Riveter Machine Reconditioning for Output Capacity Increase

Edgardo Porcell Torres
Advisor: Héctor J. Cruzado PhD, PE
Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico, Graduate School

Abstract

The ability to ramp up or down production in order to quickly respond to customers' demand is a necessity in today's competitive lean manufacturing environments. Output capacity bottlenecks forces manufacturing plants to meet customer peaks in demand by stacking up their inventory levels.

The production output capacity of the second stage of a 2-stage manufacturing cell was identified as a bottleneck and a plan was devised to double its capacity by reconditioning an unused defective riveter machine.

After a multi-disciplinary team was deployed to tackle all identified problems, the riveter was placed in production, effectively doubling the output capacity of the cell. Also, new opportunities were identified for further increasing capacity in the future.

Introduction

A manufacturing plant assembles a product in two stages: assembly and riveting. The assembly stage is a manual operation and can be ramped up or down according to demand. The riveting stage is an operational bottleneck because it is done on a unique riveter machine that processes only one product at a time at a fixed rate of 25 parts per hour. The riveting cell has only one operational riveter. A second riveter is currently available, but inoperable due to design flaws and programing bugs. There is an opportunity to increase the output capacity of the riveting stage if the second riveter machine gets reconditioned and incorporated into the assembly cell as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1
Current and Future State diagram for assembly cell

The objective of management is to double the output capacity of the riveting cell (50 parts per hour) in order to meet demand peaks by reconditioning the existing inoperable riveter machine in the following two months.

Methodology

Riveter Design Problems

- Design Flaw: During the riveting process, the riveter head presses down on the assembly before the spindle reaches the riveting point in order to minimize vibration, which can cause the product to disassemble before the riveting cycle completes. However, as the surface of the "primary contacts assembly" is uneven by product design, uneven stress gets propagated at the base of the machine's riveter head, causing machine breakage
- Programing Bug: Each "primary contact assembly" has 4 riveting points and the machine must rivet one at a time. The riveting sequence is important because the design of the product is asymmetrical and can become unstable due to vibration during the riveting process. The machine program currently starts riveting at a point in which the product is not yet very stable causing it to disassemble during riveting.

Technical Solutions (Methodology)

- Design Solution: Remove the pressure pad on the riveter head and provide an alternative method to hold down the assembly in place during the riveting process. The proposed solution will excerpt force vertically instead of horizontally and will have no interaction with the riveter head.
- Programing Solution: Re-program the riveter sequence such that the first two riveting steps are made at the points where the product is most stable. That way, the least stable riveting steps can be performed with a high probability of success as riveting points 1 and 2 bring stability to the assembly.

Plan and Schedule

The project's milestones can now be identified as the completion of each solution described in the previous section, namely: (1) Resolve design flaws and (2) Resolve programing bugs. Each milestone can be subdivided into a sequence of tasks, and each task assigned to one or more internal resources as shown in Table 1 and scheduled as in Figure 2:

Figure 2
Gantt Chart for project planning



Milestone	Task	Resource
1	Replace Pressure Pad	Maintenance
1	Design holder	Tool Room / Manufacturing
1	Fabricate holder	Tool Room
1	Install / Validate Holder	Maintenance / Manufacturing
2	Re-program	Manufacturing
2	Final Validation	Manufacturing

Table 1
Tasks and resources per milestone

Results

The output capacity of the cell was increased by 100%. A mock 4-hour session was performed with the production personnel to validate that the project's goals had been reached while the manufacturing team monitored production.

As can be seen in Figure 3, the average output obtained during the 4-hour session was 50.5. During the first hour, an output of 48 parts was obtained. The lower output during the initial hour can be explained by the operators setting up the equipment while the manufacturing team provided instructions for using the new equipment.

Once the equipment was setup, production did not fall behind the 50 parts per hour mark. A maximum output of 52 parts was obtained during hour # 3.



Figure 3
Assembly Cell's Production Output per Hour

Discussion

Task and milestones were completed in time. Progress moved steadily according to the planned schedule. The multidisciplinary team engagement and cohesion played a crucial part in the completion of the project. As an example, the collaboration between the manufacturing and tool room teams in the design of the holder proved to be key for timely completion of the project by preventing the need for redesigning.

Conclusion

Adding an identical machine to run in parallel to an existing equipment is an effective way to double output capacity in a manufacturing line or cell, if production bottlenecks do not exist in the previous stages. In our case, the effectiveness of this strategy depended on the ability of the assembly stage to ramp up or down as needed. If the assembly stage was unable to meet a demand of 50 parts per hour at a minimum, then additional actions items should have been identified to tackle opportunities in the assembly stage.

For future consideration, it might be possible to further increase output capacity in excess of 50 parts per hour by fine-tuning the riveters' speed parameters. This opportunity was identified during the re-programing task by the manufacturing team. This opportunity was not pursued at the time of this project as it was outside of its scope and it was esteemed that pursing this goal might have jeopardized meeting the deadline.

References

[1] Pinedo, Michael L., "Introduction," in Scheduling – Theory, Algorithms and Systems 5th ed. New York, USA: Springer Publishing, 2016, ch. 1, sec. 1.1, pp. 1.

[2] Weng, Wei and Fujimura, Shigeru, "Online Scheduling of Flexible Flow Shop Manufacturing" 2009 International Joint Conference on Computational Sciences and Optimization City, Sanya, Hainan, pp. 112-116, 2009.

[3] Conway, Richard W., et.al., "Further Problems with One Operation Per Job," in Theory of Scheduling 1st ed. New York, USA: Dover Publications, 2003, ch. 4, sec. 4.4 pp. 76.

[4] Palmer, Richard D., "Glossary," in Maintenance Planning and Scheduling Handbook 2nd ed. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Inc., 2006, pp. 802.

[5] Bloom, Neil B., "Fundamental RCM Concepts Explained," in Reliability Centered Maintenance – Implementation Made Easy 1st ed. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Inc., 2006, ch. 3, sec. 3.3 pp. 40.