

Reliability Information Management

Reliability Information Management

BEST PRACTICES









Best Practice #1

ONE Master Reliability Database

- Must allow entry from ALL SOURCES of information
- Must allow access to ALL USERS that need the information





Current State of Reliability Management

Many separate pieces of reliability information in reports, databases, computer folders, spreadsheets

No Standardization

No Integration

Poor Communication

Poor Accountability

No Ability to Analyze Performance





Reliability Management is Information Management

Identification and Design data
Design documentation
Purchase
Stores and stores testing/ task
Install and location details
Condition Test and Results
Contractor Management
Failure, Repair, and Warranty
Collective analysis

Isn't that what my CMMS does?

In most cases -

CMMS is tightly controlled by IT, not easy to adapt to new needs, limited access for many in plant

Focus on accounting priorities vs. maintenance & reliability needs

Not built to asset component level, or to house for condition status

Equipment design parameters at nameplate level only

Reports not visually oriented; difficult & time intensive to get useful Reliability metrics





What are the major obstacles?

For too many plants:

Varying report formats coming from different condition monitoring sources, communicated by email to different groups of plant contacts

Information such as equipment design and calibration details is held in 'cubbyholes' developed by different departments, or they are buried in large systems such as CMMS

Information originating from service contractors & repair shops who can't get through firewalls to a plant database – do you have people available to transfer this valuable information from e-mails?





What are the typical results?

In too many cases:

Difficulty in knowing the true condition status of critical equipment, due to non-standardized fault & severity descriptions coming from various monitoring reports

Poor accountability for maintenance action on condition-based calls – low visibility for mid & upper management on condition problems leads to 'squeaking wheel' relationships

Inability to retrieve useable failure mode and MTBF information to feed reliability analysis





Practical with web-based technology



DOCUMENT RESULTS FROM DIFFERENT PDM SOURCES 'FORCE' CONSISTENCY IN DEFINITIONS & NOMENCLATURE

COMMUNICATE STATUS INFORMATION THROUGH A WEB-BROWSER





Handling the standardization issue



Make result documentation easy for the analysts – don't make extra work



Standardize location names, equipment faults, & severity scale with drop-down lists



Force concise description of findings & recommendations



Let the formatting of results reporting happen dynamically "behind the scenes"





Standardization in a single database



Nomenclature – Use the same terminology across independent sources



Equipment Locations – Track movement through the life of plant equipment



Names –

Eliminate miscommunication with consistent identification



Faults – Set fault & corrective action lists for all findings



Severity Levels – Consolidate a severity for all information sources

Reports – Standardize the look of content from all sources







INTEGRATION CAN ONLY BE ACCOMPLISHED AFTER STANDARDIZATION IS IMPOSED INTEGRATING CONDITION RESULTS FROM ALL TECHNOLOGIES UNDER EACH SPECIFIC MACHINE LOCATION IS THE FIRST STEP TOWARD ASSET-CENTERED COMMUNICATION OF HEALTH STATUS

INTEGRATING RCFA, EQUIPMENT REPAIR, AND EQUIPMENT LIFECYCLE INFORMATION REQUIRES STANDARDIZED FAULTS, LOCATIONS, AND EQUIPMENT DESIGN DATA TEMPLATES





The single database should be web-based

Condition results can be collected in a single web-hosted database, independent from the proprietary databases housing the technical data



In-plant technicians and outside PDM contractors enter plain language findings and recommendations into this web-hosted database via the Internet, bypassing any issues about outside vendors having to cross security





Manager's dashboard of reliability status

An Example of the Benefits of One Master Reliability Database



