

Gamma processes and peaks-over-threshold distributions for time-dependent reliability

J.M. van Noortwijk^{a,b,*}, J.A.M. van der Weide^b, M.J. Kallen^{a,b}, M.D. Pandey^c

^a*HKV Consultants, P.O. Box 2120, NL-8203 AC Lelystad, The Netherlands*

^b*Faculty of Electrical Engineering, Mathematics and Computer Science, Delft University of Technology, P.O. Box 5031, NL-2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands*

^c*Department of Civil Engineering, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ont., Canada N2L 3G1*

Received in revised form 16 August 2006; accepted 2 November 2006

Available online 21 December 2006

Abstract

In the evaluation of structural reliability, a failure is defined as the event in which stress exceeds a resistance that is liable to deterioration. This paper presents a method to combine the two stochastic processes of deteriorating resistance and fluctuating load for computing the time-dependent reliability of a structural component. The deterioration process is modelled as a gamma process, which is a stochastic process with independent non-negative increments having a gamma distribution with identical scale parameter. The stochastic process of loads is generated by a Poisson process. The variability of the random loads is modelled by a peaks-over-threshold distribution (such as the generalised Pareto distribution). These stochastic processes of deterioration and load are combined to evaluate the time-dependent reliability.

© 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Deterioration; Load; Gamma process; Peaks-over-threshold distribution; Poisson process; Kac functional equation

1. Introduction

In structural engineering, a distinction can often be made between a structure's resistance and its applied stress. A failure may then be defined as the event in which—due to deterioration—the resistance drops below the stress. This paper proposes a method to combine the two stochastic processes of deteriorating resistance and fluctuating load for computing the time-dependent reliability of a structural system.

As deterioration is generally uncertain and non-decreasing, it can best be regarded as a gamma process (see, e.g. [1]). The gamma process is a stochastic process with independent non-negative increments having a gamma distribution with identical scale parameter. The loads occur at random times according to a Poisson process. We

consider loads that are larger than a certain threshold rather than the loads themselves, because the Poisson assumption is then better justified [2,3]. In order to determine the probability distribution of extreme loads (such as water levels, discharges, waves, winds, temperatures and rainfall), we use the peaks-over-threshold method. Exceedances over the threshold are typically assumed to have a generalised Pareto distribution [4,5].

Given the above definitions of the stochastic processes of deterioration and load, they are combined to compute the time-dependent reliability. This method extends the approach of Mori and Ellingwood [6], who modelled the uncertainty in the deterioration process through a probability distribution of the damage growth rate rather than assuming it as a stochastic process.

The paper is organised as follows. The stochastic processes of deteriorating resistance and fluctuating load are presented in Sections 2 and 3, respectively. These two stochastic processes are combined for the purpose of time-dependent reliability analysis in Section 4. The proposed method is applied to a dike reliability problem in Section 5 and conclusions are formulated in Section 6.

*Corresponding author. HKV Consultants, P.O. Box 2120, NL-8203 AC Lelystad, The Netherlands. Tel.: +31 320 294203; fax: +31 320 253901.

E-mail address: j.m.van.noortwijk@hkv.nl (J.M. van Noortwijk).

2. Stochastic process of deterioration

Deterioration can be regarded as a time-dependent stochastic process $\{X(t), t \geq 0\}$ where $X(t)$ is a random quantity for all $t \geq 0$. At first glance, it seems possible to represent the uncertainty in a deterioration process by the normal distribution. This probability distribution has been used for modelling the exchange value of shares and the movement of small particles in fluids and air. A characteristic feature of this model, also denoted by the Brownian motion with drift (see, e.g. [7, Chapter 7]), is that a structure’s resistance alternately increases and decreases, like the exchange value of a share. For this reason, the Brownian motion is inadequate in modelling deterioration which proceeds in one direction. For example, a dike of which the height is subject to a Brownian deterioration can, according to the model, spontaneously rise up, which of course cannot occur in practice. In order for the stochastic deterioration process to proceed in one direction, we can best consider it as a gamma process (see, e.g. [8]).

The gamma process is a stochastic process with independent non-negative increments (e.g. the increments of crest-level decline of a dike) having a gamma distribution with identical scale parameter. In the case of a gamma deterioration, dikes can only sink. To the best of the authors’ knowledge, Abdel-Hameed [1] was the first to propose the gamma process as a proper model for deterioration occurring random in time. The gamma process is suitable to model gradual damage monotonically accumulating over time, such as wear, fatigue, corrosion, crack growth, erosion, consumption, creep, swell, a degrading health index, etc. For the mathematical aspects of gamma processes, see Dufresne et al. [9], Ferguson and Klass [10], Singpurwalla [11], and van der Weide [12]. An advantage of modelling deterioration processes through gamma processes is that the required mathematical calculations are relatively straightforward. The stochastic differential equation from which the gamma process follows is presented by Wenocur [13].

In mathematical terms, the gamma process is defined as follows. Recall that a random quantity X has a gamma distribution with shape parameter $v > 0$ and scale parameter $u > 0$ if its probability density function is given by

$$Ga(x|v, u) = \frac{u^v}{\Gamma(v)} x^{v-1} \exp\{-ux\} 1_{(0,\infty)}(x),$$

where $1_A(x) = 1$ for $x \in A$ and $1_A(x) = 0$ for $x \notin A$. Furthermore, let $v(t)$ be a non-decreasing, right continuous, real-valued function for $t \geq 0$ with $v(0) \equiv 0$. The gamma process with shape function $v(t) > 0$ and scale parameter $u > 0$ is a continuous-time stochastic process $\{X(t), t \geq 0\}$ with the following properties:

- (1) $X(0) = 0$ with probability one,
- (2) $X(\tau) - X(t) \sim Ga(v(\tau) - v(t), u)$ for all $\tau > t \geq 0$,
- (3) $X(t)$ has independent increments.

Let $X(t)$ denote the deterioration at time $t, t \geq 0$, and let the probability density function of $X(t)$, in conformity with the definition of the gamma process, be given by

$$f_{X(t)}(x) = Ga(x|v(t), u) \tag{1}$$

with

$$E(X(t)) = \frac{v(t)}{u}, \quad \text{Var}(X(t)) = \frac{v(t)}{u^2}. \tag{2}$$

A component is said to fail when its deteriorating resistance, denoted by $R(t) = r_0 - X(t)$, drops below the stress s (see Fig. 1). For the time being, we assume both the initial resistance r_0 and the stress s to be deterministic. Let the time at which failure occurs be denoted by the lifetime T . Due to the gamma distributed deterioration, Eq. (1), the lifetime distribution can then be written as

$$F(t) = \Pr\{T \leq t\} = \Pr\{X(t) \geq r_0 - s\} \\ = \int_{x=r_0-s}^{\infty} f_{X(t)}(x) dx = \frac{\Gamma(v(t), [r_0 - s]u)}{\Gamma(v(t))}, \tag{3}$$

where $\Gamma(a, x) = \int_{t=x}^{\infty} t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt$ is the incomplete gamma function for $x \geq 0$ and $a > 0$. Using the chain rule for differentiation, the probability density function of the lifetime is

$$f(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \left[\frac{\Gamma(v(t), [r_0 - s]u)}{\Gamma(v(t))} \right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial \tilde{v}} \left[\frac{\Gamma(\tilde{v}, [r_0 - s]u)}{\Gamma(\tilde{v})} \right] \Big|_{\tilde{v}=v(t)} v'(t) \tag{4}$$

under the assumption that the shape function $v(t)$ is differentiable. The partial derivative in Eq. (4) can be calculated by the algorithm of Moore [14]. Using a series expansion and a continued fraction expansion, this algorithm computes the first and second partial derivatives with respect to x and a of the incomplete gamma integral

$$P(a, x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(a)} \int_{t=0}^x t^{a-1} e^{-t} dt = \frac{\Gamma(a) - \Gamma(a, x)}{\Gamma(a)}.$$

In modelling the temporal variability in the deterioration, a key input is the trend of the expected deterioration increasing over time. Empirical studies show that the




Fig. 1. Stochastic processes of deterioration and stress/load.

expected deterioration at time t often follows a power law:

$$E(X(t)) = \frac{v(t)}{u} = \frac{at^b}{u} \tag{5}$$

for some physical constants $u > 0$, $a > 0$, and $b > 0$. Some examples are the expected degradation of concrete due to corrosion of reinforcement (linear: $b = 1$), sulfate attack (parabolic: $b = 2$), and diffusion-controlled aging (square root: $b = 0.5$) studied by Ellingwood and Mori [15]. Because there is often engineering knowledge available about the shape of the expected deterioration (for example, in terms of the parameter b in Eq. (5)), this parameter may be assumed constant. In the event of expected deterioration in terms of a power law, the parameters a and u yet must be assessed by using expert judgment and/or statistics. It should be noted that the analysis of this paper is not restricted to using a power law for modelling the expected deterioration over time. As a matter of fact, any shape function $v(t)$ suffices, as long as it is a non-decreasing, right continuous, and real-valued function.

An important special case is the gamma process with stationary increments, which is defined by a linear shape function $at > 0$, $t \geq 0$, and scale parameter $u > 0$. The corresponding probability density function of $X(t)$ is then given by

$$f_{X(t)}(x) = \text{Ga}(x|at, u). \tag{6}$$

Due to the stationarity, both the mean value and the variance of the deterioration are linear in time; that is,

$$E(X(t)) = \frac{at}{u}, \quad \text{Var}(X(t)) = \frac{at}{u^2}.$$

A stochastic process has stationary increments if the probability distribution of the increments $X(t+h) - X(t)$ depends only on h for all $t, h \geq 0$. A gamma process with $a = u = 1$ is called a standardised gamma process.

An important property of the gamma process is that it is a jump process (for an illustration, see Fig. 1). For a gamma process, the number of jumps in any time interval is infinite with probability one. Nevertheless, $E(X(t))$ is finite, as the majority of jumps are extremely small. Dufresne et al. [9] showed that the gamma process can be regarded as a limit of a compound Poisson process. Note that for a compound Poisson process, the number of jumps in any time interval is finite with probability one.

Because deterioration should preferably be monotone, we can choose the best deterioration process to be a compound Poisson process or a gamma process. In the presence of inspection data, the advantage of the gamma process over the compound Poisson process is evident: measurements generally consist of deterioration increments rather than of jump intensities and jump sizes.

A very useful property of the gamma process with stationary increments is that the gamma density in Eq. (6) transforms into an exponential density if $t = a^{-1}$. When the unit-time length is chosen to be a^{-1} , the increments of deterioration are exponentially distributed with mean u^{-1}

and the probability of failure in unit time i reduces to a shifted Poisson distribution with mean $1 + u(r_0 - s)$ (see e.g. [16]):

$$p_i = \Pr \left\{ \frac{i-1}{a} < T \leq \frac{i}{a} \right\} \\ = \frac{1}{(i-1)!} [u(r_0 - s)]^{i-1} \exp\{-u(r_0 - s)\}, \tag{7}$$

$i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Note that this probability function is a shifted Poisson distribution because it is defined for $i = 1, 2, \dots$ rather than for $i = 0, 1, \dots$. A physical explanation for the appearance of the Poisson distribution (7) is that it represents the probability that exactly i exponentially distributed jumps with mean u^{-1} cause the component to fail; that is, cause the cumulative amount of deterioration to exceed $r_0 - s$.

The unit time for which the increments of deterioration are exponentially distributed, facilitates the algebraic manipulations considerably and, moreover, often results in a very good approximation of the optimal design or maintenance decision, especially when the expected cost must be calculated. Examples are determining optimal dike heightenings and optimal sand nourishments whose expected discounted costs are minimal ([17,18], respectively) and determining cost-optimal rates of inspection for berm breakwaters and the rock dumping of the Eastern-Scheldt barrier (see [8,16,19]).

3. Stochastic process of load

In this section, the design stress is replaced by loads occurring at random times according to a Poisson process. We consider load threshold exceedances rather than the loads themselves, because the Poisson assumption is in this context better justified.

For probabilistic design, the distribution of extreme loads (such as water levels, discharges, waves, winds, temperatures and rainfall) is of considerable interest. For example, the probability distribution of high sea water levels is important for designing sea dikes. In order to determine the probability distribution of extreme load quantities, we can use extreme-value theory. Extreme-value analysis can be based on either maxima in a given time period (block maxima), or on peaks over a given threshold. The advantage of using peaks over threshold rather than block maxima is the availability of more observations. Using only block maxima generally leads to loss of information.

In the peaks-over-threshold method, all load values larger than a certain threshold are considered. The differences between these values and a given threshold are called exceedances over the threshold. These exceedances are typically assumed to have a generalised Pareto distribution (Section 3.1). The stochastic process of load threshold exceedances can be considered as a Poisson process (Section 3.2).

3.1. Generalised Pareto distribution

A random variable Y has a generalised Pareto distribution with scale parameter $\sigma > 0$ and shape parameter c if the probability density function of Y is given by

$$Pa(y|\sigma, c) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sigma} \left[1 - \frac{cy}{\sigma}\right]_+^{(1/c)-1} I_{(0,\infty)}(y), & c \neq 0, \sigma > 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{y}{\sigma}\right\} I_{(0,\infty)}(y), & c = 0, \sigma > 0, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

where $[y]_+ = \max\{0, y\}$. The survival function is defined by

$$Pr\{Y > y\} = \bar{F}_Y(y) = \begin{cases} \left[1 - \frac{cy}{\sigma}\right]_+^{1/c} I_{(0,\infty)}(y), & c \neq 0, \sigma > 0, \\ \exp\left\{-\frac{y}{\sigma}\right\} I_{(0,\infty)}(y), & c = 0, \sigma > 0. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

The range of y is $0 < y < \infty$ for $c \leq 0$ and $0 < y < \sigma/c$ for $c > 0$. The case $c = 0$, which is the exponential distribution, is the limiting distribution as $c \rightarrow 0$. The generalised Pareto distribution mathematically arises as a class of limit distributions for exceeding a certain threshold, as the threshold increases toward the distribution’s right tail. The conditions that must be satisfied in order to assure the existence of such limit distributions are rather mild. For the mathematical details, we refer to Pickands III [4] and de Haan [5].

3.2. Homogeneous Poisson process

Apart from the probability distribution of load threshold exceedances, the stochastic process of the occurrence times of these load exceedances needs to be specified. We define the load threshold exceedance to be $Y = L - l_0 \geq 0$ with threshold l_0 . Threshold exceedances Y_1, \dots, Y_n are assumed to be mutually independent and to have a generalised Pareto distribution, where $Y_i = L_i - l_0, i = 1, \dots, n$. In most hydrological applications, the occurrence process of exceedances of large thresholds can be regarded as a Poisson process (see, e.g. [20]). To overcome the problem of dependence between successive threshold exceedances in very small time periods, threshold exceedances are defined to be the peaks in clusters of threshold exceedances. Approximating the occurrence process of threshold exceedances by a Poisson process is supported by asymptotic extreme-value theory [2,3]. It follows that the higher the threshold, the better the approximation [4].

Let the inter-occurrence times of threshold exceedances T_1, T_2, \dots be an independent, identically distributed, sequence of random quantities having an exponential distribution with mean λ^{-1} . Hence, the cumulative distribution function of the inter-occurrence time of threshold exceedances, T , is given by

$$Pr\{T \leq t\} = F_T(t|\lambda) = 1 - \exp\{-\lambda t\}. \tag{10}$$

Define the sequence of partial sums by $S_i = T_1 + \dots + T_i, i = 1, 2, \dots$. The homogeneous Poisson process $\{N(t), t \geq 0\}$ with intensity λ is defined as

$$N(t) = \max\{n | S_n \leq t\}. \tag{11}$$

Hence, the following two events are equivalent:

$$N(t) = n \Leftrightarrow S_n \leq t < S_{n+1}. \tag{12}$$

According to Karlin and Taylor [7, pp. 126–127], the joint probability density function of the occurrence times S_1, \dots, S_n is given by

$$f_{S_1, \dots, S_n}(s_1, \dots, s_n) = \lambda^n \exp\{-\lambda s_n\} 1_{\{0 < s_1 < s_2 < \dots < s_n\}}. \tag{13}$$

The Poisson process implies that the probability that exactly n load threshold exceedances occur in time interval $(0, t]$ can be written as

$$Pr\{N(t) = n\} = \frac{(\lambda t)^n}{n!} \exp\{-\lambda t\}, \quad n = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \tag{14}$$

for all $t \geq 0$; that is, the random quantity $N(t)$ follows a Poisson distribution with parameter λt . This parameter equals the expected number of threshold exceedances in time period $(0, t]$. The Poisson process $\{N(t), t \geq 0\}$ with $N(0) = 0$ has independent increments.

4. Combination of deterioration and load

Given the definition of the stochastic process of deterioration and the stochastic process of load, the question arises how we can combine them. The mathematical derivation and numerical computation of time-dependent failure probabilities are studied in Sections 4.1 and 4.2, respectively.

4.1. Derivation of failure probability

To combine the stochastic processes of deterioration and load, we follow the approach of Ellingwood and Mori [15]. On the basis of a useful property of the Poisson process, they proposed an elegant way to combine stochastic load with a resistance decreasing over time. The first assumption is that the stochastic processes of deterioration and load are independent. Mori and Ellingwood [21] claim that the deterioration can be treated as deterministic, because “its variability was found to have a second-order effect on the structural reliability”. This conclusion is based on Mori and Ellingwood [6] in which they modelled the uncertainty in the deterioration process by posing a probability distribution on the damage growth rate a/u of the power law in Eq. (5). However, in Section 5, we will show this conclusion is not always justified.

In order to combine the load events with the deteriorating resistance, Mori and Ellingwood [21] assumed that the duration of extreme load events is generally very short and is negligible in comparison with the service life of a structure. Therefore, they regard the load threshold exceedances as a series of pulses having an “infinitely

small” duration (see Fig. 1). As a consequence, we may then suppose that the resistance does not degrade during the occurrence of an extreme load event. Furthermore, they assume that failure can only occur during exceedances of the load threshold.

Assume that there are n changes of the Poisson process in time interval $[0, t]$; i.e., consider $0 \leq S_1 \leq S_2 \leq \dots \leq S_n \leq t$. Karlin and Taylor [7, pp. 126–127] show that S_1, \dots, S_n can be regarded as a set of order statistics of size n associated with a sample of n independent uniformly distributed random quantities on the interval $[0, t]$. The conditional probability distribution of the occurrence time of a load threshold exceedance, given one exceedance of the load threshold occurred in $(0, t]$, directly follows from the memoryless property of the exponential distribution: it is a uniform distribution on the interval $[0, t]$.

The conditional probability of no failure in time interval $(0, t]$, when n independent threshold exceedances of the load Y are given with cumulative distribution function $\Pr\{Y \leq y\} = F_Y(y)$, can now be formulated as [7, p. 180]

$$\Pr\{\text{no failure in } (0, t] | N(t) = n\} = E\left(\left[\int_{u=0}^t \frac{F_Y([r_0 - s_0] - X(u))}{t} du\right]^n\right), \tag{15}$$

where $s_0 \leq r_0$ and the expectation is defined with respect to the stochastic process $\{X(t), t > 0\}$. This result was obtained by Ellingwood and Mori [15] for deterministic deterioration and extended by Mori and Ellingwood [6] for deterioration with a random damage growth rate. Mathematically, the last step follows by conditioning on the sample paths of the gamma process, using the fact that the load threshold exceedances are independent, and applying the law of total probabilities with respect to the sample paths of the gamma process. Because failure can only occur at load threshold exceedances, and these exceedances are independent and uniformly distributed on $[0, t]$, we primarily can focus solely on these n exceedances.

Invoking the law of total probabilities with respect to the number of load threshold exceedances, the probability of no failure in time interval $(0, t]$ or survival probability can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}(t) &= 1 - F(t) = \Pr\{\text{no failure in } (0, t]\} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Pr\{\text{no failure in } (0, t] | N(t) = n\} \Pr\{N(t) = n\} \\ &= E\left(\exp\left\{-\lambda \int_{u=0}^t \bar{F}_Y([r_0 - l_0] - X(u)) du\right\}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

The expectation in Eq. (16) is defined with respect to the non-decreasing stochastic process $\{X(t), t > 0\}$. This result was obtained by Ellingwood and Mori [15] for deterministic deterioration and extended by the same authors in [6] for deterioration with a random damage growth rate. Eq. (16) generalises the lifetime model of van Noortwijk and Klatte [22] in which the load was assumed to be equal to the constant design stress s . The cumulative distribution

function of the lifetime is:

$$F(t) = 1 - E\left(\exp\left\{-\int_{u=0}^t k(R(u)) du\right\}\right), \tag{17}$$

where $R(t) = r_0 - X(t)$ and the physics-based expression

$$k(r) = \lambda \bar{F}_Y(r - l_0) = \lambda \Pr\{L > r\} \tag{18}$$

can be interpreted as a killing rate for resistance r in the sense of Wenocur [13]. In our time-dependent stress-strength model, the killing rate is exactly the frequency of the stress $L = l_0 + Y$ exceeding the strength r . Hence, Eq. (18) gives a nice justification of Wenocur’s definition of the killing rate. Note that, by differentiating Eq. (17), the lifetime probability density function becomes

$$f_T(t) = E\left(k(R(t)) \exp\left\{-\int_{\tau=0}^t k(R(\tau)) d\tau\right\}\right). \tag{19}$$

Wenocur [13] considers a very interesting extension of a stationary gamma process for the deterioration state under two different failure modes. A system is said to fail either when a traumatic event (such as an extreme load) destroys it or when its condition reaches a failure level. Suppose that the traumatic events occur as a Poisson process with a rate (called the ‘killing rate’) which depends on the system’s condition. The latter is a meaningful assumption, since the worse the condition, the more vulnerable it is to failure due to trauma. A fixed failure level is often used in mathematical models to optimise inspection intervals for systems subject to gamma-process deterioration such as [8,23–26].

Two straightforward possible extensions of the time-dependent stress-strength model are the following. First, in situations where the initial resistance R_0 is unknown, the lifetime distribution in Eq. (17) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} F_T(t) &= 1 - \int_{r_0=l_0}^{\infty} E\left(\exp\left\{-\int_{\tau=0}^t k(r_0 - X(\tau)) d\tau\right\}\right) \\ &\quad \times f_{R_0}(r_0) dr_0, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $f_{R_0}(r_0)$ is the probability density function of R_0 , $R_0 \geq l_0$. Second, if we take a non-homogeneous Poisson process with rate function $\lambda(t)$ as the model for the times of load threshold exceedances, we can calculate in the same way as before the probability of the event that there is no failure during the time-interval $(0, t]$. The survival probability in Eq. (16) can then be revised to

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\{\text{no failure in } (0, t]\} &= E\left(\exp\left\{-\int_{u=0}^t \lambda(u) \bar{F}_Y([r_0 - l_0] - X(u)) du\right\}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

In the remaining part of the paper, we will confine ourselves to homogeneous Poisson processes for modelling the process of load threshold exceedances. This is mainly for notational convenience, because the proposed algorithm can be easily applied to non-homogeneous Poisson processes as well.

4.2. Computation of failure probability

In order to compute the time-dependent probability of failure, the following two-dimensional integral remains to be solved numerically:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & E\left(\exp\left\{-\int_{\tau=0}^t k(R(\tau))d\tau\right\}\right) \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty \dots \int_0^\infty \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^n k(r_0 - x_i)(t_i - t_{i-1})\right\} \\
 & \quad \times f_{X(t_1), \dots, X(t_n)}(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \dots dx_n, \tag{22}
 \end{aligned}$$

where $t_i = (i/n)t, i = 0, \dots, n$. This integral is a special case of the so-called Kac functional equation (see [13,27]) and can be solved numerically in two combined steps. The first step is to approximate the integral over time by applying numerical integration with respect to the time grid $0, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{n-1}, t_n$. The second step is to approximate the integral over the sample paths of the gamma process by applying Monte Carlo simulation with respect to the independent increments $X(t_1), X(t_2) - X(t_1), \dots, X(t_n) - X(t_{n-1})$.

Although we can approximate a gamma process with a limit of a compound Poisson process, it is not efficient to simulate a gamma process in such a way. This is because there are infinitely many jumps in each finite time interval. A better approach for simulating a gamma process is simulating independent increments with respect to very small units of time. For sampling independent gamma-process increments there are basically two methods: gamma-increment sampling and gamma-bridge sampling.

Gamma-increment sampling is defined as drawing independent samples $\delta_i = x_i - x_{i-1}$ from the gamma density

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Ga}(\delta|v(t_i) - v(t_{i-1}), u) \\
 &= \frac{u^{v(t_i)-v(t_{i-1})}}{\Gamma(v(t_i) - v(t_{i-1}))} \delta^{[v(t_i)-v(t_{i-1})]-1} \exp\{-u\delta\} \tag{23}
 \end{aligned}$$

for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, where $t_0 = x_0 = 0$.

Gamma-bridge sampling is described in Dufresne et al. [9]. It consists of the following steps. First, draw a sample of the cumulative amount of deterioration $X(t)$ at the end of the time interval $(0, t]$ that we are considering. Second, draw a sample of the cumulative deterioration $X(t/2)$ from the conditional distribution of $X(t/2)$ given $X(t) = x$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_{X(t/2)|X(t)}(y|x) &= \frac{1}{x} \text{Be}\left(\frac{y}{x} \middle| v\left(\frac{t}{2}\right), v(t) - v\left(\frac{t}{2}\right)\right) \\
 &= \frac{\Gamma(v(t))}{\Gamma(v(t/2))\Gamma(v(t) - v(t/2))} \left[\frac{y}{x}\right]^{v(t/2)-1} \\
 & \quad \times \left[1 - \frac{y}{x}\right]^{[v(t)-v(t/2)]-1} \left[\frac{1}{x}\right] \tag{24}
 \end{aligned}$$

for $0 \leq y \leq x$. This is a transformed beta density on the interval $[0, x]$ with parameters $v(t/2)$ and $v(t) - v(t/2)$. Third, subdivide this time interval $(0, t]$ into two intervals $(0, t/2]$ and $(t/2, t]$, and sample $X(t/4)$ given the value of

$X(t/2)$ and $X(3t/4)$ given the value of $X(t)$. Similarly, we can simulate the values of $X(t/8), X(3t/8), X(5t/8), X(7t/8)$, and so on. An example of gamma-bridge sampling is given in Fig. 1.

The advantage of gamma-bridge sampling over gamma-increment sampling is that old iteration results can still be used if we would decide to increase the accuracy. Gamma-bridge sampling allows the accuracy to be pre-defined and the numerical integration to be terminated when that accuracy is achieved.

5. Example: Den Helder sea defense

For the purpose of illustration, we study the probability of failure of a dike section subject to crest-level decline. The dike section is part of the sea defense at Den Helder in the North-West of the Netherlands and was constructed as early as in 1775.

The failure mechanism that we regard is overtopping of the sea dike by waves. Both sea level and crest-level decline are considered random, whereas wave run-up is considered fixed. The wave run-up is represented by the height $z_{2\%}$ (this is the wave run-up level in metres, which is exceeded by 2% of the number of incoming waves). Furthermore, the effect of seiches, gust surges and gust oscillations is taken into account by the factor b_0 (m). For the Den Helder sea defense, the wave run-up height is computed as $z_{2\%} = 7.52$ m and the effect of seiches and gusts as $b_0 = 0.2$ m. The Den Helder sea defense has a crest level of $h = 12.33$ m + NAP (normal Amsterdam level). Including the effects of waves, seiches and gusts, the initial resistance of the dike can be defined as $r_0 = h - z_{2\%} - b_0 = 4.61$ m + NAP.

To account for the temporal variability of the sea level, we assume that the occurrence of extreme sea levels can be




Fig. 2. Cumulative distribution and survival function of the lifetime with $CV(X(100)) = 0.3$.

modelled with a homogeneous Poisson process for the occurrence times of load threshold exceedances and a peaks-over-threshold distribution for the load threshold exceedances themselves. In particular, we use the generalised Pareto distribution estimated by Philippart et al. [28] for observed sea levels at Den Helder. They estimated the following parameter values: $\lambda = 0.5$, $l_0 = 2.19$, $\sigma = 0.3245$, and $c = 0.05465$. Using this generalised Pareto distribution, the design water level with an exceedance probability of 10^{-4} is 4.40 m + NAP. Crest-level decline consists of a combination of settlement, subsoil consolidation, and

relative sea-level rise. In van Dantzig [29], the expected crest-level decline was assumed to be 0.7 m per century. We regard the stochastic process of crest-level decline as a stationary gamma process with mean $E(X(100)) = 0.7$ and a corresponding coefficient of variation of 0.3; that is,

$$E(X(100)) = \frac{a \cdot 100}{u} = 0.7,$$

$$CV(X(100)) = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(X(100))}}{E(X(100))} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a \cdot 100}} = 0.3.$$




Fig. 3. Probability density function of the lifetime with $CV(X(100)) = 0.3$.




Fig. 4. Probability density function of the lifetime with deterministic deterioration.

Solving these equations for a and u leads to the parameter values $a = 0.1111$ and $u = 15.8730$. The 5th and 95th percentile of $X(100)$ are 0.39 and 1.08 m, respectively.

In Fig. 2, the cumulative distribution function and the survival function are shown based on Eq. (17). In this computation, the number of gamma-process sample paths is 10,000 with numerical integration step size of $t_i - t_{i-1} = 2$ years for all i . The probability density function of the lifetime in Eq. (19) is graphed in Fig. 3. In order to investigate the sensitivity of the probability density function of the time to failure with respect to the uncertainty in the deterioration, we also computed Eq. (19) with a deterministic deterioration. Obviously, Fig. 4 shows that the uncertainty in the deterioration really matters in quantifying the uncertainty in the lifetime.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, a method is presented to compute the time-dependent reliability of structures where both the deteriorating resistance and the fluctuating load are modelled as stochastic processes. The stochastic process of deterioration is modelled as a gamma process having independent gamma-distributed increments with identical scale parameter. The stochastic process of load is modelled as a combination of a peaks-over-threshold distribution (such as the generalised Pareto distribution) and a Poisson process for the threshold exceedances. It is shown that the cumulative distribution function of the time to failure, the time at which the resistance drops below the load, can be formulated as a Kac functional equation. This equation can be solved by combining numerical integration and simulating sample paths of the gamma process. The advantages of the proposed method are that a gamma process properly models the monotonic behaviour of aging and that peaks-over-threshold distributions is consistent with extreme-value statistics.

References

- [1] Abdel-Hameed M. A gamma wear process. *IEEE Trans Reliab* 1975;24(2):152–3.
- [2] Pickands III J. The two-dimensional Poisson process and extremal processes. *J Appl Probab* 1971;8(4):745–56.
- [3] Leadbetter MR. Extremes and local dependence in stationary sequences. *Z Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie Verw Geb* 1983;65:291–306.
- [4] Pickands III J. Statistical inference using extreme order statistics. *Ann Stat* 1975;3(1):119–31.
- [5] de Haan L. Fighting the arch-enemy with mathematics. *Stat Neerl* 1990;44(2):45–68.
- [6] Mori Y, Ellingwood BR. Maintaining: reliability of concrete structures. I: role of inspection/repair. *J Struct Eng* 1994;120(3):824–45.
- [7] Karlin S, Taylor HM. A first course in stochastic processes, second ed. San Diego: Academic Press; 1975.
- [8] van Noortwijk JM, Kok M, Cooke RM. Optimal maintenance decisions for the sea-bed protection of the Eastern-Scheldt barrier. In: Cooke R, Mendel M, Vrijling H, editors. *Engineering probabilistic design and maintenance for flood protection*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1997. p. 25–56.
- [9] Dufresne F, Gerber HU, Shiu ESW. Risk theory with the gamma process. *ASTIN Bull* 1991;21(2):177–92.
- [10] Ferguson TS, Klass MJ. A representation of independent increment processes without Gaussian components. *Ann Math Stat* 1972;43(5):1634–43.
- [11] Singpurwalla N. Gamma processes and their generalizations: an overview. In: Cooke R, Mendel M, Vrijling H, editors. *Engineering probabilistic design and maintenance for flood protection*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1997. p. 67–75.
- [12] van der Weide H. Gamma processes. In: Cooke R, Mendel M, Vrijling H, editors. *Engineering probabilistic design and maintenance for flood protection*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers; 1997. p. 77–83.
- [13] Wenocur ML. A reliability model based on the gamma process and its analytic theory. *Adv Appl Probab* 1989;21(4):899–918.
- [14] Moore RJ. Algorithm AS 187: derivatives of the incomplete gamma integral. *Appl Stat* 1982;31(3):330–5.
- [15] Ellingwood BR, Mori Y. Probabilistic methods for condition assessment and life prediction of concrete structures in nuclear power plants. *Nucl Eng Des* 1993;142(2–3):155–66.
- [16] van Noortwijk JM, Cooke RM, Kok M. A Bayesian failure model based on isotropic deterioration. *Eur J Oper Res* 1995;82(2):270–82.
- [17] Speijker LJP, van Noortwijk JM, Kok M, Cooke RM. Optimal maintenance decisions for dikes. *Probab Eng Inf Sci* 2000;14(1):101–21.
- [18] van Noortwijk JM, Peerbolte EB. Optimal sand nourishment decisions. *J Water Port Coastal Ocean Eng* 2000;126(1):30–8.
- [19] van Noortwijk JM, van Gelder PHAJM. Optimal maintenance decisions for berm breakwaters. *Struct Safety* 1996;18(4):293–309.
- [20] Buishand TA. Statistics of extremes in climatology. *Stat Neerl* 1989;43(1):1–30.
- [21] Mori Y, Ellingwood BR. Time-dependent system reliability analysis by adaptive importance sampling. *Struct Safety* 1993;12(1):59–73.
- [22] van Noortwijk JM, Klatter HE. Optimal inspection decisions for the block mats of the Eastern-Scheldt barrier. *Reliab Eng Syst Safety* 1999;65(3):203–11.
- [23] Dieulle L, Béranger C, Grall A, Roussignol M. Sequential condition-based maintenance scheduling for a deteriorating system. *Eur J Oper Res* 2003;150(2):451–61.
- [24] Grall A, Béranger C, Dieulle L. A condition-based maintenance policy for stochastically deteriorating systems. *Reliab Eng Sys Safety* 2002;76(2):167–80.
- [25] Grall A, Dieulle L, Béranger C, Roussignol M. Continuous-time predictive-maintenance scheduling for a deteriorating system. *IEEE Trans Reliab* 2002;51(2):141–50.
- [26] Park KS. Optimal continuous-wear limit replacement under periodic inspections. *IEEE Trans Reliab* 1988;37(1):97–102.
- [27] Beghin L, Hochberg KJ, Orsingher E. Conditional maximal distributions of processes related to higher-order heat-type equations. *Stochastic Processes Appl* 2000;85(2):209–23.
- [28] Philippart ME, Dillingh D, Pwa ST. De basispeilen langs de Nederlandse kust; de ruimtelijke verdeling en overschrijdingslijnen [The base levels along the Dutch coast; the spatial distribution and exceedance curves]. Technical Report RIKZ-95.008, Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, The Hague, The Netherlands; 1995.
- [29] van Dantzig D. Economic decision problems for flood prevention. *Econometrica* 1956;24(3):276–87.