and qualitative evaluation was provided by Khan and Haddara (2003) to calculate the damages in terms of failure and accordingly the prioritization of the equipment maintenance is advised. Equation (7-5) presents the combined loss in order to find the overall consequences of the risk (Khan and Haddara, 2003).

\[ Consequences = \{0.25 A^2 + 0.25 B^2 + 0.25 C^2 + 0.25 D^2\}^{0.5} \] 7-5

The shortcoming of applying this equation is that it may result in the same value with different scenarios. For example, with factor $A = 100$ and factor $B = 50$ would result into the same value when factor $A = 50$ and factor $B = 100$ if the other factors were neglected. The recommendations provided by the author in this case is to provide chance for the company practitioners to set the weight for each loss consequence that suit their companies environment, therefore, equation 7-5 can be modified to a more generic format as follows:

\[ Consequences = \{W_a A^2 + W_b B^2 + W_c C^2 + W_d D^2\}^{0.5} \] 7-6

Where:-

- $W_a$ The weight of performance loss.
- $W_b$ The weight of financial loss.
- $W_c$ The weight of human health loss.
- $W_d$ The weight of environment loss.

The maintenance team has to prioritize the importance of the loss factors while investigating the four loss factors and for instance could first prioritize human health followed by environmental loss, financial loss and system performance and reflect that on the weights accordingly.
7.2.2.1 System Performance Loss (A)

Factor (A) represents the system performance loss due to the equipment failure. Equation (7-7) is developed to represents the system performance loss and it shows two possible scenarios:

1. If the equipment has a stand-by redundancy then this factor is considered as zero.

2. If the equipment is a vital to the system then the proposed quantification scheme by Khan and Haddara (2003) is considered to take the measures of the loss as shown in table (7-2).

\[
A = \begin{cases} 
\text{Function performance} & \text{Table (7 - 2)} \\
0 & \text{otherwise} 
\end{cases} 
\]

### Table 7-2: Performance Function (Khan and Haddara 2003)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Function (operation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I     | • Very important for system operation  
\hspace{1cm} • Failure would cause system to stop functioning | 8-10 |
| II    | • Important for good operation  
\hspace{1cm} • Failure would cause impaired performance and adverse consequences | 6-8 |
| III   | • Required for good operation  
\hspace{1cm} • Failure may affect the performance and may lead to subsequent failure of the system | 4-6 |
| IV    | • Optional for good performance  
\hspace{1cm} • Failure may not affect the performance immediately but prolonged failure may cause system to fail | 2-4 |
| V     | • Optional for operation  
\hspace{1cm} • Failure may not affect the system's performance | 0-2 |

7.2.2.2 Financial Loss

Loss factor (B) accounts for the damages to the property or/and equipment and major costs are involved as a consequence of the failure. Financial loss (B) is calculated by the developed equation (7-8).
\[ B = \frac{\left( B_p + C_{mc} \right) - P_{mc}}{P_{mc}} \]

Where:

\( B_p \) Denotes financial loss of the property and the facilities in terms of explosion or fire.

\( C_{mc} \) Corrective maintenance cost.

\( P_{mc} \) Preventive maintenance cost.

Khan and Haddara (2003) proposed equation (7-9) to calculate the \( B_p \) as follows:

\[ B_p = \frac{(AR) \times (AD)}{UFL} \]

Where:

\( AR \) Area under the damage radius (m²)

\( AD \) Asset density in the vicinity of the event (up until 500 m radius) ($/m²)

\( UFL \) The level of an unacceptable financial loss which assumed by Khan and Haddara (2003) as 1000.

\( C_{mc} \) Costs incurred due to the failure and calculated by the developed equation (7-10) which has been extensively demonstrated in Chapter Five:

\[ C_{mc} = \left\{ \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{rp_{ni}} \times p_{rp_{ni}} \right) + \left( t_{ti} + t_{su} \right) \times \frac{x}{\pi} + (V \times C_{pd}) + L_{c} + C_{wd} + C_{sd} + \right\} \]

\[ \left\{ \frac{(t_{ti} + t_{su})}{\pi} \times C_{pd} \right\} + \left( C_{MT} - D_{FT} \right) \times C_{h} \times \left( X_{1} \times t_{tc} \times S_{mh} \right) + \left( t_{ti} + t_{su} \right) \times S_{oh} \times \]

\[ X_{2} \]
$C_{sp}$ Cost of spare parts ($\).$

$P_{rp}$ Probability of replacement ($\%$).

$t_{ti}$ Production time loss excluding machine setup time (hrs).

$t_{su}$ Machine set up time (hrs).

$\alpha$ Department's income due to one barrel ($\$\).$

$\pi$ Production cycle time (hrs).

$V$ Number of damaged production by barrel.

$C_{pd}$ Value of damaged production ($\$\).$

$Lc$ Legal fines in case of environmental damages ($\$\).$

$C_{wd}$ Cost of cleaning non-hazardous and hazardous materials ($\$\).$

$C_{sd}$ Cost of damaged parts due to the failure of another part ($\$\).$

$C_{MT}$ Time required complete corrective actions (hrs).

$D_{FT}$ Due fine time (hrs).

$Ch$ Cost of delay charges per unit ($\$\).$

$t_{tc}$ Time spent by the maintenance personnel to repair failure (hrs).

$X_1$ Number of maintenance personnel.

$S_{mh}$ Maintenance hourly rate ($\$\).$

$S_{oh}$ Operator's hourly rate ($\$\).
$X_2$  Number of operational personnel.

$P_{mc}$ Indicates the preventive maintenance cost that is required to prevent the failure and calculated by the developed equation (7-11) which has been extensively demonstrated in Chapter Five

\[
P_{mc} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_{sp_i} \times Prp_i \right) + \left( X_1 \times S_{mh} \times t_{ip} \right) + C_{wp} + C_{oh} \]

Where:-

$c_{sp}$ Cost of spare parts ($).

$Prp$ Possibility of replacing the part (%).

$X_1$ Number of maintenance personnel.

$S_{mh}$ Maintenance personnel hourly rate ($/h)$.

$t_{ip}$ Time spent by maintenance personnel carrying out PM (hrs).

$C_{wp}$ Waste disposable cleaning cost ($).

$C_{oh}$ Cost of out-house maintenance ($).

7.2.2.3 Human Health Loss

The consequences of failure on human health loss or factor $(C)$ are estimated for each accident by the use of equation (7-12).

\[
C = (AR) \times (PDI)/UFR \]

Where: -

$AR$ Area under the damage radius ($m^2$).

$UFR$ Unacceptable fatality rate "suggested value $10^{-3}$ (person) by Khan and Haddara (2003).
Population density in the vicinity of the event (Persons/m²)

\[ PDI = PD1 \times PDF1 \]  

Where:-

- **PD1**: Number of people within the radius of impacted area.
- **PDF1**: Population distribution factor that reflects the heterogeneity of the population distribution within the impacted area. Hirst and Carter (2000) assigned two values for this factor:
  - The factor is substituted as 1 if the population is uniformly distributed within 500m radius; 0.2 if the population is localized away from the point of accident.

### 7.2.2.4 Environment Loss

The impact of failure on ecology (factor \( D \)) can be estimated by the use of the equation (7-14).

\[ D = (AR) \times (IM)/UDA \]  

Where:-

- **UDA**: Unacceptable damaging (m²). This value of this parameter may change from one case to another due to the estimated damaged area which can be assumed following three possible methods
  1. Historical data from the equipment or similar equipment.
- **IM**: Impact factor and if the damage radius is greater than the distance between an accident and the location of the ecosystem. This parameter can be quantified using figure (7-2) (Khan and Haddara 2003).
7.3 Applications of the Proposed Risk Assessment Method

In this section, application of the proposed risk estimation is applied on two parts (Mixer 100 and Valve 101) of high pressure separator (Khan and Haddara 2004). The assumption made for this application is the result of the qualitative assessment for the likelihood of the risk is equal and therefore is not discussed in this application.

Table (7-3) demonstrates the failure frequency of the selected parts. Mixer 101 averages mean time between failure (MTBF) is 6667 hrs (9.26 months) and Valve 101 (8.90 months). The outcome of the applied proposed LOR and its recommendations for the inspection intervals will be compared to the average MTBF of the parts in order to estimate the validity of the proposed model in this aspect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Unit Name</th>
<th>Failure Frequency(per Hour)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mixer 100</td>
<td>6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Valve 102</td>
<td>6410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.1 Application (1): Mixer 100

7.3.1.1 LOR for Mixer 100

Table (7-4) demonstrates the implementation of the developed mathematical equation to quantify the likelihood of risk (LOR) by considering the growth factor (G) factor and the physical life of assets. Mixer 100 physical life is considered to be (9 months).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.1189</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>0.5689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.356</td>
<td>0.1278</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.689</td>
<td>0.5911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td>0.6138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.378</td>
<td>0.1466</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td>0.6371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.1566</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.722</td>
<td>0.6608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.1670</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.6851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>0.1778</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.744</td>
<td>0.7098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.0064</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td>0.1890</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.7351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>0.0082</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.2006</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>0.7609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.0102</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.2126</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.7872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.2251</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.8140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.0150</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.2379</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.8414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.0177</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.2512</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.8692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.0208</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.2650</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.8976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.0241</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.2792</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.9265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.0277</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.511</td>
<td>0.2938</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>0.9560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.0316</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.3088</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.856</td>
<td>0.9860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>0.0357</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>0.3243</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td>1.0165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.544</td>
<td>0.3403</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>1.0475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>0.0449</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.3568</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>1.0791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td>0.0500</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>0.3736</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>1.1111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.578</td>
<td>0.3910</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>1.1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.0611</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>0.4088</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1.1769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.0671</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.600</td>
<td>0.4272</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>1.2106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td>0.0735</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>0.4459</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>1.2448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.289</td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.4652</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.2796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>0.0872</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>0.4850</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>1.3149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.0946</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.5052</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>1.3507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.1023</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.5259</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.989</td>
<td>1.3871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.1104</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.5472</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.4240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure (7-3) shows the behaviour of the probability of failure and LOR against the part's life ratio. It demonstrates that the LOR crosses the life ratio of the part at about 6.9 months (4968hrs) and reaches 100% at 7.8 months (5616hrs).

The mean time between failures for Mixer 100 is 9.3 months. Likelihood of risk crosses the growth factor at (4968hrs) and reached 100% at (5616hrs). The advised interval inspection time is accordingly suggested to take place between 6.9 months and 7.8 months to ensure the part's health state can reach the next scheduled maintenance time(figure 7-4). In comparison with the reliance on the probability of the failure, LOR proposed mathematical
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equations shows better translation of understanding and estimating the inspection interval time. In terms of overlapping inspection jobs, the priority of the inspection is decided on the highest value of the consequences damages.

![Figure 7-4: Optimum Inspection Interval for Mixer 100](image)

7.3.1.2 Consequences of the Failure for the Mixer 100

Once the assessment of the likelihood of the risk is conducted the maintenance team should move to the estimation of the consequences of the failure.

Performance loss: - In this case, the assumption is that the failure of the mixer 100 would lead to the stoppage of the separator unit and therefore the performance loss would be classified as the highest (10).
Financial loss: Equation (7-8) is applied to estimate the financial loss. Due to the fact that the failure of the equipment has got no financial impact in terms of fire and explosion leading to $B_p$ to be considered having zero value.

For the estimation of the incurred costs for the failure, equation (7-10) is applied and the related assumed cost in terms of the failure is listed in table (7-5). Few assumptions are presumed in order to apply equation (7-10) and (7-11):

- The equipment has no alternative (stand-by equipment).
- Costs are calculated in US dollar.
- The equipment process 300 barrels a day.

| Table 7-5: Related maintenance Costs (Mixer 100) |
|---|---|---|
| Cost | Value | Unit |
| $C_{sp}$ | 500 | $|
| $PrP_n$ | 100 | % |
| $C_{wd}$ | 100 | $|
| $Soh$ | 10 | $/h |
| $Smh$ | 10 | $/h |
| $x_1$ | 5 | |
| $x_2$ | 5 | |
| $t_{cc}$ | 5 | hrs |
| $t_{ti}$ | 7 | hrs |
| $t_{su}$ | 1 | hrs |
| $a$ | 50 | $ |
| $\tau$ | $300/24=0.08$ | $/h$ |

Applying equation (7-10) of all expected and assumed costs in terms of corrective maintenance, we obtain the cost that may occur:

\[
C_{mc} = \{(500 \times 100) + (5 + 1) \times \left( \frac{50}{0.08} \right) + 100 + \left( \frac{5 + 1}{0.08} \right) + (5 \times 5 \times 10) + (5 + 1 \times 5 \times 10) \}
\]

\[
= 500 + 3750 + 100 + 75 + 250 + 300
\]

\[
C_{mc} = $4975
\]
Applying equation (7-11) we can calculate the preventive maintenance cost with the assumption that the production time loss is less (8h) in the case of corrective action. \( C_{wd} \) and \( C_{oh} \) are assumed to be zero:

\[
P_{mc} = (500 \times \%100) + (5 \times 10 \times 8)
\]

\[
P_{mc} = $900
\]

Therefore, substituting the values of \( C_{mc} \) and \( P_{mc} \) into equation (7-8)

\[
B = \frac{4975 - 900}{900} = 4.53
\]

The failure of the part has no environmental or human loss impact and therefore, substitute the determined values for the performance loss and the financial loss in equation (7-6) with the assumption that the weight given by the maintenance to prioritize the loss factors is equal (0.25):

\[
Consequence = \{(0.25 \times 10^2) + (0.25 \times 4.53^2)\}^{0.5}
\]

\[
Consequence = 5.49
\]

7.3.2 Application (2): Valve 102

The failure frequency for the Valve 102 is 6410/hours and this value is converted into months (8.902 months). The designed life for Valve 102 is assumed as 9 months.

Table (7-6) demonstrates the time (T) in months, the growth factor (G) which is the result of dividing the increasing time by the designed age (9 months) and LOR, which approaches 100% of risk at just before 7.59 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>LOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.3444</td>
<td>0.1282</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.6778</td>
<td>0.6075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0222</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.3556</td>
<td>0.1377</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.6889</td>
<td>0.6310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.0333</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.3667</td>
<td>0.1476</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.7000</td>
<td>0.6550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.3778</td>
<td>0.1580</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.7111</td>
<td>0.6795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.0556</td>
<td>0.0026</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.3889</td>
<td>0.1687</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.7222</td>
<td>0.7045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0667</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.4000</td>
<td>0.1799</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>0.7333</td>
<td>0.7301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0778</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.4111</td>
<td>0.1914</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.7444</td>
<td>0.7561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.0889</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.4222</td>
<td>0.2034</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>0.7556</td>
<td>0.7827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>0.0088</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.4333</td>
<td>0.2159</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.7667</td>
<td>0.8098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1111</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4444</td>
<td>0.2287</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.7778</td>
<td>0.8374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.1222</td>
<td>0.0135</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.4556</td>
<td>0.2411</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.7889</td>
<td>0.8656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.1333</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.4667</td>
<td>0.2558</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>0.8000</td>
<td>0.8943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.1444</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.4778</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.8111</td>
<td>0.9235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1556</td>
<td>0.0225</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.4889</td>
<td>0.2847</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.8222</td>
<td>0.9532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1667</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5000</td>
<td>0.2998</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.8333</td>
<td>0.9835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.1778</td>
<td>0.0299</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>0.5111</td>
<td>0.3154</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>0.8444</td>
<td>1.0142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1889</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.5222</td>
<td>0.3315</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.8556</td>
<td>1.0455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.2000</td>
<td>0.0386</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.5333</td>
<td>0.3481</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>0.8667</td>
<td>1.0774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2111</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.5444</td>
<td>0.3651</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.8778</td>
<td>1.1097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2222</td>
<td>0.0485</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5556</td>
<td>0.3826</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.8889</td>
<td>1.1426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.2333</td>
<td>0.0540</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.5667</td>
<td>0.4005</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.9000</td>
<td>1.1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.2444</td>
<td>0.0598</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0.5778</td>
<td>0.4190</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.9111</td>
<td>1.2100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.2556</td>
<td>0.0660</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0.5889</td>
<td>0.4380</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.9222</td>
<td>1.2445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2667</td>
<td>0.0725</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>0.4574</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>0.9333</td>
<td>1.2795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2778</td>
<td>0.0793</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>0.6111</td>
<td>0.4773</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.9444</td>
<td>1.3150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.2889</td>
<td>0.0865</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0.6222</td>
<td>0.4978</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.9556</td>
<td>1.3510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.3000</td>
<td>0.0941</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.6333</td>
<td>0.5187</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.9667</td>
<td>1.3876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.3111</td>
<td>0.1021</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.6444</td>
<td>0.5402</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.9778</td>
<td>1.4247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.3222</td>
<td>0.1104</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.6556</td>
<td>0.5621</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>0.9889</td>
<td>1.4623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3333</td>
<td>0.1191</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6667</td>
<td>0.5846</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>1.5004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure (7-5) demonstrates the comparison between the behaviour of the cumulative distribution function ($F_At$) and likelihood of risk (LOR). The capture of the figure is taken until the assumed physical life time ends.

The consideration of the physical life of parts/equipment through the application of LOR assists in the prioritization of planning the inspection intervals maintenance intervention. The growth factor ($G$) crosses the LOR at almost 6.6 month (4752hrs) which is suggested the time of inspection until the time where LOR =100% at 7.59 months (5465hrs). In comparison with the MTBF of valve 102 (6410hrs) 8.90 months, the suggested time seems to leave enough time before the recorded average of MTBF. Figure (7-6) demonstrates the suggested inspection interval for valve 102. The designed life of part/equipment is a main parameter for the outcomes of LOR. In case
of the two parts having the same value of probability of failure, the part with shorter designed life will be resulting in higher value of LOR, which leads to prioritizing it for inspection.

![Graph showing optimum inspection interval for Valve 102](image)

**Figure 7-6: Optimum Inspection Interval for Valve 102**

### 7.3.2.1 Consequences of the Failure for Valve 102

The consequences of the risk on the system performance loss are considered to be at the highest given the function of the valve and therefore are substituted as 10. Equation (7-8) is applied to calculate the financial loss under the assumption that the failure of the valve would cause explosion. The area under the damage (AR) is estimated 40 m² and the estimated assets density is 10000$/m²

\[ B_p = \frac{(40 \times 10000)}{1000} = \$400 \]
The corrective maintenance cost ($C_{mc}$) and preventive maintenance cost $P_{mc}$ that occurs due to the failure of valve 102 are assumed to be equal to the $C_{mc}$ and $P_{mc}$ that was calculated for mixer 100 which was $C_{mc} = $4975 and $P_{mc} = $900. Thus, the financial loss is computed as followed (equation 7-8)

\[
B = \frac{(400 + 4975) - 900}{900}
\]

\[
B = 4.97
\]

The human health loss factor is calculated by applying equation (7-12) and (7-13). The values of AR and UFR are (40 m$^2$) and (10$^{-3}$ person) respectively. The population distribution factor PDF1 is substituted as (1) on the assumption that the population is localised within less than 500m and the number of people within that area is 10 persons. Thus:-

\[
PDI = 10 \times 1 = 10 \text{ persons/m}^2.
\]

Resulting into the human health loss (C).

\[
C = (40 \times 10)/10^{-3} = 400000
\]

Equation (7-14) is applied to calculate the environmental loss (D), with AR 40 m$^2$ and from figure (7-2) IM is obtained (0.99). Unacceptable damaging level (UDA) is assumed to be 2m$^2$ as the closest next equipment is placed close by. Thus:-

\[
D = (40 \times 0.99)/2 = 19.8
\]

The consequences damages are estimated by adding up the entire applied factors, using equation (7-6)
\[
\text{Consequence} = \{(0.25 \times 10^2) + (0.25 \times 4.97^2) + (0.25 \times 40000^2)
+ (0.25 \times 19.8^2)\}^{0.5} = 200,000
\]

If we assume that the consequences of the failure for both parts (Mixer 100 and Valve 102) were as resulted from, the above calculation (5.49 and 200,000 respectively then Valve 102 would be prioritized for maintenance action over Mixer 100. The weight of the loss factors would play a principal role in prioritizing the importance of the loss factors which would lead to different scenarios. For instance, for the Mixer 100 if the performance loss factor was weighted lower than the financial loss because of having stand by system, it would mean that the performance of the system would decrease but would not completely stopping the production.

7.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, the estimation of risk has been discussed and used to assess equipment health within the petroleum industry. The proposed model seek to assist into three main points

- Estimation of risk likelihood
- Optimisation of the inspection scheduling
- Evaluation of the consequences of risk into four areas

The proposed mathematical model for calculating Likelihood of Risk (LOR) to estimate the probability of risk has shown better reflection of the reality of the equipment risk’s probability than the use of cumulative failure distribution. LOR and its consideration of the parameters of designed life and physical life (growth factor) help the inspector to prioritize the inspection intervals optimally. In the situation that both parts/equipment have the same failure
distribution, the consequences would be impacted and different design life would play a decisive imperative role by prioritizing the shorter designed life component for inspection.

The application of LOR to identify the optimum inspection interval to determine whether the component will serve to the next maintenance interval or not show a promising results. In the two applications, the suggested intervals were identified with enough time before the MTBF by referencing to the cross of the growth factor to the time where LOR reached 100%.

The evaluation of the consequences for the four main loss areas: performance loss, financial loss, human loss and environment loss were considered in this work to estimate the consequences of the failure. The proposed consequences equation would allow more generalisation and accuracy of weighing the losses through the flexibility of the weight of the loss factors to avoid the shortages of having the same weight of loss with different scenarios as proposed by Khan and Haddara (2003). A modified equation was developed for the performance loss consequences that include the condition of having spare system to accurately simulate the performance loss of the production line.

The equation of the financial loss, which was originally proposed, by Khan and Haddara (2003), that considers the area of expected damage (AR) and the capacity of the equipment within that area (AD) has been further developed to involve the balance between costs of corrective actions and preventive actions. The analysis of the major related costs assists in alerting
the maintenance team to have an estimation of the involved costs and the possibility of avoiding risk.

The contribution of this work to the assessment and estimation of the probability of risk and its consequences within the oil and gas industry can improve the responsiveness to the possibility of risk as well as providing better understanding of the impact of the risk on the major areas within this industry. Overall, this will particularly enhance the efficiency of maintenance by evaluating risk which is imperative to the nature of the petroleum industry.
Chapter Eight
Conclusions, Recommendations and Future Work

This chapter provides the concluding discussions of the research. It includes a discussion of research findings and their implications. The chapter summarises the contributions of the research to the knowledge in the field of maintenance in petroleum industry. Then the chapter ends with limitations and suggestions the future work.
8.1 Review of the Conducted Research

8.1.1 The Proposed Integrated Maintenance Framework

The main conception of the thesis is to optimise the major maintenance activities within the petroleum industry. To achieve this target, an integrated framework was created to comprehensively include major activities that maintenance function is involved in within the petroleum industry to guide this project. The framework investigates the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policy on the strategic level, considering all the relevant factors influencing this selection. As the major activities of maintenance within the petroleum industry are carried out on predefined intervals, the second level (maintenance operational level) is designed to carry on this activity. The outcome of the operational level is an optimum maintenance interval, which is then linked to the activity of risk assessment to obtain the inspection time and study the risk of the equipment. The outputs of the risk assessment are linked back to the operational level and the strategic level. The determination of the spare parts required by the maintenance is generated by the integrated approach between preventive maintenance, where most of the spare parts are consumed and spare parts control.

The proposed integrated framework demonstrates clear guidance to collaborate between the major activities of maintenance within the petroleum industry to optimise the maintenance actions in terms of reliability, risk, availability and cost-effectiveness.

8.1.2 Maintenance Strategic Level

On the strategic level, the problem of selecting the most suitable maintenance policy and assigning it to equipment or its parts was discussed.
The modelling of the problem using multi-criteria decision-making method (AHP) was applied and the structure of the criteria and sub-criteria that drives the decision-maker to select a particular maintenance policy and possible alternatives were identified. Both classic and fuzzy derivation methods were applied to understand the sensitivity of the methods in response to the changes in the preferences.

The proposed created model included the main criteria that concerns the selection of the maintenance policy, given the diversity of equipment and different required levels of reliability, availability and safety. The highlight of the proposed model is that it comprehensively embodies the most commonly used methodologies such as: reliability-centred maintenance and risk based maintenance by representing them in the form of criterion. In addition to that, the decomposition of the problem, which in this case is "selection of maintenance policy", provides the maintenance team with the a clear vision of reasoning of the selection of the alternatives, giving the advantage of quick response to changes in the circumstances that may lead to change in the maintenance policy. Since the model widely considers the major criteria, their sub-criteria and the possible maintenance policies, it can be applied to any section of the oil and gas production line from upstream to downstream.

8.1.3 Maintenance Operation Level

Chapter (5) addressed the difficulty of scheduling preventive maintenance activities (operational level) for equipment within the oil and gas industry and a developed mathematical model was introduced. The development of the model included the identification of the relevant maintenance costs that represent the nature cost of maintenance within the petroleum industry.
The equations of costs of corrective and preventive maintenance were modified in order to achieve this target. For instance, the probability of replacement parts, fees due to delay in delivering the product and cost of environmental cleaning and out-house maintenance cost were considered. The outcome of the mathematical model shows promising results in terms of reducing the cost of maintenance activities and without compromising on reliability of assets. The results were then compared with the historical data of failure to ensure that the advised maintenance interval does not suggest conducting maintenance after the occurrence of the failure and all obtained times were encouraging.

The operational availability of equipment was remarkably improved. The sensitivity analysis proved the importance of the developed costs to simulate the real scenario, by showing the impact of the change on the cost of PM and CM. The applications showed that higher the cost of PM over the cost of CM, the longer the mean time between maintenance will be. The logical explanation of the sensitivity analysis suggests that, if CM cost is less than PM cost, then the part should be run until failure occurs. This again proves the importance of considering the major costs of failure within the oil and gas industry, as any miscalculation would result in the selection of an incorrect maintenance interval.

In conclusion, the proposed model for identifying the selection of maintenance policy within the petroleum industry included all the major aspects and factors, leading to the appropriate selection of maintenance policies.
8.1.4 Proposed Integrated Approach between Preventive Maintenance and Spare Parts Inventory

Chapter (6) covered the proposed integrated approach between the optimised maintenance intervals and the inventory management of spare parts to minimise the total inventory cost without impacting the availability of spare parts. The approach relied on optimising the preventive maintenance interval to calculate the demands of spare parts and applying the data to control spare parts availability within the stock.

The application of the proposed approach were applied with different assumptions of lead time restrictions and compare to the existing inventory policy. The outputs of the integrated approach demonstrated promising results in terms of smooth reordering cycle, while guaranteeing the availability of spare parts at the time of maintenance, avoiding erratic movement of spare parts, providing the possibility of predictability of future movement of spare parts and allowing the treatment of any shortage expected by increasing either the safety stock or the EOQ and decreasing the overall cost of inventory by decreasing the total annual average of the spare parts.

In summary, the availability of spare parts is imperative for the success of sustainable maintenance operations. The risk of shortages in supplying the maintenance with the spare parts demand could result in costly operation stoppages, while overstocking can lead to additional inventory costs. The proposed approach improves the integration between PM and spare parts control to eliminate the risk of shortage supply and overstocking, creating a cost effective approach.
8.1.5 Proposed Risk Assessment Model for the Petroleum Equipment

Chapter (7) dealt with the activity of assessing the risk for equipment within the petroleum industry. A proposed mathematical model for calculating the likelihood of risk (LOR) was introduced to estimate the probability of the risk. The model involved the growth factor, which considers the life expectancy of parts. The applications of the model demonstrated good results leading to advices to prioritize the inspection intervals optimally.

The consequences of expected failure were estimated to influence four main areas - "performance loss, financial loss, human loss and environment loss". A modified equation was developed for assessing the consequences of performance loss to consider the condition of having standby system. Another equation was developed to consider the impact of risk, on the financial loss for the petroleum equipment to enhance the existing models.

The results of applying the proposed model demonstrated practical ways in the selection of the inspection intervals and evaluating the probability of occurrence of risk, as well as precise evaluation of the consequences of risk.

8.2 Research Contribution to knowledge

The research in this thesis has established a concrete framework through which maintenance activities within the petroleum industry can be optimised. The clear benefits and the uniqueness of the proposed models and integration approach is their practicality in real life. The key contributions to knowledge of this thesis can be summarised as follows:-

- An integrated maintenance framework to plan and control the major activities of maintenance and their interactions.
• A proposed model on the strategic level for the selection of the most appropriate maintenance policies considering the relevant factors within the petroleum industry and application of classic and fuzzy AHP.

• A cost optimisation mathematical model that balance between the cost of failure of a unit during operation against the cost of planned/preventive maintenance to schedule the preventive maintenance activities at the minimum possible cost without compromising on the utilisation of equipment's performance.

• An integrated approach between preventive maintenance and spare parts control to minimise the total inventory cost and ensure availability of spare parts when maintenance is performed.

• A risk assessment model for equipment within the petroleum industry and a new mathematical equation to assess the likelihood of risk and identifying the optimum inspection interval.

• A modified mathematical equation to evaluate consequences of risk which allow more generalisation and accuracy of weighing the losses.

8.3 Limitations

In this research, some limitation where distinguished while carrying out this work. The limitations can be summarised as followed:-

• The collection of the data of the preventive and corrective costs was quite difficult as the policy of the Oil and Gas Company was strict on revealing some relevant information such as the maintenance personnel's wages. However, an estimation of the average cost was provided.
• Another considered limitation is the scheduling of preventive maintenance and the inability of applying it on a production line that contains multi equipment because of the limited time to find a company to agree to that. This would have brought comprehensive details of the comparison between the outcomes of the mathematical model and the manufacturer recommendations.

8.4 Future Work

In the course of this research, even though there were many new developments in terms of framework, model, and integration approach, however, it was still possible to identify several areas for future research within the scope of this research. Few recommendations are suggested for future work as follows:-

• The applications of the maintenance interval is required to be applied on different equipment within the same production line to validate the grouping of the maintenance intervals.

• The integration between the condition based maintenance and spare parts control in terms of identifying an appropriate spare parts policy to control the stock quantity.

• Development of a software prototype to facilitate the application of the proposed models and integration approaches proposed in this research work.

• The conflict between the maintenance department and production department needs to be investigated in terms of for instance, responsibility of machine health.
• Conduct more applications of the proposed framework, models and integration approaches to further weight to the conclusions that were reached.

• An investigation into the risk assessment model within the petroleum industry that consider the existed local regulations and laws and their impact on the maintenance work.
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Appendices

This section provides other important parts of the research, and consists of four appendices. Appendix (A) shows the questionnaire that used for the verification of the proposed hierarchy structure for the selection of maintenance policy. Appendix (B) provides the questionnaire for the pairwise comparison. Appendix (C) demonstrates the total maintenance cost for the major services. Appendix (D) captures the weekly movement of part (1) under the proposed integrated approach.
Appendices

Appendix (A): A Questionnaire for Validating the Proposed Strategic

The hierarchy structure for the selection of the maintenance policy within the petroleum industry

As an important part of our research to develop a framework for strategic purpose of maintenance management in oil and gas industry to optimise the maintenance's activities by selecting the most appropriate maintenance policy(s) to equipment in the oil and gas field. We have created a model as shown in page (8) using analytic hierarchy process (AHP) and we have identified the criteria and sub-criteria for the main target "Maintenance optimum policy". As an experienced engineer/manager in this field we are seeking your assistance to help us completing the work successfully. Your contribution and participation is highly appreciated and we would like to thank you in advance for your time and answers.

Your information and answers will be kept confidential.

Please complete the following information and return it together with the completed questionnaire;

Name: (optional):-

Field of expertise:-

Years of experience:-

Tel No:-

E-mail:-
Criteria and sub criteria

Maintenance as multi criteria decision making has different criteria and sub criteria which affect and shape up the final selected strategy(s) of maintenance when using analytic hierarchy process (AHP). Different levels of criteria, sub-criteria and alternatives are modelled to comprehensively consider achieving the main target of maintenance management in the oil and gas fields. We have identified and modelled four levels of our hierarchy framework. Please consider each of these four levels and make your comments and suggestions in the boxes below each of the levels.

Level (1)

In the first level, we have identified four main criteria namely" safety, cost, availability, reliability" that have a direct impact on the main target of maintenance "Optimum maintenance policy".

Safety: - Safety level in the oil and gas industry is high, due to the possibility of the risk of the failure and its catastrophic consequences and damages.

Reliability: - reliability is another main parameter that comes into account when planning and managing asset's maintenance in the oil and gas industry. Reliability in general is function of time, so predefined reliable system is a system that works as expected within a given time.

Availability: -The degree to a piece of equipment works properly when it is required and computed as uptime divided by both uptime plus downtime. The criticality of availability of the asset is a main factor when planning maintenance
Appendices

Cost: - The costs incurred to keep an item in good condition and/or good working order is a main criterion that influences the maintenance management decision on the policy that will be associated with the machines.

Please state that if you agree on these four criteria being the most direct influence on the main target. If you have any comments on or addition factor that you would like to suggest in regard to level (1) please state that in following box.

Level (2)
The main criteria in level 1 have other sub criteria that influence each of them.
We have identified them and listed all sub criteria that have an impact on the upper level of main criteria.

Safety: - four sub criteria that are considered when evaluating the safety.

The likelihood of failure: - indicating to the possibility of the occurrence of risk as a consequence of the failure.

Personals:- Considering the consequences of the failure on personals
Facility:- This sub-criterion considers the impact of the failure on the machine itself or consequentially on other machines.
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Environments: The consequences of the failure of equipment on the environment.

State that if you agree on these 2 criteria being the only influence on safety and if you disagree or have additional concerns, please show them in the box below.

Reliability: has been identified to have three sub criteria that have direct influence that are:

Maintenance significant items (MSI): it is the factor that when the maintenance management decided on the importance of the equipment to the reliability of the system and if the machine would lead to shut down and disturb the process.

Mean time between failure (MTBF): Considers the average time between failure for equipment.

Accessible to Inspection: accessibility to machines and the easier to be inspected the more reliable the machine becomes and the more data and information is available the more understanding of the machine's condition becomes.
State that if you agree on these 2 criteria being the only influence on reliability and if you disagree or have additional concerns, please show them in the box below.

Availability: - has been identified to have three sub criteria that have direct influence on it which are:

Main time to repair (MTTR): - it is the time needed to repair or recover the system from the failure. MTTR includes the time to diagnose the problem, the time to get the technicians and material needed on site and the time it takes to physically repair the system.

Inherent availability: - Inherent availability considers the availability of the equipment and its importance and criticality to the system that might lead to putting the system down in case of failure. The equipment is considered to be inherent to the system when, for instance, it has no stand-by equipment.

Availability on demand: - In this case, the availability of equipment is on demand. For example, it has spare system that can take over in case of maintenance or failure.

State that if you agree on these sub-criteria being the only influence on availability and if you disagree or have additional concerns, please show them in the box below.
Cost: - there are five different costs that have been identified to impact on the cost in level 1 and they are: -

**Manpower:** - The number of technicians needed in each type of maintenance and acceptable qualifications they have.

**Spare parts:** - the cost of the spare parts should be considered as the cost of them will affect the selected maintenance policy.

**Production loss:** - The loss of producing the crude while performing each type of maintenance policy.

**E-maintenance:** - It indicates to the cost of the hardware "computers and sensors" and the cost of the software which is needed for analysing measured parameters data when using condition-based maintenance.

**Production damage:** - it indicates to the possibility of damaging the production due to the failure.

*State that if you agree on these sub-criteria being the only influence on the cost and if you disagree or have additional concerns, please show them in the box below.*
Three alternative maintenance policies have been identified as possible policies to select for proposed model:

**Planed corrective maintenance (CM):** - it is the type of maintenance when the machine is run to failure after the maintenance management has decided that the failure cannot disturb the productivity and it can be repaired quickly.

**Time based maintenance (TBM):** - it is planned and performed periodically "calendar time, operating time or age" to reduce frequent and sudden failure.

**Condition based maintenance (CBM):** - The decision is made depending on the measured data. Techniques such as vibration monitoring, lubricating analysis, and ultrasonic testing are used to tell engineers whether the situation is normal or allowing the maintenance staff to implement necessary maintenance before failure occurs.

*State that if you agree on these alternatives being used in oil and gas field as maintenance policies and if you disagree or have additional concerns, please show them in the box below.*
Figure A-1: The proposed model of the strategic level in oil and gas field
If you have any more concerns and adjustment to the model, we would be pleased to read about it. Please write them in the box below.
Appendix (B)::-Maintenance Strategy Selection for Petroleum Equipment

As an important part of our research to develop a framework for selecting the most appropriate maintenance policy to equipment in the oil and gas field, we implemented Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). We have identified the criteria, sub-criteria, and alternatives as shown in figure (B-1) to meet the main target "optimum maintenance policy". As an experienced engineer/manager in this field we are seeking your assistance to help us completing this survey.

This survey is for selecting the maintenance policy for separators within the production line in the oil and gas field "the separator function is to separate oil and water as first treatment which is so important to the production line ".

Each question is to compare between two elements with respect the higher connected level and you have to select one answer by clicking on the answer to emphasise to what extent you think one element is either more, less or equally important to another element.

Your contribution and participation is highly appreciated and we would like to thank you in advance for your time and answers.

The questionnaire was created by google doc and sent out on the form of a link which is attached below:

https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Mj1kSaGQiJh8_J34qS0fkkYiDCounBM-3XH1g6JQCw/viewform
Figure (B-1): Proposed hierarchy structure for the selection of maintenance's policy
Participant name:-
Occupation:-
Years of experience:-
Sector Of experience:-
  Academic:-
  Industrial:-
  Both:-
  Others:-
1 Comparison between the main criteria: cost, reliability, availability and safety is performed with respect to the main target "Optimum maintenance selection".

Compare the relative importance between COST and RELIABILITY with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy".

- Cost is extremely more important than reliability
- Cost is very strongly more important than reliability
- Cost is strongly more important than reliability
- Cost is moderately more important than reliability
- Cost and reliability are equally important
- Reliability is moderately more important than cost
- Reliability is strongly more important than cost
- Reliability is very strongly more important than cost
- Reliability is extremely more important than cost

Compare the relative importance between SAFETY and RELIABILITY with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy".

- Safety is extremely important than reliability
- Safety is very strongly more important than reliability
- Safety is strongly more important than reliability
- Safety is moderately more important than reliability
- Safety and reliability are equally important
- Reliability is moderately more important than safety
- Reliability is strongly more important than safety
- Reliability is very strongly more important than safety
- Reliability is extremely more important than safety

Compare the relative importance between SAFETY and COST with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy".

- Safety is extremely more important than cost
- Safety is very strongly more important than cost
- Safety is strongly more important than cost
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- 3 Safety is moderately more important than cost
- 1 Safety and cost are equally important
- 3 Cost is moderately more important than safety
- 5 Cost is strongly more important than safety
- 7 Cost is very strongly more important than safety
- 9 Cost is extremely more important than safety

Compare the relative importance between AVAILABILITY and RELIABILITY with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy"
Reliability means the importance of equipment to the reliability of production line to be function as expected. Availability means how important the equipment to be available for the production line.

- 9 Availability is extremely more important than reliability
- 7 Availability is very strongly more important than reliability
- 5 Availability is strongly more important than reliability
- 3 Availability is moderately more important than reliability
- 1 Availability and reliability are equally important
- 3 Reliability is moderately more important than availability
- 5 Reliability is strongly more important than availability
- 7 Reliability is very strongly more important than availability
- 9 Reliability is extremely more important than availability

Compare the relative importance between AVAILABILITY and COST with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy"
Cost includes costs that associated with the maintenance activities such as spare parts, manpower, production damage and production loss in terms of failure. Availability means how important the equipment to be available for the production line.

- 9 Availability is extremely more important than cost
- 7 Availability is very strongly more important than cost
- 5 Availability is strongly more important than cost
- 3 Availability is moderately more important than cost
- 1 Availability and cost are equally important
- 3 Cost is moderately more important than availability
- 5 Cost is strongly more important than availability
- 7 Cost is very strongly more important than availability
- 9 Cost is extremely more important than availability

XV
Appendices

Compare the relative importance between AVAILABILITY and SAFETY with respect to the main target "optimum maintenance policy".

Safety concerns with the likelihood and consequences of the failure. Availability means how important the equipment to be available for the production line.

- 9 Availability is extremely more important than safety
- 7 Availability is very strongly more important than safety
- 5 Availability is strongly more important than safety
- 3 Availability is moderately more important than safety
- 1 Availability and safety are equally important
- 3 Safety is moderately more important than availability
- 5 Safety is strongly more important than availability
- 7 Safety is very strongly more important than availability
- 9 Safety is extremely more important than availability

2 Comparison between the associated sub criteria of cost with respect to cost

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION DAMAGE and PRODUCTION LOSS with respect to Cost.

Production damage indicates to cost of the damaged production in case of failure. Production Loss indicates to the production that is not being produced because of the failure.

- 9 Production damage is extremely more important than production loss
- 7 Production damage is very strongly more important than production loss
- 5 Production damage is strongly more important than production loss
- 3 Production damage is moderately more important than production loss
- 1 Production damage and production loss are equally important
- 3 Production loss is moderately more important than production damage
- 5 Production loss is strongly more important than production damage
- 7 Production loss is very strongly more important than production damage
- 9 Production loss is extremely more important than production damage

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION DAMAGE and SPARE-PARTS with respect to Cost.

Production damage indicates to cost of the damaged production in case of failure. Spare-parts indicate to the cost of spare-parts.

- 9 Production damage is extremely more important than spare-parts
- 7 Production damage is very strongly more important than spare-parts
- 5 Production damage is strongly more important than spare-parts
- 3 Production damage is moderately more important than production loss
- 1 Production damage and spare-parts are equally important
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3 Spare-parts is moderately more important than Production damage
5 Spare-parts is strongly more important than Production damage
7 Spare-parts is very strongly more important than Production damage
9 Spare-parts is extremely more important than Production damage

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION-DAMAGE and MEN-POWER with respect to Cost
Production damage indicates to cost of the damaged production in case of failure. Men-power indicates to cost of the men-power in terms of salaries and quantity

9 Production damage is extremely more important than men-power
7 Production damage is very strongly more important than men-power
5 Production damage is strongly more important than men-power
3 Production damage is moderately more important than men-power
1 Production damage and men-power are equally important
3 Men-power is moderately more important than Production damage
5 Men-power is strongly more important than Production damage
7 Men-power is very strongly more important than Production damage
9 Men-power is extremely more important than Production damage

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION-DAMAGE and E-MAINTENANCE with respect to Cost
Production damage indicates to cost of the damaged production in case of failure. E-maintenance indicates to the associated costs of software and hardware needed monitor the equipment

9 Production damage is extremely more important than E-maintenance
7 Production damage is very strongly more important than E-maintenance
5 Production damage is strongly more important than E-maintenance
3 Production damage is moderately more important than E-maintenance
1 Production damage and E-maintenance are equally important
3 E-maintenance is moderately more important than Production damage
5 E-maintenance is strongly more important than Production damage
7 E-maintenance is very strongly more important than Production damage
9 E-maintenance is extremely more important than Production damage

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION-LOSS and MEN-POWER with respect to Cost
Production Loss indicates to the production that is not being produced because of the failure. Men-power indicates to cost of the men-power in terms of salaries and quantity

9 Production loss is extremely more important than men-power
7 Production loss is very strongly more important than men-power
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- 5 Production loss is strongly more important than men-power
- 3 Production loss is moderately more important than men-power
- 1 Production loss and men-power are equally important
- 3 Men-power is moderately more important than production loss
- 5 Men-power is strongly more important than production loss
- 7 Men-power is very strongly more important than production loss
- 9 Men-power is extremely more important than production loss

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION-LOSS and E-MAINTENANCE with respect to Cost

Production Loss indicates to the production that is not being produced because of the failure. E-maintenance indicates to the associated costs of software and hardware needed to monitor the equipment.

- 9 Production loss is extremely more important than E-maintenance
- 7 Production loss is very strongly more important than E-maintenance
- 5 Production loss is strongly more important than E-maintenance
- 3 Production loss is moderately more important than E-maintenance
- 1 Production loss and E-maintenance are equally important
- 3 E-maintenance is moderately more important than production loss
- 5 E-maintenance is strongly more important than production loss
- 7 E-maintenance is very strongly more important than production loss
- 9 E-maintenance is extremely more important than production loss

Compare the relative importance between PRODUCTION-LOSS and SPARE-PARTS with respect to Cost

Production Loss indicates to the production that is not being produced because of the failure. Spare-parts indicate to the cost of spare-parts.

- 9 Production loss is extremely more important than spare-parts
- 7 Production loss is very strongly more important than spare-parts
- 5 Production loss is strongly more important than spare-parts
- 3 Production loss is moderately more important than spare-parts
- 1 Production loss and spare-parts are equally important
- 3 Spare-parts is moderately more important than production loss
- 5 Spare-parts is strongly more important than production loss
- 7 Spare-parts is very strongly more important than production loss
- 9 Spare-parts is extremely more important than production loss

Compare the relative importance between SPARE-PARTS and MEN-POWER with respect to Cost
Men-power indicates to cost of the men-power in terms of salaries and quantity. Spare-parts indicate to the cost of spare-parts.

- **9** Men-power is extremely more important than spare-parts
- **7** Men-power is very strongly more important than spare-parts
- **5** Men-power is strongly more important than spare-parts
- **3** Men-power is moderately more important than spare-parts
- **1** Men-power and spare-parts are equally important
- **3** Spare-parts is moderately more important than men-power
- **5** Spare-parts is strongly more important than men-power
- **7** Spare-parts is very strongly more important than men-power
- **9** Spare-parts is extremely more important than men-power

Compare the relative importance between SPARE-PARTS and E-MAINTENANCE with respect to Cost

Spare-parts indicate to the cost of spare-parts. E-maintenance indicates to the associated costs of software and hardware needed to monitor the equipment.

- **9** E-maintenance is extremely more important than spare-parts
- **7** E-maintenance is very strongly more important than spare-parts
- **5** E-maintenance is strongly more important than spare-parts
- **3** E-maintenance is moderately more important than spare-parts
- **1** E-maintenance and spare-parts are equally important
- **3** Spare-parts is moderately more important than E-maintenance
- **5** Spare-parts is strongly more important than E-maintenance
- **7** Spare-parts is very strongly more important than E-maintenance
- **9** Spare-parts is extremely more important than E-maintenance

Compare the relative importance between MEN-POWER and E-MAINTENANCE with respect to Cost

Men-power indicates to cost of the men-power in terms of salaries and quantity. E-maintenance indicates to the associated costs of software and hardware needed to monitor the equipment.

- **9** E-maintenance is extremely more important than Men-power
- **7** E-maintenance is very strongly more important than Men-power
- **5** E-maintenance is strongly more important than Men-power
- **3** E-maintenance is moderately more important than Men-power
- **1** E-maintenance and Men-power are equally important
- **3** Men-power is moderately more important than E-maintenance
- **5** Men-power is strongly more important than E-maintenance
- **7** Men-power is very strongly more important than E-maintenance
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3 Comparison between the associated sub-criteria of reliability with respect to reliability

Compare the relative importance between MAINTENANCE SIGNIFICANT ITEMS and ACCESSIBLE TO INSPECTION with respect to RELIABILITY

Maintenance significant items means the importance of the equipment to the production line and to the reliability of the system. Accessible to inspection indicates how accessible the equipment to be inspected to increase the confidence level of the system.

- 9 Maintenance significant items is extremely more important than accessible to inspection
- 7 Maintenance significant items is very strongly more important than accessible to inspection
- 5 Maintenance significant items is strongly more important than accessible to inspection
- 3 Maintenance significant items is moderately more important than accessible to inspection
- 1 Maintenance significant items and accessible to inspection are equally important
- 3 Accessible to inspection is moderately more important than maintenance significant items
- 5 Accessible to inspection is strongly more important than maintenance significant items
- 7 Accessible to inspection is very strongly more important than maintenance significant items
- 9 Accessible to inspection is extremely more important than maintenance significant items

Compare the relative importance between MAINTENANCE SIGNIFICANT ITEMS and MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURE (MTBF) with respect to RELIABILITY

Maintenance significant items means the importance of the equipment to the production line and to the reliability of the system. MTBF indicates the period of time between failures and the longer the time the more reliable the equipment.

- 9 Maintenance significant items is extremely more important than MTBF
- 7 Maintenance significant items is very strongly more important than MTBF
- 5 Maintenance significant items is strongly more important than MTBF
- 3 Maintenance significant items is moderately more important than MTBF
- 1 Maintenance significant items and MTBF are equally important
- 3 MTBF is moderately more important than maintenance significant items
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- 5 MTBF is strongly more important than maintenance significant items
- 7 MTBF is very strongly more important than maintenance significant items
- 9 MTBF is extremely more important than maintenance significant items

Compare the relative importance between ACCESSIBLE TO INSPECTION and MEAN TIME BETWEEN FAILURE (MTBF) with respect to RELIABILITY

Accessible to inspection indicates to how accessible the equipment to be inspected to increase the confidence level of the system. MTBF indicates to the period of time between failures and the longer the time the more reliable the equipment.

- 9 Accessible to inspection is extremely more important than MTBF
- 7 Accessible to inspection is very strongly more important than MTBF
- 5 Accessible to inspection is strongly more important than MTBF
- 3 Accessible to inspection is moderately more important than MTBF
- 1 Accessible to inspection and MTBF are equally important
- 3 MTBF is moderately more important than Accessible to inspection
- 5 MTBF is strongly more important than Accessible to inspection
- 7 MTBF is very strongly more important than Accessible to inspection
- 9 MTBF is extremely more important than Accessible to inspection

4 Comparison between the associated sub-criteria of safety with respect to safety

Compare the relative importance between LIKELIHOOD and FACILITY with respect to SAFTEY

Likelihood indicates to the possibility of the occurrence of the risk in terms of failure. Facility indicates to the consequences of the failure on damaging the facility.

- 9 Likelihood is extremely more important than facility
- 7 Likelihood is very strongly more important than facility
- 5 Likelihood is strongly more important than facility
- 3 Likelihood is moderately more important than facility
- 1 Likelihood and facility are equally important
- 3 Facility is moderately more important than likelihood
- 5 Facility is strongly more important than likelihood
- 7 Facility is very strongly more important than likelihood
- 9 Facility is extremely more important than likelihood

Compare the relative importance between LIKELIHOOD and PERSONNELS with respect to SAFTEY

Likelihood indicates to the possibility of the occurrence of the risk in terms of failure. Personnels indicates to the consequences of the failure on any person who would be around if failure happened.
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- 9 Likelihood is extremely more important than personnels
- 7 Likelihood is very strongly more important than personnels
- 5 Likelihood is strongly more important than personnels
- 3 Likelihood is moderately more important than personnels
- 1 Likelihood and personnels are equally important
- 3 Personnels is moderately more important than likelihood
- 5 Personnels is strongly more important than likelihood
- 7 Personnels is very strongly more important than likelihood
- 9 Personnels is extremely more important than likelihood

Compare the relative importance between LIKELIHOOD and ENVIRONMENT with respect to SAFTEY

Likelihood indicates to the possibility of the occurrence of the risk in terms of failure.
Environment indicates to the consequences of the failure on the surroundings and the effect of the failure on the environment

- 9 Likelihood is extremely more important than environment
- 7 Likelihood is very strongly more important than environment
- 5 Likelihood is strongly more important than environment
- 3 Likelihood is moderately more important than environment
- 1 Likelihood and environment are equally important
- 3 Environment is moderately more important than likelihood
- 5 Environment is strongly more important than likelihood
- 7 Environment is very strongly more important than likelihood
- 9 Environment is extremely more important than likelihood

Compare the relative importance between PERSONNELS and ENVIRONMENT with respect to SAFTEY

Personnels indicates to the consequences of the failure on any person who would be around if failure happened. Environment indicates to the consequences of the failure on the surroundings and the effect of the failure on the environment

- 9 Personnels is extremely more important than environment
- 7 Personnels is very strongly more important than environment
- 5 Personnels is strongly more important than environment
- 3 Personnels is moderately more important than environment
- 1 Personnels and environment are equally important
- 3 Environment is moderately more important than personnels
- 5 Environment is strongly more important than personnels
- 7 Environment is very strongly more important than personnels
- 9 Environment is extremely more important than personnels
Compare the relative importance between FACILITY and ENVIRONMENT with respect to SAFTEY
Facility indicates to the consequences of the failure on damaging the facility. Environment indicates to the consequences of the failure on the surroundings and the effect of the failure on the environment

- 9 Facility is extremely more important than environment
- 7 Facility is very strongly more important than environment
- 5 Facility is strongly more important than environment
- 3 Facility is moderately more important than environment
- 1 Facility and environment are equally important
- 3 Environment is moderately more important than facility
- 5 Environment is strongly more important than facility
- 7 Environment is very strongly more important than facility
- 9 Environment is extremely more important than facility

Compare the relative importance between PERSONNELS and FACILITY with respect to SAFTEY
Personnells indicates to the consequences of the failure on any person who would be around if failure happened. Environment indicates to the consequences of the failure on the surroundings and the effect of the failure on the environment

- 9 Personnells is extremely more important than facility
- 7 Personnells is very strongly more important than facility
- 5 Personnells is strongly more important than facility
- 3 Personnells is moderately more important than facility
- 1 Personnells and facility are equally important
- 3 Facility is moderately more important than personnells
- 5 Facility is strongly more important than personnells
- 7 Facility is very strongly more important than personnells
- 9 Facility is extremely more important than personnells

5 Comparison between the associated sub-criteria of availability with respect to availability

Compare the relative importance between AVAILABILITY ON DEMAND and INHERENT AVAILABILITY with respect to AVAILABILITY
Availability on demand indicates to that equipment is either has alternative equipment that to swap with or not required to be working all the time for the system to be funcioning. Inherent availability indicates to that the equipment is always required to be working for the production line to be funcioning

- 9 Availability on demand is extremely more important than inherent availability
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○ 7 Availability on demand is very strongly more important than inherent availability
○ 5 Availability on demand is strongly more important than inherent availability
○ 3 Availability on demand is moderately more important than inherent availability
○ 1 Availability on demand and inherent availability are equally important
○ 3 Inherent availability is moderately more important than Availability on demand
○ 5 Inherent availability is strongly more important than Availability on demand
○ 7 Inherent availability is very strongly more important than Availability on demand
○ 9 Inherent availability is extremely more important than Availability on demand

Compare the relative importance between AVAILABILITY ON DEMAND and MEAN TIME TO REPAIR (MTTR) with respect to AVAILABILITY
Availability on demand indicates to that equipment is either has alternative equipment that to swap with or not required to be working all the time for the system to be functioning. MTTR represents the average (mean) time required to repair a failed component or equipment

○ 9 Availability on demand is extremely more important than MTTR
○ 7 Availability on demand is very strongly more important than MTTR
○ 5 Availability on demand is strongly more important than MTTR
○ 3 Availability on demand is moderately more important than MTTR
○ 1 Availability on demand and MTTR are equally important
○ 3 MTTR is moderately more important than Availability on demand
○ 5 MTTR is strongly more important than Availability on demand
○ 7 MTTR is very strongly more important than Availability on demand
○ 9 MTTR is extremely more important than Availability on demand

Compare the relative importance between INHERENT AVAILABILITY and MEAN TIME TO REPAIR (MTTR) with respect to AVAILABILITY
Inherent availability indicates to that the equipment is always required to be working for the production line to be functioning. MTTR represents the average (mean) time required to repair a failed component or equipment

○ 9 Inherent availability is extremely more important than MTTR
○ 7 Inherent availability is very strongly more important than MTTR
○ 5 Inherent availability is strongly more important than MTTR
○ 3 Inherent availability is moderately more important than MTTR
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- 1 Inherent availability and MTTR are equally important
- 3 MTTR is moderately more important than inherent availability
- 5 MTTR is strongly more important than inherent availability
- 7 MTTR is very strongly more important than inherent availability
- 9 MTTR is extremely more important than inherent availability

Comparison between the alternatives "time based maintenance, condition based maintenance and corrective maintenance" with respect to each one of the sub-criteria

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to personnel/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance" it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Personnels/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".
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- Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to personnel/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Environment/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Environment/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
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- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Environment/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
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Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Facility/Safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based on the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Facility/Safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
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- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Facility/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Likelihood/Safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion", corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".
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- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Likelihood/safety

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
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- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Likelihood/safety
"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Production-Damage/Cost
"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
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- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Production- Damage/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you use the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when you use the equipment until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance
Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Production-Damage/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Production-Loss/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
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- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Production-Loss/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Production-Loss/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance " it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".
### Appendices

- **9** Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- **7** Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- **5** Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- **3** Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- **1** Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- **5** Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- **7** Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- **9** Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

**Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Spareparts/Cost**

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- **9** Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- **7** Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- **5** Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- **3** Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- **1** Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- **3** Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- **5** Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- **7** Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
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- Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Spareparts/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion." Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Spareparts/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion." Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
Appendices

- Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Menpower/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion", corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Menpower/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion", corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails.
Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation “equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring”.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Menpower/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion”. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance “it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine”. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation “equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring”.

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
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- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to E-maintenance/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance, it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly, and monthly or based on the number of operations of the machine.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to E-maintenance/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation. Equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure, or temperature change, and any other form of monitoring.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
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- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to E-maintenance/Cost

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance; it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
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Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Maintenance Significant Items (MSI)/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance which can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based on the number of operations of the machine.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Maintenance Significant Items (MSI)/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation. Equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
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- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Maintenance Significant Items (MSI)/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Accessible to inspection/Reliability
"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance which can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Accessible to inspection/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation. Equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance

7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance

9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Accessible to inspection/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance

7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance

5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance

3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance

1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important

3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance

5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance

7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance

9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Mean Time Between Failure MTBF/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance " it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
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- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Mean Time Between Failure MTBF/Reliability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion", corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance.

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Mean Time Between Failure MTBF/Reliability. Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance; it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based on the number of operations of the machine. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation; equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring.

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Inherent availability/Availability. Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion. Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance; it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based on the number of operations of the machine.

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
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- Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Inherent availability/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Inherent availability/Availability
"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Availability on demand/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Availability on demand/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance

Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance

Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance

Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance

Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important

Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance

Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance

Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance

Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Availability on demand/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
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- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) with respect to Mean Time To Repair (MTTR)/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you run the equipment until it fails. Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and time based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance
Compare the relative importance between CORRECTIVE MAINTENANCE (CM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Mean Time To Repair (MTTR)/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Corrective maintenance CM is the form of maintenance when you the equipment is run until it fails. Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Corrective maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Corrective maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Corrective maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Corrective maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
- 1 Corrective maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than corrective maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than corrective maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than corrective maintenance

Compare the relative importance between TIME BASED MAINTENANCE (TBM) and CONDITION BASED MAINTENANCE (CBM) with respect to Mean Time To Repair (MTTR)/Availability

"Please provide your judgement with respect to this particular sub-criterion". Time based maintenance is a periodic maintenance "it can be planned hourly, daily, weekly and monthly or based of the number of operations of the machine". Condition based maintenance is the form of maintenance when the equipment is run until it shows a sign of degradation "equipment health can be observed by visual mentor, pressure or temperature change and any other form of monitoring".

- 9 Time based maintenance is extremely more important than condition based maintenance
- 7 Time based maintenance is very strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 5 Time based maintenance is strongly more important than condition based maintenance
- 3 Time based maintenance is moderately more important than condition based maintenance
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- 1 Time based maintenance and condition based maintenance are equally important
- 3 Condition based maintenance is moderately more important than time based maintenance
- 5 Condition based maintenance is strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 7 Condition based maintenance is very strongly more important than time based maintenance
- 9 Condition based maintenance is extremely more important than time based maintenance

If you have any comment or suggestions you would like to advise in regards to the hierarchy structure in terms of more criteria or alternative or any other information please add it in the following box.
### Appendix (C): Total Maintenance Cost for Major Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time/h</th>
<th>failure probability</th>
<th>Corrective cost</th>
<th>Preventive cost</th>
<th>Total Maintenance cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>0.0000000001</td>
<td>1.13455E-05</td>
<td>3280.842</td>
<td>3280.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>0.00000000022</td>
<td>0.000479055</td>
<td>3280.841993</td>
<td>1640.420996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>0.00000000199</td>
<td>0.004278371</td>
<td>3280.841935</td>
<td>1093.613978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672</td>
<td>0.00000000943</td>
<td>0.020227752</td>
<td>3280.841691</td>
<td>820.2104227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>0.00000003146</td>
<td>0.067493451</td>
<td>3280.840968</td>
<td>656.161936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1008</td>
<td>0.00000008420</td>
<td>0.180650951</td>
<td>3280.839237</td>
<td>546.8065396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1176</td>
<td>0.00000019357</td>
<td>0.415291152</td>
<td>3280.835649</td>
<td>468.6908071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1344</td>
<td>0.0000039811</td>
<td>0.854100051</td>
<td>3280.828939</td>
<td>410.1036178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>0.0000075201</td>
<td>1.613361171</td>
<td>3280.817328</td>
<td>364.53526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1680</td>
<td>0.0000132835</td>
<td>2.849842101</td>
<td>3280.798419</td>
<td>328.0798457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>0.0000222244</td>
<td>4.76803414</td>
<td>3280.769085</td>
<td>298.2517447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>0.0000355537</td>
<td>7.627719091</td>
<td>3280.725354</td>
<td>273.3938021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2184</td>
<td>0.0000547766</td>
<td>11.75184055</td>
<td>3280.662286</td>
<td>252.3586869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2352</td>
<td>0.0000817312</td>
<td>17.5346591</td>
<td>3280.573853</td>
<td>234.3268062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2520</td>
<td>0.0001186263</td>
<td>25.45017194</td>
<td>3280.452806</td>
<td>218.697055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2688</td>
<td>0.0001680837</td>
<td>36.0607776</td>
<td>3280.290544</td>
<td>205.0185379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2856</td>
<td>0.0002331780</td>
<td>50.02616591</td>
<td>3280.076998</td>
<td>192.946391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3024</td>
<td>0.0003174802</td>
<td>68.1124122</td>
<td>3279.800398</td>
<td>182.2123349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3192</td>
<td>0.0004251001</td>
<td>91.20125236</td>
<td>3279.447314</td>
<td>172.6045316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3360</td>
<td>0.0005607306</td>
<td>120.2995131</td>
<td>3279.002331</td>
<td>163.9534912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3528</td>
<td>0.0007296923</td>
<td>156.5486675</td>
<td>3278.447995</td>
<td>156.1220148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3696</td>
<td>0.0009379783</td>
<td>201.2344819</td>
<td>3277.764641</td>
<td>148.9978896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3864</td>
<td>0.0011922995</td>
<td>255.7967156</td>
<td>3276.930254</td>
<td>142.4885045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4032</td>
<td>0.0015001297</td>
<td>321.8388257</td>
<td>3275.920311</td>
<td>136.5168265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>0.0018697511</td>
<td>401.1376274</td>
<td>3274.707642</td>
<td>131.018363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4368</td>
<td>0.0023102979</td>
<td>495.6528448</td>
<td>3273.262277</td>
<td>125.9388475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4536</td>
<td>0.0028318011</td>
<td>607.5364854</td>
<td>3271.551308</td>
<td>121.232463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4704</td>
<td>0.0034452302</td>
<td>739.1419535</td>
<td>3269.538744</td>
<td>116.8605022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4872</td>
<td>0.0041625341</td>
<td>893.0328134</td>
<td>3267.185383</td>
<td>112.7902828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5040</td>
<td>0.0049966803</td>
<td>1071.991093</td>
<td>3264.448681</td>
<td>108.994392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5208</td>
<td>0.0059616905</td>
<td>1279.025012</td>
<td>3261.282635</td>
<td>105.4501135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5376</td>
<td>0.0070726733</td>
<td>1517.375993</td>
<td>3257.637676</td>
<td>102.1389383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5544</td>
<td>0.0083458530</td>
<td>1790.524818</td>
<td>3253.460575</td>
<td>99.0463575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5712</td>
<td>0.0097985936</td>
<td>2102.196742</td>
<td>3248.694363</td>
<td>96.1616696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5880</td>
<td>0.0114494166</td>
<td>2456.365392</td>
<td>3243.278273</td>
<td>93.4779416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6048</td>
<td>0.0133180128</td>
<td>2857.255251</td>
<td>3237.147704</td>
<td>90.9920638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6216</td>
<td>0.0154252461</td>
<td>3309.342474</td>
<td>3230.234205</td>
<td>88.7049022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6384</td>
<td>0.0177931485</td>
<td>3817.35383</td>
<td>3222.465491</td>
<td>86.6215442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6552</td>
<td>0.0204449053</td>
<td>4386.263479</td>
<td>3213.765496</td>
<td>84.7516394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6720</td>
<td>0.0234048283</td>
<td>5021.28731</td>
<td>3204.054456</td>
<td>83.1098336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6888</td>
<td>0.0266983170</td>
<td>5727.874548</td>
<td>3193.24904</td>
<td>81.7630427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time/h</td>
<td>Failure probability</td>
<td>Corrective cost</td>
<td>Preventive cost</td>
<td>Total Maintenance cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7056</td>
<td>0.0303518052</td>
<td>6511.69631</td>
<td>3181.262523</td>
<td>80.59740041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7224</td>
<td>0.0343926917</td>
<td>7378.630779</td>
<td>3168.005013</td>
<td>79.78638882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7392</td>
<td>0.0388492544</td>
<td>8334.744671</td>
<td>3153.383735</td>
<td>79.3243217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7560</td>
<td>0.0437505443</td>
<td>9386.270644</td>
<td>3137.303377</td>
<td>79.26102628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7728</td>
<td>0.0491262603</td>
<td>10539.58032</td>
<td>3119.666502</td>
<td>79.6562374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7896</td>
<td>0.0550066014</td>
<td>11801.15257</td>
<td>3100.374032</td>
<td>80.58086886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8064</td>
<td>0.0614220949</td>
<td>13177.53678</td>
<td>3079.325811</td>
<td>82.11845158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8232</td>
<td>0.0684034009</td>
<td>14675.31077</td>
<td>3056.421249</td>
<td>84.36674377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8400</td>
<td>0.0759810896</td>
<td>16301.03311</td>
<td>3031.56005</td>
<td>87.43953236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8568</td>
<td>0.0841853925</td>
<td>18061.18966</td>
<td>3004.643029</td>
<td>91.46864358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8736</td>
<td>0.0930459253</td>
<td>19962.13422</td>
<td>2975.57302</td>
<td>96.60618333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8904</td>
<td>0.1025913831</td>
<td>22010.02304</td>
<td>2944.255881</td>
<td>103.027031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9072</td>
<td>0.1128492078</td>
<td>24210.74352</td>
<td>2910.601579</td>
<td>110.9316137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9240</td>
<td>0.1238452279</td>
<td>26569.83693</td>
<td>2874.525375</td>
<td>120.5489927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9408</td>
<td>0.1356032727</td>
<td>29092.41562</td>
<td>2835.949088</td>
<td>132.1402975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9576</td>
<td>0.1481447621</td>
<td>31783.07504</td>
<td>2794.802442</td>
<td>146.002557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9744</td>
<td>0.1614882756</td>
<td>34645.80122</td>
<td>2751.024483</td>
<td>162.4729401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9912</td>
<td>0.1756491025</td>
<td>37683.87438</td>
<td>2704.565047</td>
<td>181.9335769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10080</td>
<td>0.1906387799</td>
<td>1.13455E-05</td>
<td>2655.386284</td>
<td>204.816846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10248</td>
<td>0.2064646221</td>
<td>0.80936122</td>
<td>2603.461969</td>
<td>231.611416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10416</td>
<td>0.2231292489</td>
<td>0.793535378</td>
<td>2548.790189</td>
<td>262.868981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10584</td>
<td>0.2406301200</td>
<td>0.776870751</td>
<td>2491.372596</td>
<td>299.2119455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10752</td>
<td>0.2589590847</td>
<td>0.75936988</td>
<td>2431.238159</td>
<td>341.3421155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10920</td>
<td>0.2781019552</td>
<td>0.741040915</td>
<td>2368.433425</td>
<td>390.0506423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11088</td>
<td>0.2980381163</td>
<td>0.721898045</td>
<td>2303.02603</td>
<td>446.2294296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11256</td>
<td>0.3187401805</td>
<td>0.701961884</td>
<td>2235.105829</td>
<td>510.884293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11424</td>
<td>0.3401737020</td>
<td>0.68125982</td>
<td>2164.785831</td>
<td>585.150223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11592</td>
<td>0.3622969625</td>
<td>0.659826298</td>
<td>2092.202909</td>
<td>670.3091787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11760</td>
<td>0.3850608400</td>
<td>0.637703037</td>
<td>2017.518224</td>
<td>767.8109543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11928</td>
<td>0.4084087740</td>
<td>0.61493916</td>
<td>1940.917341</td>
<td>879.2977697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12096</td>
<td>0.4322768395</td>
<td>0.591591226</td>
<td>1862.609989</td>
<td>1006.633409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12264</td>
<td>0.4565939396</td>
<td>0.56772316</td>
<td>1782.829426</td>
<td>1151.937923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12432</td>
<td>0.4812821265</td>
<td>0.54340606</td>
<td>1701.831386</td>
<td>1317.629153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12600</td>
<td>0.5062570588</td>
<td>0.518717874</td>
<td>1619.892579</td>
<td>1506.472669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12768</td>
<td>0.5314285990</td>
<td>0.493742941</td>
<td>1537.308732</td>
<td>1721.642078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12936</td>
<td>0.5567015538</td>
<td>0.468571401</td>
<td>1454.392161</td>
<td>1966.792191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13104</td>
<td>0.5819765546</td>
<td>0.443298446</td>
<td>1371.468877</td>
<td>2246.148149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13272</td>
<td>0.6071510726</td>
<td>0.418023445</td>
<td>1288.875261</td>
<td>2564.614456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13440</td>
<td>0.6321205588</td>
<td>0.392848927</td>
<td>1206.954322</td>
<td>3280.842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LV
## Appendix (D): The Weekly Movement of Part (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
<td>Weeks</td>
<td>on hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>359</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>529 28</td>
<td>573 36</td>
<td>573 36</td>
<td>617 44</td>
<td>530 28</td>
<td>574 36</td>
<td>574 36</td>
<td>618 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532 28</td>
<td>576 36</td>
<td>576 36</td>
<td>620 44</td>
<td>533 28</td>
<td>577 36</td>
<td>577 36</td>
<td>621 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535 28</td>
<td>579 36</td>
<td>579 36</td>
<td>623 44</td>
<td>536 28</td>
<td>580 36</td>
<td>580 36</td>
<td>624 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538 28</td>
<td>582 36</td>
<td>582 36</td>
<td>626 44</td>
<td>539 30</td>
<td>583 38</td>
<td>583 38</td>
<td>627 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 30</td>
<td>585 38</td>
<td>585 38</td>
<td>629 46</td>
<td>542 30</td>
<td>586 38</td>
<td>586 38</td>
<td>630 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>544 30</td>
<td>588 38</td>
<td>588 38</td>
<td>632 46</td>
<td>545 30</td>
<td>589 38</td>
<td>589 38</td>
<td>633 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547 30</td>
<td>591 38</td>
<td>591 38</td>
<td>635 46</td>
<td>548 30</td>
<td>592 38</td>
<td>592 38</td>
<td>636 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 32</td>
<td>594 40</td>
<td>594 40</td>
<td>638 48</td>
<td>551 32</td>
<td>595 40</td>
<td>595 40</td>
<td>639 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>553 32</td>
<td>597 40</td>
<td>597 40</td>
<td>641 48</td>
<td>554 32</td>
<td>598 40</td>
<td>598 40</td>
<td>642 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556 32</td>
<td>600 40</td>
<td>600 40</td>
<td>644 48</td>
<td>557 32</td>
<td>601 40</td>
<td>601 40</td>
<td>645 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>559 32</td>
<td>603 40</td>
<td>603 40</td>
<td>647 48</td>
<td>560 32</td>
<td>604 40</td>
<td>604 40</td>
<td>648 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 34</td>
<td>606 42</td>
<td>606 42</td>
<td>650 50</td>
<td>563 34</td>
<td>607 42</td>
<td>607 42</td>
<td>651 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565 34</td>
<td>609 42</td>
<td>609 42</td>
<td>653 50</td>
<td>566 34</td>
<td>610 42</td>
<td>610 42</td>
<td>654 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568 34</td>
<td>612 42</td>
<td>612 42</td>
<td>656 50</td>
<td>569 34</td>
<td>613 42</td>
<td>613 42</td>
<td>657 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>571 34</td>
<td>615 42</td>
<td>615 42</td>
<td>659 50</td>
<td>572 36</td>
<td>616 44</td>
<td>616 44</td>
<td>660 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td>Weeks on hand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661 52</td>
<td>705 30</td>
<td>749 38</td>
<td>793 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>662 52</td>
<td>706 30</td>
<td>750 38</td>
<td>794 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>663 52</td>
<td>707 30</td>
<td>751 38</td>
<td>795 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664 52</td>
<td>708 30</td>
<td>752 38</td>
<td>796 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665 52</td>
<td>709 30</td>
<td>753 38</td>
<td>797 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>666 52</td>
<td>710 30</td>
<td>754 38</td>
<td>798 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>667 52</td>
<td>711 30</td>
<td>755 38</td>
<td>799 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668 52</td>
<td>712 30</td>
<td>756 38</td>
<td>800 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>669 52</td>
<td>713 30</td>
<td>757 38</td>
<td>801 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670 52</td>
<td>714 30</td>
<td>758 38</td>
<td>802 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>671 54</td>
<td>715 32</td>
<td>759 40</td>
<td>803 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 54</td>
<td>716 32</td>
<td>760 40</td>
<td>804 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673 54</td>
<td>717 32</td>
<td>761 40</td>
<td>805 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674 54</td>
<td>718 32</td>
<td>762 40</td>
<td>806 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>675 54</td>
<td>719 32</td>
<td>763 40</td>
<td>807 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676 54</td>
<td>720 32</td>
<td>764 40</td>
<td>808 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>677 54</td>
<td>721 32</td>
<td>765 40</td>
<td>809 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>678 54</td>
<td>722 32</td>
<td>766 40</td>
<td>810 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>679 54</td>
<td>723 32</td>
<td>767 40</td>
<td>811 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680 54</td>
<td>724 32</td>
<td>768 40</td>
<td>812 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681 54</td>
<td>725 32</td>
<td>769 40</td>
<td>813 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>682 26</td>
<td>726 34</td>
<td>770 42</td>
<td>814 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>683 26</td>
<td>727 34</td>
<td>771 42</td>
<td>815 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>684 26</td>
<td>728 34</td>
<td>772 42</td>
<td>816 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685 26</td>
<td>729 34</td>
<td>773 42</td>
<td>817 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>686 26</td>
<td>730 34</td>
<td>774 42</td>
<td>818 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>687 26</td>
<td>731 34</td>
<td>775 42</td>
<td>819 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688 26</td>
<td>732 34</td>
<td>776 42</td>
<td>820 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>689 26</td>
<td>733 34</td>
<td>777 42</td>
<td>821 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>690 26</td>
<td>734 34</td>
<td>778 42</td>
<td>822 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>691 26</td>
<td>735 34</td>
<td>779 42</td>
<td>823 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>692 26</td>
<td>736 34</td>
<td>780 42</td>
<td>824 50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693 28</td>
<td>737 36</td>
<td>781 44</td>
<td>825 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694 28</td>
<td>738 36</td>
<td>782 44</td>
<td>826 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>695 28</td>
<td>739 36</td>
<td>783 44</td>
<td>827 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>696 28</td>
<td>740 36</td>
<td>784 44</td>
<td>828 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697 28</td>
<td>741 36</td>
<td>785 44</td>
<td>829 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698 28</td>
<td>742 36</td>
<td>786 44</td>
<td>830 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>699 28</td>
<td>743 36</td>
<td>787 44</td>
<td>831 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 28</td>
<td>744 36</td>
<td>788 44</td>
<td>832 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 28</td>
<td>745 36</td>
<td>789 44</td>
<td>833 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>702 28</td>
<td>746 36</td>
<td>790 44</td>
<td>834 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>703 28</td>
<td>747 36</td>
<td>791 44</td>
<td>835 52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>704 30</td>
<td>748 38</td>
<td>792 46</td>
<td>836 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
<th>Weeks</th>
<th>on hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>837</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>838</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>839</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>840</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>841</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>843</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>844</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>845</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>846</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>