

Hazard Analysis Software Engineering

Team #12, Streamliners

Mahad Ahmed

Abyan Jaigirdar

Perna Prabhu

Farhan Rahman

Ali Zia

Table 1: Revision History

Date	Developer(s)	Change
2025-10-02	Abyan	Scope and Purpose
2025-10-02	Farhan	Critical assumptions made for the project
2025-10-01	Prerna	Initial draft of safety and security requirements
2025-10-01	Prerna	Add initial version of introduction
Date2	Name(s)	Description of changes
...

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Scope and Purpose of Hazard Analysis	1
3	System Boundaries and Components	2
4	Critical Assumptions	3
5	Failure Mode and Effect Analysis	4
6	Safety and Security Requirements	4
6.1	Data Security Requirements	4
6.2	Payment Security Requirements	4
6.3	Access Control Requirements	5
6.4	System Reliability & Availability Requirements	5
6.5	Operational Safety Requirements	5
7	Roadmap	6

1 Introduction

This document outlines the hazard analysis of the **Large Event Management System (LEMS)** for the McMaster Engineering Society (MES). The LEMS is a centralized platform designed to streamline event workflows such as **ticket sales, registrations, waivers, payments, bus/table sign-ups, notifications, and event check-ins.**⁷

For this deliverable, the analysis will specifically focus on the features within the scope of **Project B** which include:

- Payment System
- Role-Centric/Feature-Based Access Control (RBAC/FBAC)
- Bus Sign-Ups
- RSVP Sign-Ups
- Table Sign-Ups

Hazards in this system refer to conditions or failures that may lead to financial loss, security/privacy breaches, accessibility failures, or reputational damage for MES and McMaster University. While the system does not directly involve hardware or pose risks of physical harm, software risks are significant. These include data loss, payment errors, registration corruption, check-in failures, and unauthorized access to sensitive information.

The purpose of this hazard analysis is to:

- Identify risks associated with the Payment, Access Control, and Signup modules.
- Define their potential impacts on users, organizers, and the MES organization.
- Introduce mitigation strategies by specifying safety and security requirements that will guide system design and implementation.

By proactively addressing these hazards, this analysis ensures the system will be reliable, secure, accessible, and trustworthy for both organizers and attendees.

2 Scope and Purpose of Hazard Analysis

The purpose of this hazard analysis is to identify and evaluate potential hazards that could arise during the development and operation of the Large Event Management System (LEMS). Since LEMS is a software-based platform that supports event registration, ticketing, payments, and participant management,

hazards are primarily related to data integrity, system availability, security, and user interactions. By analyzing these risks early, the project team can define mitigation strategies, incorporate safety and security requirements into the design, and reduce the likelihood of organizational or reputational harm.

The scope of this analysis covers all major components of LEMS, including the backend services, web and mobile applications, and the database. It considers hazards introduced by user error, software defects, integration failures across modules, and security vulnerabilities. Hazards that fall outside the team's control, such as third-party cloud hosting failures or issues with external payment providers (e.g., Stripe), are acknowledged but not analyzed in detail.

The goals of this hazard analysis are:

- To proactively identify risks related to security, data integrity, privacy, and availability in LEMS.
- To evaluate the potential consequences of failures, such as data loss, financial errors, or unauthorized access to sensitive information.
- To define mitigations or controls that reduce these risks to acceptable levels.
- To guide architectural and design decisions and support the definition of non-functional requirements such as reliability, security, and maintainability.

This hazard analysis will be refined as the project design evolves, ensuring that new risks are addressed as they emerge. It is part of the broader quality assurance process and ensures that LEMS meets the standards of safety, security, and reliability expected by the McMaster Engineering Society.

3 System Boundaries and Components

The MacSync platform system that the hazard analysis will be conducted on consists of:

1. The application that is both web and mobile based, which includes the front-end and back-end made up of the following major components:
 - Dashboards (User and Admin)
 - Payment System
 - Authentication (Role/Feature Based Access Control)
 - RSVP Sign-Ups
 - Bus Sign-Ups
 - Table Sign-Ups

2. The PostgreSQL database where all user, admin, event and transaction data will be stored.
3. The payment module that interfaces with external payment gateways to process ticket payments and refunds.
4. The notification service that sends automated emails and notifications to users for event details and payment receipts.

The system boundary in the case of the MacSync platform includes components necessary to support event operations for the MES, which includes the entire application, both web and mobile based, along with their subcomponents, the database, payment gateway and notification service. The payment and notification services are controlled by external providers. The payment is controlled by Stripe and the notification service is controlled by Microsoft. However, they remain critical to the function of the system and the overall operation of the platform and thus fall within the system boundary.

4 Critical Assumptions

The following assumptions have been identified as critical to the safe and reliable operation of the MacSync platform.

- **Reliable Internet Access:** It is assumed that both attendees and organizers will have access to stable internet connections during registration, payment, and check-in. While temporary connectivity loss may occur, the system must handle these cases gracefully.
- **Third-Party Service Availability:** The platform depends on external services such as payment processors (e.g., Stripe, PayPal) and hosting infrastructure. It is assumed these services provide high availability, but the system will still account for outages or delays to prevent complete operational failure.
- **Device Compatibility:** It is assumed that attendees will primarily use modern smartphones and organizers will have access to laptops or mobile devices capable of running the dashboard. Reliance on outdated devices or unsupported browsers must be minimized through compatibility testing.
- **User Data Accuracy:** The system assumes that users provide correct information (e.g., dietary restrictions, accessibility needs, payment details). However, hazards tied to incorrect or incomplete inputs will be addressed by validation checks.
- **Organizational Oversight:** It is assumed that event organizers will actively monitor the system for anomalies (e.g., payment disputes, capacity errors, failed notifications). This system will assist and automate many of the tasks and centralize information, but human oversight is still necessary to manage unexpected situations.

- **Security Measures:** It is assumed that standard security practices (encrypted storage, secure authentication, and role-based access control) will be implemented and maintained. Failure to enforce these could expose sensitive student data or enable fraudulent event access.

5 Failure Mode and Effect Analysis

[Include your FMEA table here. This is the most important part of this document. —SS] [The safety requirements in the table do not have to have the prefix SR. The most important thing is to show traceability to your SRS. You might trace to requirements you have already written, or you might need to add new requirements. —SS] [If no safety requirement can be devised, other mitigation strategies can be entered in the table, including strategies involving providing additional documentation, and/or test cases. —SS]

6 Safety and Security Requirements

6.1 Data Security Requirements

- **SSR-DS1 (Encryption in Transit):** The system shall use TLS 1.2 or higher to encrypt all network communications between client applications, servers, and third-party APIs.
- **SSR-DS2 (Encryption at Rest):** The system shall encrypt sensitive stored data (user profiles, accessibility needs, dietary restrictions, waiver records) using AES-256.
- **SSR-DS3 (Privacy Compliance):** The system shall comply with PIPEDA and relevant McMaster University policies regarding data collection, storage, and retention.
- **SSR-DS4 (Data Minimization):** The system shall only store the minimum personal data necessary for event operations (e.g., no raw payment card details).

6.2 Payment Security Requirements

- **SSR-PS1 (Third-Party Gateways):** All financial transactions shall be processed exclusively through secure payment providers (Stripe, Square, or PayPal). The system shall not store or transmit raw credit card details.
- **SSR-PS2 (Transaction Confirmation):** The system shall generate a unique transaction confirmation code for every payment, retrievable by both the attendee and the organizer.

- **SSR-PS3 (Audit Logging):** All financial operations (payments, refunds, chargebacks) shall be logged in an immutable audit trail accessible only to authorized financial officers.
- **SSR-PS4 (Duplicate Protection):** The system shall prevent duplicate payments by checking for transaction IDs before ticket issuance.

6.3 Access Control Requirements

- **SSR-AC1 (Role-Based Access Control):** The system shall enforce RBAC/FBAC to ensure that each organizer only has access to the features necessary for their role.
- **SSR-AC2 (Authentication):** The system shall integrate with McMaster University's Single Sign-On (SSO) to authenticate student attendees and organizers.
- **SSR-AC3 (Session Management):** The system shall automatically expire inactive sessions after 15 minutes of inactivity for admin accounts and 60 minutes for attendee accounts.
- **SSR-AC4 (Privilege Escalation Protection):** The system shall log and alert MES executives of any attempts at unauthorized access or privilege escalation.

6.4 System Reliability & Availability Requirements

- **SSR-SR1 (Uptime):** The system shall maintain at least 98% uptime during active registration and event check-in periods.
- **SSR-SR2 (Offline Check-in):** The system shall support offline QR code validation to allow event entry if internet connectivity is unavailable.
- **SSR-SR3 (Notification Redundancy):** All time-sensitive notifications (registration confirmations, event reminders) shall include retry mechanisms to ensure delivery.
- **SSR-SR4 (Backup & Recovery):** The system shall automatically back up all event and registration data daily and enable recovery within 24 hours of data loss.

6.5 Operational Safety Requirements

- **SSR-OS1 (Waiver Enforcement):** The system shall not allow final ticket confirmation until the attendee has digitally signed the required waiver.
- **SSR-OS2 (Capacity Validation):** The system shall enforce real-time capacity limits for bus sign-ups, table sign-ups, and RSVP sign-ups to prevent overbooking.

- **SSR-OS3 (Organizer Accountability):** All organizer actions (e.g., modifying capacities, issuing refunds, editing registrations) shall be logged with a timestamp and user identifier.
- **SSR-OS4 (Fail-Safe Defaults):** In the event of a system error, the system shall default to denying access to sensitive data until the error is resolved.

7 Roadmap

[Which safety requirements will be implemented as part of the capstone timeline? Which requirements will be implemented in the future? —SS]

Appendix — Reflection

[Not required for CAS 741 —SS]

The purpose of reflection questions is to give you a chance to assess your own learning and that of your group as a whole, and to find ways to improve in the future. Reflection is an important part of the learning process. Reflection is also an essential component of a successful software development process.

Reflections are most interesting and useful when they're honest, even if the stories they tell are imperfect. You will be marked based on your depth of thought and analysis, and not based on the content of the reflections themselves. Thus, for full marks we encourage you to answer openly and honestly and to avoid simply writing "what you think the evaluator wants to hear."

Please answer the following questions. Some questions can be answered on the team level, but where appropriate, each team member should write their own response:

1. What went well while writing this deliverable?
2. What pain points did you experience during this deliverable, and how did you resolve them?
3. Which of your listed risks had your team thought of before this deliverable, and which did you think of while doing this deliverable? For the latter ones (ones you thought of while doing the Hazard Analysis), how did they come about?
4. Other than the risk of physical harm (some projects may not have any appreciable risks of this form), list at least 2 other types of risk in software products. Why are they important to consider?