

**Enhance the Ability to Perform Root Cause Analysis
With Reliability Physics**

by Mark A. Latino,
Sr.V.P. Operations, Reliability Center, Inc.
www.reliability.com

Over the years root cause analysis has become a word that is now associated with many problems. At one time the National Transportation & Safety Board (NTSB) was unique in its use referencing the conclusion of an airline crash investigation as the root cause analysis of the mishap. Today the word root cause is heard on the news more often and associated with all kinds of events. The events now range from the root cause of 9/11 to the root cause of a factory explosion.

The context of the word root cause means many things to many people. It is so diverse that people use it without fully understanding its meaning. Because of this, the word root cause is thrown out at times when people are looking for answers. Most people don't understand what it takes to get those answers. This article will help to give a deeper understanding of what Root Cause Analysis is and what it takes to get to the root causes of an event.

Root Cause Analysis to this writer means analyzing failures down to their latent root causes, which are the deficiencies in management systems and restraining cultural norms that allowed the failure to occur.


Seldom is the time or effort taken to drive a root cause analysis past the physical condition of the failure into the human intervention and the system(s) that drive the human behavior. There is a quantum difference in the returns to the company when the extra effort to understand the total failure mechanism is taken.

The power of root cause analysis is in its leverage. To eliminate a failure that is currently under investigation in a "one at a time" fashion should be a secondary objective of root cause analysis. When root cause investigations drive down into the latent roots, you will discover that the latent roots are common to failures both past and future. These are in equipment and systems that are entirely different or even in another facility. They may share nothing in common with the current failure being analyzed except the latent failure roots.

When latent root causes are discovered, their correction justified and their elimination finalized, the facilities will have been raised to an unprecedented high reliability. This quantum level of reliability could never be reached by only the secondary objective of solving one failure at a time.


Leveraged Root Cause Analysis

Strait Line RCA - Not Leveraged



Leveraged Root Cause Analysis

Out Of The Box RCA - Leveraged



Using the definition above in a perfect world would reward the root cause analyst as being some kind of problem solving genius. The reality is that this is very difficult to do because there are so many agendas in play at the same time. The root cause analyst must be equipped with all the tools necessary to solve problems nearly single handedly. This goes against what most root cause methodologies teach. However, if the event is not of significant loss and in the eye of the highest stakeholders, the root cause becomes less significant and the resources to solve the problem are not made readily available to some analysts.

The root cause analyst must have a solid understanding of how systems work to understand how systems fail. Learning the reliability physics of mechanical, electrical, and human failure can equip the analyst with most of this knowledge.

Mechanical failure can tell the analyst particular information about what was physically happening at the time of the failure. This can be extremely valuable to know for the analyst. It is important to get to the physical cause of a failure as fast as possible. This is usually not difficult because the reliability physics of material is straight forward. An example of this would be a shaft that failed in a torsion overload condition such as the one shown in *figure 1*.

The forty-five degree angle of the break indicates that the shaft was in torsion at the time of failure, the surface corrosion indicates that the shaft's material fatigue strength was weakened, and the chevron marks on the fractured surface indicate that the material was overloaded. This information allows the analyst to rule out fatigue and erosion and focus the failure scenarios that would explain how the shaft came to be corroded and overloaded.




Figure 1

The root cause analyst can also benefit from a solid understanding of electrical failure modes in such equipment as breakers, relays, batteries, transformers, etc. If a relay fails and there is a signal loss that could have been due to high resistance the analyst would look for things that would cause high resistance such as a connection failure, sulfur or chloride contamination, insulation breakdown, thermal cycle fatigue and/or mechanical fatigue failure of connections. This type of understanding will give the analyst a great step forward in solving the failure and understanding the failure mechanism.

I have spoken of the physical failure, which is the first and easiest understanding of any failure. Materials, in most cases fail in a familiar manner that can be explained using the properties of materials, service environment, and the conditions such as motion and flow that the material was

performing. This is needed, but it is the lesser concern because it has already happened and the components will be replaced and the equipment will quickly be restored to service. What should be the concern at this point is how the material or components came to be in the failed condition. This is more difficult to uncover because the human is now introduced into the failure mechanism. The human element has remained as a constant over time. The human when asked to expose what they may have done wrong to contribute to a failure situation will almost always skirt around the true chain of events to make it unclear as to their contribution if any. I have often found that the concern of being implicated is high enough that people will not give up information just in case it might look like they have had involvement in the event.

It is extremely important for the root cause analyst to understand human error and how it manifests itself in the work environment. I am going to talk about this to some extent because it is the corridor to the true root causes of events.

The place to start when dealing with human error is with the supervision of the work force. Good supervision makes all the difference in reducing the human error rate. A good supervisor motivates the employees through leadership. This means that the supervisor has informed the employees of the expectations and has taken an active role in enforcing those expectations through a means that gets the point across but not in a threatening manner. This is accomplished through a consistent style of addressing expectation problems immediately and not waiting until it has become a bad habit (habits are hard to change). The other part of this is to constantly reinforce the expectations until those expectations are a part of the work culture. Good supervision is the number one skill in reducing human error. There are nine other skills that a supervisor should strive to master.

1. Accountability
2. Field Surveillance
3. Review & Verification
4. Pre-job Briefing
5. Complacency Mitigation
6. Problem Solving
7. Command & Control
8. Communication & Coordination
9. Crew Turnover

This is the framework that begins the process of reducing human error.

Other things that affect the human error rate that are considered to be human error traps are time pressure to perform work. This is the top reason that human error occurs. Employees generally want to do a good job and deliver for their supervision. Often in our work culture there are perceptions that are reinforced by actions that production is paramount over all other management concerns. This manifests itself through the supervisor asking are we ready to start up? How much longer will it take? This type of pressure real or perceived causes employees to cut corners or to miss steps in a sequence that cause secondary events to occur such as injury, delayed start-ups and maintenance mishaps.

Now lets combine a distractive environment with the pressure to get done on time or to start up on time. A distractive environment is defined as some type of interruption every 5 to 15 minutes. This would include the management asking is it ready yet to field personnel asking questions about job sequences or job routines. This manifests itself in cultures where the employees are micromanaged or when practice and rehearsal job training are not routine. This culture is one where there is poor supervision and the workforces are not confident enough to make decisions on their own. There are of course other things that may come into play as contributors but if you encounter this type of manifestation you can count on the higher rate of human errors. The added distraction with pressure can increase the possibility of human error to as high as a 31% chance.

Other things that contribute are:

1. High Workload
2. First Time Evolution
3. First Working Day After Days Off
4. One-Half Hour After Wake-Up or Meal
5. Vague or Incorrect Guidance
6. Over-Confidence
7. Imprecise Communication
8. Work Stress

If the root cause analyst understands human error and how it affects the work, they can make recommendations that will minimize the human error rate. This is usually learned during a root cause investigation but it can become a proactive tool in reducing the need for performing root cause in the future.

Common latent root causes that are discovered are procedural problems, training issues, culture issues, design issues, supervision issues, accountability issues, proper tool usage issues, etc. When the root cause analyst drives into the latent area quantum benefits can be gained by the company as I have expressed at the beginning of this article. Leveraging what is learned from the investigation back into the company is the most important part of the root cause analyst's job.

At this point cost becomes a large factor as to how much management is willing to invest into the correction of the root causes identified. As an example let's say an identified root cause might be a procedure is inadequate for the job because there were steps missing that if followed would have avoided the event. The management will now have to make a decision to add the missing steps, revamp the entire procedure, train the personnel involved on how to properly perform that particular job task, discipline the individual or some combination of these items. PITFALL.

From a cost standpoint it is cheaper to add a few steps and take discipline against the individual. This covers the management as far as compliance goes but it does not solve the problem. It may have been that the procedure was too difficult to follow in the first place and now as a quick fix we add more steps to make it more complicated. If this is the case, the root cause investigation has uncovered the true roots but the management's decision to add steps has allowed the failure mechanism to stay in place. Usually there would be a combination of procedure review to look for human error traps and rewrite the procedure without the traps. Then we would do some training on the proper execution of the procedure. Taking the cheap way out removes the ability for quantum benefits and leaves you with incremental improvement at best.

To conclude, you as root cause investigators have a responsibility to get to the true root causes and to have the training and tools to allow you to accomplish this task. The management has the responsibility to review the root causes and implement recommendations that will remove the failure mechanism while reporting the knowledge back into the organization.

About the Author

Mark Latino is Vice President of Operations for Reliability Center, Inc. (RCI). Mark came to RCI after 19 years in corporate America. During those years a wealth of reliability, maintenance, and manufacturing experience was acquired. He worked for Weyerhaeuser Corporation in a production role during the early stages of his career. He was an active part of Allied Chemical Corporations (Now Honeywell) Reliability Strive for Excellence initiative that was started in the 70's to define, understand, document, and live the reliability culture until he left in 1986. Mark spent 10 years with Philip Morris primarily in a production capacity that later ended in a reliability engineering role. Mark is a graduate of Old Dominion University and holds a BS Degree in Business Management that focused on Production & Operations Management.

Some content within this paper is based on the Eisenhart Seminar Series, © Copyright 2004 VATIC. All rights reserved. Used with Permission.

