Bruce Wallace
Customer Success Manager

Maureen Wilson
Reliability Solutions Specialist

Nic Grither
Reliability Engineering Manager

Bruce, Maureen, and Nic are part of the Reliability Solutions team at Experitec, your Emerson Impact Partner. Experitec's team has been trained to diagnose and understand pretty much everything there is to know about control valves, rotating equipment, and instrumentation that affects critical asset performance in manufacturing and processing plants. With decades of experience amongst the team, chances are that if you're experiencing an issue, we've seen it before. As such, we would like to share—and debunk—three of the top myths that we commonly encounter when companies try to improve their facility's reliability performance.

MYTH #1 We've gotten by so far; why should we change our reliability approach now?

Reality: The numbers don't lie...A more reliable plant is a safer and more productive plant. Getting by is just not acceptable to meet today's safety, cost, and environmental requirements. Whether you have a full-blown program or are just starting out with a few analytical techniques, the pace of technological advancements can bring the benefits of reliability improvements closer than ever before. Without a solid approach, you have no means to sustain those gains, nor any way to measure progress. No matter where your organization may be in its maintenance and reliability journey, the fact remains that there is a high ceiling for fortifying your approach. Companies that consistently outpace their competitors have a dedicated focus on using reliability to increase production while simultaneously reducing plant maintenance costs. Suffice it to say, even a small investment in reliability can pay big dividends.

MYTH #2 Changing or re-designing our reliability approach is too expensive and time prohibitive.

Reality: Expense and time are the most common factors that prevent people from making incremental improvements in their reliability journey. The fact is that most downtime events and unplanned costs are usually due to a handful of 'bad actors', and it only requires a small investment to monitor the health of those critical assets. Typically, the return on investment (ROI) can be achieved within a single incident avoidance, and each additional preventable failure equates to more reclaimed production that in turn can fund future reliability efforts. Demonstrating small (or big) wins on just a few pieces of equipment creates a positive cycle that motivates change and eases the purse strings—further increasing the potential for ROI as more assets are pulled into your program.

MYTH #3 We think we're getting good results, but how can we be sure that we're not missing anything? What else can we do to maximize our data collection efforts?

Reality: If a member of your team or an outside contractor is collecting PdM data on some routine basis, it is very likely that things can be missed. For instance, it's common for some pieces of equipment to be on routes that are either inaccessible or unavailable at the time of collection. What happens if you or someone is late analyzing that data for another month...or more? By the time an actual analysis occurs, other problems could have materialized.

That's the unfortunate reality of reliability in most facilities, and it's paramount that conventional PdM approaches be augmented with new techniques to maximize the chance of predicting and preventing failures. When deciding how to structure your program or when to enlist outside help, consider the frequency, quality, and ownership of the data. Nobody likes spending money to look at perfectly healthy assets while other issues persist. Be aware that if your contractor changes, a decade's worth of *your* historical data and plant knowledge may walk out the door with them.

Look for more reliability myths 'debunked' from Experitec, and please share your stories with our MythBusters, Bruce, Maureen, and Nic.

experitec.com