INDIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT KOZHIKODE

Working Paper

IIMK/WPS/242/QM&OM/2017/26

May 2017

Risk Analysis of Product Innovation Using Markov Process Methodology

Thangamani Gurunathan[1]

[1] Associate Professor, QM&OM Area,
Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode
IIMK Campus P.O, Kunnamangalam
Kozhikode - 673 570, India.
Email: gtmani@iimk.ac.in

IIMK WORKING PAPER

Risk Analysis of Product Innovation Using Markov Process Methodology

Thangamani Gurunathan
Associate Professor, QM&OM Area, IIMK

Abstract:

Product Innovation is a key aspect of any company and central to the New Product Development (NPD) process. Companies must take risks to launch innovative new products speedily and successfully for its survival and sustainability. Despite meticulous efforts by companies to bring innovations, most of them are failing in the market place and hence the ability to diagnose and manage risk is a very important activity in high risk innovations. This paper presents a new Product Innovation and Development (PID) process and a quantitative methodology for risk assessment. FMEA (Failure Modes and Effects Analysis) and Markov process analysis are combined and presented as the risk assessment method. This methodology also investigates the overall Product innovation and Development process and explores various risks, categorize them according to their sources, assess those risks and explores various risk mitigation techniques. The methodology is demonstrated using a case study on a new innovative home appliance project.

1. Introduction

Risk is the potential that a chosen action or activity (including the choice of inaction) or actions from external world will lead to a loss (an undesirable outcome). Risk management is the identification, assessment, and prioritization of risks followed by coordinated and economical application of resources to minimize, monitor, and control the probability and/or impact of unfortunate events or to maximize the realization of opportunities. Risk management and innovations are not opposed. The core competency of the most effective and successful innovator is risk management (Clark G. Gilbert and Matthew J. Eyring; 2010). For these innovators the ability to identify, prioritize, and systematically eliminate risks is what drives innovation forward. This paper aims to present new PID process and a risk assessment methodology for product innovation and development system for a new product or service which the company wants to bring into the market. Any innovative products are of little value to a firm that cannot get to market, either on its own and/or through partnership. Find below are some of the essential requirements of a successful organizations.

- Imperative to innovate
- Emphasis on developing the capability and capacity to innovate and taking into market
- Culture of accountability and responsibility for delivering results
- Systematic organizational learning
- Risk management processes in decision making

This view of innovation from a market and institutional perspectives reveals that importance of innovation is related to the overall market delivery system which the organization possess or intend to develop to bring innovative product / service to the market. A risk assessment methodology has been developed for the product innovation and development system to assess risks available in the current product innovation and development system of organization. This helps the organization in making better decisions and to ensure corrective actions are in place to bridge the gap in the PID system and hence to bring innovation successfully to the market.

2. The Proposed PID Process Framework

2.1 Six Phases of PID

Six phases process has been recommended for Product Innovation and Development process. (Figure 1). It consists of six phases and the details are given below.

Phase 1- Scan

Keep your eyes open for new technologies/innovations that might assist you. It is a series of studies that tracks trends, technologies, competitor activities, substitution products, and innovations could influence or be leveraged as part of next generation products. The scope of this phase is the Innovation/*Technology Watch List*, which includes identified innovation/technologies, their trajectory in terms of performance and potential for adoption, along with major opportunities and limiting factors.

Phase 2 - Screen

Evaluate the innovation against your strategy. Ask yourself if implementing this innovation/technology will help your company reach its strategic goals better or faster. Does it increase efficiency, reduce cost or act as a product differentiator? It is about detailed understanding about various technologies under consideration and identifying potential options.

Phase 3 - Select

During this phase, we will identify all the necessary requirements including business, functional, and technical. Based on focused stakeholder interviews, requirements technology options are categorized and prioritized. Each requirement is weighted to provide a level of importance to the organization. In addition, this phase will evaluate the organization’s current business product /processes potentially affected by the technology change and begin to outline the future state of these product/ processes.

Phase 4 - Develop and Mini-implement

Begin with a limited test of the innovation/technology. A mini-implementation can help to evaluate innovation & new technologies within organization’s own products, processes and services. This will serve as a proof of innovation/technology/concept to proceed further with development.

Phase 5 - Recommend

Based on results from phase 4, further development as NPD will be recommended. This should include communications such as status, timetables, phases, issue resolution and cost. It also should include how to communicate with employees, vendors or consultants assisting with the implementation.

Phase 6 – NPD Process

After completion of innovation proving, the NPD process shall be initiated to bring new product into the market. The phase 6 shows the generic new product development model adopted by many organizations (Karl T Ulrich, Steven D Eppinger and Anita Goyal; 2009).

Figure 1: The proposed Innovation &Product Development Framework



3. PID Case Study: Infrared Technology based Clothe Dryer

From late 1990s onwards, developments in home appliances focused on energy efficiency and environmental friendliness. Environmental awareness is at an all-time high and studies had found that home appliances were a major source of electricity consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Many governments introduced a product labelling program, whereby the energy efficiency of an appliance was clearly displayed. These encouraged consumers to buy the most environmentally-friendly option available. Because of these, the strength of competitiveness of appliances industry is determined by their good technology innovation capability and technology development process meeting these energy/environmental requirements. In the international market and competitiveness of products or industry is directly proportional to its scientific and technological content meeting these needs (Baozhi Li and Ran Bi; 2009).

Clothes dryer is the second most energy consuming household appliance after refrigerator. This paper is to evaluate risk associated with infrared heating (IR) based heating for the clothe dryer since these are believed to have lower power consumption, reduced drying time, flexibility in drying temperature compared to the existing technology which is based on filament heating element. This new technology option may also have some limitations with respect to their ability to handle different type of clothes and safety in usage etc. Most risk assessment framework addresses only the financial aspects and does not include other issues related to technology/innovations. In this paper, FMEA method combined with Markov analysis are used to assess risk in this new product development.

3.1 The Proposed Risk Assessment Methodology

3.1.1 Sources of Risks and Failure Modes

The proposed Risk assessment method for innovation helps to identify risks associating in delivering innovation value thro' all the six phases of PID. This will help the companies to focus their effort in important delivery system aspects, so that the innovation value has been delivered as intended. To start with, the product FMEA has been used for assessing the risks in delivering innovation value. The IRPN

(Innovation Risk Priority Number) for different innovation values of the product or service under consideration will help the organization in recommending corrective actions for overall delivery of innovation values. The various sources of innovation risks and their failure modes for infrared technology based clothes dryer are given in Table 1.

	Table 1: Sources of Risks and their Failures Modes	
Id.	Sources of Risks	Sources' Failure Modes
a.	Market and Competition	Lack of market understanding (Customer needs and wants)
		Difficulty in building relationship with key customer
		Delay in developing new market
		Issue in product positioning
		Lack of proper portfolio
		Unrealistic sales forecasts
		Growing internal competition
		Growing international competition
b.	Strategy, Managerial and Oraganizational	Difficulty in clarifying and agreeing on innovation objectives
		Unscientific feasibility study
		Lack of coordination between functions / departments
		Late / delay in making decisions
		Frequent decision changes
		Lack of internal competencies
		Retention of key employees
		Internal organizational change
		Lack of commitment to innovation and product development
c.	Financial	Over running budget
		Incorrect pricing
		Inadequate sales expectation
		High initial costs
		Unpredictability of suppliers costs
		Cash flows issues
		High BoM cost
		Low IRR and NPV
d.	Innovation	Inadequate idea evaluation
		Confusing priorities
		Issue in linking technology with customer / business needs
e.	Technology	High technology development time
		Unanticipated technology complexities
		Lack of competencies in technology development
		Not viable in price/performance
		High cost to acquire technology
		Huge funds to be invested in R&D
f.	Design / manufacturing related	Many iterations
		Too much waiting time for ID, prototypes
		Performance is not proven
		Quality issues
		Issue in manufacture
		Too much material handling and transport
		Very short time available to market
g.	Suppliers	Too much dependance on components / services from suppliers
		Supplier component quality issues
		Inadequate capacity
h.	IP	Research not sufficient to validate claims
		Delay in developing and protecting IP
i	Legal and Compliance	Test compliance with standards issues
		Safety issues
		Compliance with any new requirements
		Legal issues with competitors

The excel model of the FMEA method is given below.

Figure 2: Innovation FMEA – The Excel Model

Innovation FMEA

Product / Service Name:	
Responsibility:	

Product or Service Innovation and Development Value Chain Steps	Sources of Risks	Source's Failure Modes	Failure Effects	S E V	Potential Causes	O C C	Current Controls	D E T	I R P N	Actions Recommended	Resp.
Steps in PID Value Chain	Importance sources of PID risks?	In what ways can the delivery system go wrong?	What is the impact of the Failure Mode on the customer and/or organization?	How severe is the effect on the customer or organization?	What are the causes of the Failure Mode?	What is the probability of accurence of Failure Mode or Cause?	What are the existing controls and procedures that prevent the Cause or Failure Mode?	How well can the Cause or Failure Mode will be prevented?	Calculated	What are the actions to improve innovation benefits and reduce cost and to prevent delivery system failure?	Who is responsible for the recommended action?

As per the methodology, IRPN indicates *"Innovation Risk Priority Number"* which guides the organization to better understand their product innovation and development system risk and providing scope for corrective action to deliver innovation without scarifying its value to market place.

The implementation of Innovation FMEA for the case study is provided in the Figure 3. Innovation risk priority numbers were developed for the clothes dryer. The comparative analysis of various risk sources are provided in the Figure 4. From this analysis, it is evident that company has to work on market & competition, innovation and technology aspects of clothes dryer to minimize risk. The actions recommended to minimize risks are provided in Figure 3. There are nine sources of risk are identified using FMEA study. These inputs are used for Markov modelling and analysis.

3.1.2 Markov Modelling

We begin with the Markov formulation by designating all the possible states of the Product Innovation and Development Value Chain process.

G: PID process operating without any risk events
R: PID process is under partial risk environment, working at reduced efficiency/effectiveness and is being under risk response actions.
F: PID process is under complete risk environment and is being under risk response actions.

Assumptions

- All sources transition rates are constant over time.
- All sources states except those arising due to multiple sources risks are mutually independent.
- A response actions will result in process without risks.
- All response actions begin immediately upon appearance of risks

Notations

λ_{x_1}	transition rate from state *G* to state *R* because of risk source *`x'* where *x* stands for any of the source *a, b, ..., i*. The subscript *1* indicates the partial risk state of PID process because of source *x*.
λ_{x_2}	transition rate from state *R* to state *F* because of risk source *`x'*. The subscript *2* indicates the complete risk state of PID process because of source *x*.
μ_{x_1}	transition rate from state *R* to state *G* because of the source *`x'*.
μ_{x_2}	transition rate from state *F* to state *R* because of the source *`x'*.
φ	common-cause event rate from state *R* to state *F* due to the events of sources *`a',`b' and `c'*.
ω	response rate from state *F* to state *G* due to response completion of sources *`a',`b' and `c'*.
τ	common-cause event rate from state *G* to state *F* due to the events of sources *`a',`b' and `c'*.
η	response rate from state *F* to state *G* due to response completion of sources *`a',`b' and `c'* collectively.
P	Pr {PID process is in a state of risk free}
P_{x_1}	Pr {PID process is in a state of partial risk due to risk events of *x*}
P_{x_2}	Pr {PID process is in a state of complete risk due to complete risk events of *x*}
$P_{(a_2 e) com}$	Pr {PID process is in a state of failure due to common-cause failure of *a* (after reaching a_1) and *e*}
$P_{(a e_2) com}$	Pr {PID process is in a state of failure due to common-cause failure of *a and e* (after reaching e_1)}
$P_{(a_2 e_2) com}$	Pr {PID process is in a state of failure due to common-cause failure of *a and e* (together)}
Availability	Steady state availability of PID process without any risks.

3.1.3 Mathematical Analysis

(This section requires some improvements)

Figures 5 represent the state-transition diagrams for the PID process. Since the transition from any state is possible only to the next higher state or to the next lower state, based on Chapman-Kolmogorov equations, one can identify the evolution of the system with a birth and death process. The derivation of the differential equations and state probabilities of the events of the sources, though complex, can be obtained from Figures 5. The steady state probabilities are given by the following expressions.



Figure 5. State transition diagram for PID process (draft - needs improvement)

$P_{a_1} = \dfrac{\lambda_{a_1}}{(\mu_{a_1} + \phi)} P$	**(1)**
$P_{a_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{a_1} \cdot \lambda_{a_2}}{\mu_{a_2} . (\mu_{a_1} + \phi)} P$	**(2)**
$P_{(a_2 bc) com} = \dfrac{\phi \cdot \lambda_{a_1}}{\omega . (\mu_{a_1} + \phi)} P$	**(3)**
$P_{b_1} = \dfrac{\lambda_{b_1}}{(\mu_{b_1} + \phi)} P$	**(4)**
$P_{b_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{b_1} \cdot \lambda_{b_2}}{\mu_{b_2} . (\mu_{b_1} + \phi)} P$	**(5)**
$P_{(a b_2 c) com} = \dfrac{\phi \cdot \lambda_{b_1}}{\omega . (\mu_{b_1} + \phi)} P$	**(6)**
$P_{c_1} = \dfrac{\lambda_{c_1}}{(\mu_{c_1} + \phi)} P$	**(7)**
$P_{c_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{c_1} \cdot \lambda_{c_2}}{\mu_{c_2} . (\mu_{c_1} + \phi)} P$	**(8)**
$P_{(ab c_2) com} = \dfrac{\phi \cdot \lambda_{c_1}}{\omega . (\mu_{c_1} + \phi)} P$	**(9)**

$P_{(a_2b_2c_2)com} = \dfrac{\tau}{\eta} P$	**(10)**
$P_{d_1} = \dfrac{\lambda_{d_1}}{\mu_{d_1}} P$	**(11)**
$P_{d_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{d_1} \cdot \lambda_{d_2}}{\mu_{d_1} \cdot \mu d_2} P$	**(12)**
$P_{e_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{e_2}}{\mu_{e_2}} P$	**(13)**
$P_{f_1} = \dfrac{\lambda_{f_1}}{\mu_{f_1}} P$	**(14)**
$P_{f_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{f_1} \cdot \lambda_{f_2}}{\mu_{f_1} \cdot \mu_{f_2}} P$	**(15)**
$P_{g_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{g_2}}{\mu_{g_2}} P$	**(16)**
$P_{h_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{h_2}}{\mu_{h_2}} P$	**(17)**
$P_{i_2} = \dfrac{\lambda_{i_2}}{\mu_{i_2}} P$	**(18)**
where, $P = \left[1 + \dfrac{\lambda_{a_1}}{\mu_{a_1} + \phi} + \dfrac{\lambda_{a_1}\lambda_{a_2}}{\mu_{a_2}(\mu_{a_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\phi \lambda_{a_1}}{\omega(\mu_{a_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\lambda_{b_1}}{\mu_{b_1} + \phi} + \dfrac{\lambda_{b_1}\lambda_{b_2}}{\mu_{b_2}(\mu_{b_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\phi \lambda_{b_1}}{\omega(\mu_{b_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\lambda_{c_1}}{\mu_{c_1} + \phi} + \dfrac{\lambda_{c_1}\lambda_{c_2}}{\mu_{c_2}(\mu_{c_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\phi \lambda_{c_1}}{\omega(\mu_{c_1} + \phi)} + \dfrac{\tau}{\eta} + \dfrac{\lambda_{d_1}}{\mu_{d_1}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{d_1}\lambda_{d_2}}{\mu_{d_1}\mu_{d_2}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{e_2}}{\mu_{e_2}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{f_1}}{\mu_{f_1}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{f_1}\lambda_{f_2}}{\mu_{f_1}\mu_{f_2}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{g_2}}{\mu_{g_2}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{h_2}}{\mu_{h_2}} + \dfrac{\lambda_{i_2}}{\mu_{i_2}} \right]^{-1}$	**(19)**
$Availability = P + P_{a_1} + P_{b_1} + P_{c_1} + P_{d_1} + P_{f_1}$	**(20)**

Equation 19 gives the steady state probability that the PID process is in state *G*, whereas Equations 1, 4, 7, 11 and 14 constitute the steady state probability that the PID process is in state *R*. The various common-cause risk probabilities are given by Equations 3, 6, 9 and 10. The complete risk probabilities of PID process are given by Equations 2, 5, 8, 12, 13 and 15 to 18 and its steady state availability is determined by Equation 20.

4. Results and Discussion

This section requires working with data and analysis. Not yet completed.

5. Conclusion

The Innovation FMEA combined with Markov process method for the IR clothes dryer generates proactive solutions for managing different sources of risks associated with product innovation and development effectively. A company can also use these methodologies to find out their weaknesses in their PID process. This will help organizations to develop necessary learning and increase their innovation capabilities which lead to innovation success.

References

1. C.C. Hang, Jin Chen and Dan Yu (2011), 'An assessment framework for disruptive innovation', Foresight 2011, Vol. 13, No. 5, pages 4-13.
2. F. Ponsignon, P.A. Smart and R.S.Maull (2011), 'Service delivery system design: Characteristics and contingencies', International Journal of Production Management 2011, Vol. 31, No. 3, pages 324-349.
3. Morten T. Hansen and Julian Birkinshaw (2007), 'The innovation value chain', Harvard Business Review, June 2007, Pages 2-12.
4. Clark G. Gilbert and Matthew J. Eyring (2010), 'Beating the odds when you launch a new venture', Harvard Business Review, May 2010, pages 2-7.
5. Karl T Ulrich, Steven D Eppinger and Anita Goyal (2009), 'Product Design and Development', Tata McGraw Hill Education Private Limited, New Delhi.
6. Baozhi Li and Ran Bi (2009), 'Using ANP to Evaluate Technology Innovation', 2009 International Conference on Future BioMedical Information Engineering, pages 272-275.
7. Robert N. Jerrard, Nick Barnes and Adele Reid (2008), 'Design, Risk and New Product Development in Five Small Creative Companies', International Journal of Design 2008, Vol. 2, No. 1, Pages 21-30.

Figure 4: Comparison of Risk Sources



Figure 3: Innovation FMEA for IR Clothes Dryer

Step / Function	Risk Category	Failure Mode(s)	Possible Cause(s)	Effect(s)	Severity	Occur	Current Control	Detectability	IRPN	Recommended Action(s)	Responsibility & Target completion date	Controls/ Actions taken
Front End of Innovation (FEI) & New Product Development (NPD) Process	**a) Market and Competition**	Lack of Customer Understnding (needs and wants)	Not so good market understanding / research	Risk of business survival	8	6	Target market study with pilot	4	192	Collect / analyse customer data, QFD	Kumar, May 2017	
		Difficulty in building relationship with key customer										
		Delay in developing new market										
		Issue in product positioning										
		Lack of proper portfolio										
		Changes in sales forecasts	Lack of market potential understanding and competition	Loosing competitive advantage	6	7	Competitor analysis / monitoring	5	210	Collect / analyse competitor data	Kumar, May 2017	
		Growing local competition										
		Growing international competition										
		Unscientific feasibility study										
	b) Strategy, Managerial and Organizational	Difficulty in clarifying and agreeing on innovation objectives	Lack of leadership and organizational culture	Risk of business survival	8	5	Innovation Roll-out	7	280	Leadership coomunication & comitment plan on innovation	Kumar, June 2017	
		Lack of coordination between functions / departments										
		Late / delay in making decisions										
		Frequent decision changes										
		Lack of internal competencies	Inability to attract talent	Mistrust and poor organizational culture	6	4	Training on innovation topics	5	120	Hiring and retension policy to meet innovation requirements	John, May 2017	
		Retention of key employees										
		Internal organizational change										
		Lack of commitment to innovation and product development										
	c) Financial	Over running budget	Lack of awareness in overall cost	Hampered growth and return	7	4	Learnings on innovation costing	5	140	Training on cost control	Amit, July 2017	
		Incorrect pricing										
		Inadequate sales expectation										
		High initial costs										
		Unpredictability of suppliers costs										
		Cash flows issues										
		High BoM cost	Additional parts to ensure safety	Low profit margin	8	5	Elaborate design review	2	80	Detailed design review	Amit, July 2017	
		Low IRR and NPV										
	d) Innovation	Poor in opportunity identifaction/analysis	Lack of structured "Front End for Innovation" Process	Less flow of innovations and hence hapered economic sustainability	6	8	Seed funding available for idea prooving	8	384	FEI process development and its integration with NPD	Amit, July 2017	
		Not many ideas										
		Inadequate idea evaluation / short-listing										
		Poor idea/concept development and prooving										
		Confusing priorities										
	e) Technology	High technology development time	Lack of understanding on technical difficulty and uncertainty	Less flow of innovations and hence hampered economic sustainability	6	7	Collecting more info about technology and tracking trends	8	336	Expert identification and consultancy	John, June 2017	
		Issue in linking technology with customer/business needs										
		Unanticipated technology complexities										
		Lack of competencies in technology development										
		Not viable in price/performance										
		High cost to acquire technology										
		Huge funds to be invested in R&D										
	f) Design/manufacturing related	Quality issues	Poor execution of NPD	Missing product launch & decline in market share	7	6	NPD process is available	4	168	Strict adherence of NPD process	John, June 2017	
		Many iterations										
		Too much waiting time for ID, prototypes										
		Performance is not proven										
		Issue in manufacture										
		Too much material handling and transport										
		Current design maturity level										
		Materials issues										
		Process capability issue										
		Manufacturing and fabrication										
		Very short time available to market										
	g) Suppliers	Too much dependance on components / services from suppliers	Missing ESI in FEI	Not meeting sales targets and revenue reduction	6	4	Supplier involvement in NPD	5	120	ESI in innovation activities	John, June 2017	
		Supplier component quality issues										
		Inadequate capacity										
	h) IP	Research not sufficient to validate claims	Lack of understanding and structure in handling IP	Loosing market leadership	7	6	Has some previous experience	5	210	Training of key people	David, June 2017	
		Delay in developing and protecting IP										
		Legal issues with competitors										
	i) Legal and Compliance	Test compliance with standards issues	Lack of understanidng on countries policies, laws and regulations	Not meeting sales targets and revenue reduction	6	4	Similar activities on existing products	4	96	Training of key people	David, June 2017	
		Safety issues										
		Compliance with any new requirements										

Research Office

Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode

IIMK Campus P. O.,

Kozhikode, Kerala, India,

PIN - 673 570

Phone: +91-495-2809238

Email: research@iimk.ac.in

Web: https://iimk.ac.in/faculty/publicationmenu.php