

Smart Monitoring System for Weather and Tsunami Detection (SMSTWD)

Saumya Roy
Eindhoven University of Technology

Victor Petre
Eindhoven University of Technology

1 System Mission and Objectives

1.1 Mission Statement

The core mission of the Smart Monitoring System for Weather and Tsunami Detection (SMSTWD) is as follows:

“To save lives, mitigate damage, and offer peace of mind by transforming accurate monitoring into actionable intelligence on natural disasters.”

This mission highlights the monitoring capabilities of our SMSTWD, focusing on life-saving intervention and communication via active inference.

1.2 SMSTWD Philosophy and Vision

The SMSTWD is designed to enhance natural disaster monitoring, preparedness, response, and resilience. The SMSTWD integrates multi-modal data sources, namely satellite imaging, aircraft-based monitoring, and underwater sensor networks to provide a comprehensive view of environmental conditions. By leveraging solid-state sensing technologies and machine learning algorithms, the SMSTWD aims to save lives by minimizing the latency between hazard detection and public alerting. The vision for the SMSTWD extends beyond immediate detection to include:

- **Proactive Safety:** Moving from reactive warnings to triggering pre-emptive physical safety mechanisms and personalized evacuation routes in the future.
- **Global Accessibility:** Ensuring the SMSTWD is applicable across diverse geographic regions, from densely populated urban centers to remote coastal villages, with multilingual support.
- **Actionable Intelligence:** Ensuring that all data is translated into clear, decision-ready information for government agencies and emergency responders.

1.3 Primary Objectives

To achieve its mission, the SMSTWD has the following primary objectives:

1. **Life-Saving Early Warning:** To drastically reduce fatalities by providing accurate, real-time early warnings predicted through state of the art Machine Learning inferences, that enable communities to evacuate or prepare before disaster strikes.
2. **Infrastructure Protection:** To safeguard critical infrastructure (such as power grids and flood gates) by allowing for proactive protective measures based on accurate storm and tsunami trajectory predictions.
3. **Multi-Modal Data Fusion:** To integrate heterogeneous data from atmospheric, oceanic, and seismic domains into a centralized processing unit, utilizing fusion techniques for robust pattern identification.
4. **Reliable Communication:** To distribute alerts through multiple channels, including SMS, mobile apps, and government networks ensuring information reaches stakeholders even in volatile environments.
5. **Knowledge Advancement:** To contribute valuable data to scientific research, fostering long-term improvements in meteorology, oceanography, and climate resilience.

1.4 Target Stakeholders

The SMSTWD supports a diverse set of stakeholders:

- **Primary Beneficiaries:** The general public in coastal and storm-prone regions.
- **Operational Users:** National meteorological agencies, government disaster response agencies, and emergency responders.
- **Secondary Stakeholders:** Insurance firms, cloud service providers, and smart city infrastructure operators.

2 Meta model: System Thinking and Contradictions

To understand the operational environment, we utilized the “9 Boxes” from the TRIZ framework. Table 1 illustrates the temporal evolution and operational context of the SMSTWD, showing a transition from independent monitoring systems in the past to a fully integrated, autonomous system in the future. Sub-system components such as sensors currently operate at higher resolutions than in previous years, and there is increasing integration of modern AI to support the decision-making process. Although the super-system mostly consisted of agencies and broadcasters in the past, there is a shift towards connecting disaster alert systems to smart infrastructure, and an increased reliance on cloud services.

Table 1: 9-Box Table for SMSTWD Evolution

Level	Past (-5 years)	Present (Now)	Future (+5 years)
Super-System (Context)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National meteorological agencies • Government disaster response agencies • Broadcasters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Private tech companies and insurance • Cloud service providers • Smart city infrastructure • Smartphones and vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autonomous Transport Networks • Autonomous Infrastructure (flood gates, gas lines, and power grids)
System (Function)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independent operation of atmospheric, oceanic, and seismic monitoring. • Assimilation of data for situational updates • Detection and alerting of hazards • Issuance of warnings to multiple channels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Near real-time ingestion of multi-source data. • Multi-modal data integration • Probabilistic hazard estimation and risk scoring. • Technical dashboards and decision-support systems. • Automated warnings issued to multiple channels. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of personalized evacuation routes • Triggering of preemptive physical safety mechanisms. • High-resolution prediction at street-block level. • Distributed decision-making.

Level	Past (-5 years)	Present (Now)	Future (+5 years)
Sub-systems (Component)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satellites (4-8km resolution). • Ocean buoys, slow telemetry. • Seismic networks (land-based). • Standard Doppler radar. • Single-Channel broadcast systems. • Physics-based numerical inference models. • Human forecasters. • Aircraft monitors (radio). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satellites (0.5-2km resolution). • Deep sea floor seismic networks. • Faster scanning radar. • Fiber-optic seismic sensing. • ML accelerators for onboard inference. • 5G/WiFi broadcast systems. • AI based multilingual support. • GenAI/Hybrid forecasting models. • Optimised pressure sensors. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denser ocean buoy mesh network. • Direct Satellite-to-Sensor communication. • ML models for epicentre radius pinpointing. • Smart IoT bunker guidance. • Nano-Sensors with energy harvesting. • Advanced deep-tectonic seismic sensors. • AR Interfaces for relief. • Advanced AI chips embedded in sensors.

Following this analysis, we identified the parameters requiring improvement, and the contradictions encountered when attempting to improve them all. The complete contradiction matrix is presented in Table 2, and we focused on three core contradictions to address using TRIZ's 40 Inventive Principles. These have been highlighted in Table 2, and are elaborated upon below.

1. Reliability (#35) vs. Energy Used (#17) and Function Efficiency (#24): Fusing all data in a central unit risks a single pipeline failure compromising the whole system, leading to wasted compute and energy. To resolve this, we applied **Principle #3 (Local Quality)** to separate early data inference pipelines by sensor subsystem (atmospheric, oceanic, seismic). In this way, should a sensor sub-system fail, inference can proceed via the remaining functional ones, leading to increased reliability, and less wasted compute. Additionally, **Principle #19 (Periodic Action)** was used to configure underwater sensors to transmit data via periodic pulses rather than a continuous stream to save energy.

2. Robustness against Noise (#29) vs. System Complexity (#45): Improving robustness typically requires heavy de-noising, which can drastically increase complexity if every sensor modality requires a unique model. We applied **Principle #6 (Universality)** to create a universal de-noising pipeline. The SMSTWD uses a single, configurable de-noising algorithm where only the hyperparameters change based on the sensor type (e.g., underwater vs. aerial).

3. Loss of Time (#26) vs. Reliability (#35): Mechanical components in sensors are slow and prone to wear; improving on these would improve both loss of time and reliability. Using **Principle #28 (Mechanics Substitution)**, the SMSTWD replaces mechanical water flow spinners with solid-state sensing technologies, such as ultrasonic flow detectors. This substitution improves reaction time and eliminates moving parts, simultaneously enhancing reliability and speed.

Table 2: Complete TRIZ Contradiction Matrix for SMSTWD

Worsening → / Improving ↓	Amount of Information (#11)	Loss of information (#28)	System Complexity (#45)	Loss of Time (#26)	Reliability (#35)	Ability to detect/Measure (#47)	Noise (#29)	Energy Used (#17)	Compatibility/connectability (#33)	Function Efficiency (#24)	Security (#37)
Amount of Information (#11)		15 19 7 32			10 24 13 25						
Loss of information (#28)	2 7 24 3		6 25 13 24	24 28 32 2				10 1 24 36			
Loss of time (#26)		24 28 32 2	28 21 6 10		35 10 3 14	37 10 18 32					2 28 26 9

Continued on next page

Worsening → / Improving ↓	Info (#11)	Loss (#28)	System (#45)	Time (#26)	Relia (#35)	Detect (#47)	Noise (#29)	Energy (#17)	Connect (#33)	Effic (#24)	Sec (#37)
System Complexity (#45)					3 13 28 1	28 10 32 37			6 28 13 35		
Reliability (#35)			5 35 13 33					35 19 3 1		15 3 19 35	
Ability to detect/Measure assure (#47)			28 37 10 15					35 19 2 24			
Measurement Precision (#48)				24 28 2 10				10 24 5 3			
Noise (#29)		6 13 1 24		35 28 19 35						17 15 31 3	
Energy Used (#17)					40 13 35 19	32 15 1 9				2 19 15 3	
Compatibility/connectability (#33)			28 24 13 12								24 10 28 25
Function Efficiency (#24)		3 4 19 15									
Security (#37)			2 6 4 17 13	26 28 25 2							

3 Requirements and Use cases

This section details the requirements needed for the SMSTWD to complete its mission. These requirements are categorized into Functional (FR), Non-Functional (NFR), and Safety requirements. These requirements were generated from the assignment description, the 9 Boxes analysis, as well as the contradiction resolution methods in the previous section.

3.1 Functional Requirements (FR)

The Functional Requirements describe the specific behaviors and functions the SMSTWD must perform. The structural relationship of these requirements is illustrated in Figure 1.




Fig. 1. SysML Functional Requirements Diagram

- The SMSTWD shall issue public alerts and communicate to emergency responders and government agencies in real-time regarding tsunamis.
- The SMSTWD shall issue real-time SMS warnings.

- The SMSTWD shall send real-time updates to mobile applications, government networks, and news outlets.
- The SMSTWD shall communicate to emergency responders and meteorologists in real-time regarding storms.
- The SMSTWD shall translate its textual information into the primary languages of each region.
- The SMSTWD shall integrate satellite, aircraft, and underwater sensor data centrally.
- The SMSTWD shall use machine learning algorithms with early fusion for pattern identification of potential disasters.
- The SMSTWD shall use threshold analysis to determine when to issue public alerts.
- The SMSTWD shall reliably and accurately detect tsunamis by detecting tectonic shifts, vibrations beneath the ocean bed, and monitoring ocean water behavior.
- The SMSTWD shall integrate both seismic and oceanographic data into its prediction of the likelihood, intensity, and possible impact of tsunamis.
- The SMSTWD shall reliably and accurately track and predict storm position, wind speed, direction, and precipitation.
- The SMSTWD shall apply a single, configurable de-noising algorithm to process data from all sensor types.
- The SMSTWD shall process data from atmospheric, oceanic, and seismic sensors through decoupled, independent computing pipelines.
- The SMSTWD shall cross-reference the predicted disaster impact zone coordinates with the registered location of users to identify the specific subset of recipients for SMS warnings.
- The SMSTWD shall maintain a configurable database mapping each geographical region to its designated "primary language".

3.2 Derived Requirements

Two requirements were derived from high-level operational goals identified in the system analysis. The goal to issue real-time SMS warnings led to the derived requirement for the SMSTWD to cross-reference predicted impact zone coordinates with registered user locations. Similarly, the need for multilingual support led to the derived requirement for a configurable database mapping geographical regions to designated primary languages. These two derived requirements can also be seen in Figure 1.

3.3 Non-Functional Requirements (NFR)

The Non-Functional Requirements define the system's quality attributes, such as reliability, efficiency, and interpretability. These are visualized in Figure 2.




Fig. 2. SysML Non-Functional Requirements Diagram

- The SMSTWD underwater sensors shall transmit data using periodic pulses (e.g., every 10-30 seconds) rather than a continuous stream, only switching to continuous mode when a hazard threshold is breached.

- The SMSTWD shall dynamically alter its internal risk scoring parameters and detection thresholds in real-time based on the current environmental state.
- The SMSTWD shall utilize solid-state sensing technologies instead of mechanical moving parts for water flow and seismic detection.
- The SMSTWD sensor nodes shall be configured with non-uniform sampling rates and power profiles specific to their local physical environment.
- The SMSTWD shall have reliable pipelines consistently feeding into the aggregation module.
- The SMSTWD shall use explainable algorithms for better interpretability.
- The SMSTWD shall present inferences regarding tsunamis and storm parameters in an accessible way to the end user.
- The SMSTWD shall reduce warning times to minimize casualties.
- The SMSTWD shall be accessible to all regions.

3.4 Safety Requirements

Safety constraints are critical to prevent false positives and environmental harm. Figure 3 depicts the safety requirement hierarchy.




Fig. 3. SysML Safety Requirements Diagram

- The SMSTWD shall validate high-level tsunami alerts using data from at least two different sensor modalities (e.g., Seismic + Water Pressure) before issuing a public warning.
- The SMSTWD underwater components shall be constructed using non-toxic, non-corrosive materials to prevent chemical leakage into the marine ecosystem.
- The SMSTWD shall perform a self-diagnostic "heartbeat" check on all critical sensors every 60 seconds to immediately detect system failures.

3.5 TRIZ-Based Requirements

We utilized the TRIZ Contradiction Matrix to resolve three critical technical conflicts identified in the system design: Reliability (#35) vs. Energy Used (#17), Robustness against Noise (#29) vs. System Complexity (#45), and Loss of Time (#26) vs. Reliability (#35). To address these, we selected four relevant Inventive Principles (#3, #6, #19, #28) and mapped them to specific technical requirements:

- **Universality (Principle #6):** To resolve the conflict between noise robustness and complexity, we defined a requirement for a single, configurable de-noising algorithm that is applicable to all sensor types (aerial, underwater, satellite), differing only by configuration parameters.

- **Local Quality (Principle #3):** To balance energy efficiency with reliability, we required that sensor nodes use non-uniform power profiles specific to their local environment (e.g., deep-sea nodes operate differently than surface buoys).
- **Mechanics Substitution (Principle #28):** To address the loss of time and reliability issues caused by mechanical wear, the system requires the use of solid-state sensing technologies (such as ultrasonic flow detectors) instead of mechanical moving parts.
- **Periodic Action (Principle #19):** To further resolve the Reliability vs. Energy Used contradiction, we mandated that underwater sensors transmit data using periodic pulses (e.g., every 10-30 seconds) rather than a continuous stream, switching to continuous mode only when hazards are detected.

4 System Context and Environment

This section defines the operational boundaries of the SMSTWD and its interactions with the wider environment. The system operates as a central hub within an ecosystem of sensor networks, end-users, and external computational infrastructure. The high-level interactions between the SMSTWD and these external entities are illustrated in the System Context Diagram shown in Figure 4.




Fig. 4. SMSTWD Context Diagram illustrating boundaries, actors, and constraints.

4.1 System Boundaries

As depicted in Figure 4, the operational boundary of the SMSTWD contains the core logic for data ingestion, multi-modal sensor integration, probabilistic risk scoring, and alert generation. The physical sensor hardware (satellites, buoys, seismometers) are considered external data sources that feed into the system boundary. As

such, we do not consider the effect of the natural environment; this is the concern of the sensor manufacturers. Human users and external infrastructure systems are actors outside the boundary, and receive processed information or provide decision-making support.

4.2 External Entities and Interactions

The entities surrounding the SMSTWD can be categorized into three primary groups: sensor inputs, user outputs, and external infrastructure.

Sensor Inputs The SMSTWD relies on real-time data ingestion from diverse physical environments:

- **Satellite Systems:** Provide high-resolution imagery and large-scale meteorological data.
- **Oceanic Sensor Networks:** Deep-sea buoys and sensors providing telemetry on water pressure, flow direction, and tidal wave characteristics.
- **Seismic Networks:** Land-based and submarine sensors detecting ground vibrations and tectonic plate movements.
- **Aerial Sensors:** Localized weather stations providing data on pressure, temperature, and wind speeds.

User Outputs and Stakeholders The primary purpose of the system is to deliver actionable intelligence to human actors:

- **General Public:** Receives time-critical emergency alerts via multiple broadcast channels (SMS, apps) to facilitate evacuation.
- **Government Agencies/Responders:** Receive detailed probabilistic risk scores, technical dashboards, and decision-support data to coordinate operational disaster response.

External Infrastructure Support To maintain high availability and processing power, the SMSTWD integrates with external technical systems:

- **Cloud Service Providers:** Offer scalable external storage for historical data and high-performance computing resources for running complex AI/ML inference models.
- **Smart City Infrastructure & Autonomous Transport Networks:** Future-facing integrations intended to receive automated triggers from the SMSTWD to activate flood gates, shut down gas lines, or reroute autonomous traffic without human intervention.

4.3 System Constraints and Regulations

The system operates under strict technical and legal constraints that influence its architecture and data handling procedures.

Technical Constraints

- **Data Quality and Noise:** The system ingests highly noisy data from heterogeneous sources. Signals from underwater and aerial sensors often contain environmental interference, requiring heavy de-noising and domain-specific tuning before processing can occur.
- **Latency Requirements:** To prevent loss of life, the system must process data and issue warnings in near real-time, requiring minimized latency between detection and alert dissemination.

Laws and Regulations

- **Data Storage and Privacy:** As the system interacts with mobile applications and personal devices for alerts, it must adhere to data privacy laws regarding the storage and handling of user location data.
- **Government Compliance:** The system functions as a critical alert mechanism for national safety. It must comply with government regulations regarding the format, timing, and validation of public emergency broadcasts to prevent false alarms and panic.
- **Sharing Policies:** Inter-agency data sharing policies dictate how raw sensor data and risk scores are distributed between national meteorological agencies and private tech companies.

5 System Architecture and User Model

This section details the structural design and internal behavioral flows of the SMSTWD. The system architecture is defined via a Block Definition Diagram (BDD), illustrating the decomposition into major subsystems. The internal interactions and data processing pipelines that realize the system's function are detailed in the Internal Block Diagram (IBD).

5.1 System Architecture (Block Definition Diagram)

The high-level structure of the SMSTWD is presented in the BDD in Figure 5. The architecture separates data acquisition, processing and alerting, handling these classes of functionality with specialized sub-systems.




Fig. 5. Block Definition Diagram (BDD) depicting the high-level architecture and subsystems of the SMSTWD.

As shown in Figure 5, the central **SMSTWD** is composed of three primary components:

- **Main Unit:** This is the interface layer between external physical sensors and the internal processing logic. It is responsible for ingesting raw data from satellite, aerial, and underwater sensor systems.
- **Data Processing Unit (DPU):** The computational core of the system. The DPU pre-processes raw data with a shared de-noising pipeline, performs initial inference based on each individual data source, then pools these inferences into higher-level inferences about the meteorological phenomena, as well as the associated risk. These computations are performed asynchronously, in near real-time.
- **Communication Unit (CU):** This subsystem acts as the output interface. It receives inferences from the DPU and translates them into actionable formats for human stakeholders (the public, government agencies, etc.).

5.2 Internal Interactions (Internal Block Diagram)

While the BDD defines what the components are, the IBD in Figure 6 illustrates how the sub-components of the main unit exchange data.




Fig. 6. Internal Block Diagram (IBD) illustrating the data flow and processing pipeline within the SMSTWD.

The final outputs of the inference pipelines within the DPU are sent to the CU, where these values are compared against pre-determined thresholds, and messages are routed to both government and public channels. The government receives a consistent stream of data regardless of conditions, whereas the public is alerted only when one or more internal thresholds have been crossed.

6 Behavioral Analysis

This section details the behavior of the SMSTWD. We use SysML State Machine Diagrams to define the operational states of the system's components, and a Sequence Diagram to illustrate the time-ordered interaction between sensors, the DPU, and the CU.

6.1 State Machine Modeling

The system's behavior is event-driven. The main controller triggers inference within the DPU, as new data is received from sensor sub-systems. The high-level behavior of the SMSTWD is depicted in Figure 7.




Fig. 7. State Machine Diagram for the SMSTWD Main System.

As shown in Figure 7, the system transitions from **Off** to **On** via the **evSwitchOn** event. Upon entry into the **On** state, the system triggers the **evDetectParameters()** event on all connected sensors (Aerial, Satellite, and Underwater), initializing the global monitoring process. Inside the **On** state, the central unit acts as a listener and waits for data events (e.g., **evNewAerialData**, **evNewUnderwaterData**) and immediately routes these payloads to **itsDataProcessingUnit** for inference.

Sensor Behaviors Each sensor subsystem contains multiple parallel categories of data.

- **Aerial Sensor Subsystem:** (Figure 8) monitors **precipitationAmount**, **stormPosition**, **windDirection**, and **windSpeed**. The statechart shows these parameters being updated in parallel loops (with varying timer intervals like 5000ms or 7000ms), ensuring a continuous stream of atmospheric data.
- **Satellite Sensor Subsystem:** (Figure 9) monitors **ImageData** and **stormCoordinates**. This separation allows image processing (which may be slower) to occur without blocking coordinate tracking.
- **Underwater Sensor Subsystem:** (Figure 10) monitors **waterPressure**, **seismicVibration**, and **flowDirection**. Crucially, it includes a specific state for **transmissionMode**. This state governs the sensor's communication behavior, adhering to the TRIZ requirement to periodically sleep or pulse data transmission to conserve energy in remote deep-sea locations.




Fig. 8. Aerial Sensor Statechart.




Fig. 9. Satellite Sensor Statechart.




Fig. 10. Underwater Sensor Statechart highlighting the transmission mode.

6.2 Operational Sequence and Data Logic

The end-to-end data flow is illustrated in the Sequence Diagram (Figure 11), taking the Aerial Sensor scenario as a representative example. The sequence of operations proceeds as follows:

1. Data Ingestion and Inference (DPU) The DPU receives raw inputs from the sensors, including the diagnostic signal confirming the sensor is transmitting correctly.

- **Input:** Wind speed, wind direction, storm position, precipitation (all from aerial sensor subsystem); water pressure, seismic vibrations, flow direction (all from underwater sensor subsystem); storm coordinates, images (all from satellite sensor subsystem).
- **Inference:** The DPU runs this data through an internal machine learning model. It runs the `deNoise` function on all data streams, and generates specific predictions: `stormIntensityInference`, `waterPressureInference`, and `seismicInference`.
- **Risk Scoring:** Based on these predictions, the DPU calculates a consolidated `currentRiskScore`.

2. Communication (CU) The inferred data and risk scores are passed to the CU, which manages stakeholder interaction based on the following logic:

- **Government Communication:** The CU maintains a constant link with government agencies.
 - *Normal State:* If the risk score is below the threshold, the system sends a heartbeat message: “Everything is Fine.”
 - *Alert State:* If `stormIntensityInference`, `waterPressureInference`, or `seismicActivityInference` cross predefined thresholds, the message changes dynamically to indicate the specific hazard (Tsunami or Storm). Simultaneously, a visual signal (represented by `ledLight`) is triggered to indicate high risk.
- **Public Communication:** Unlike the constant government stream, public alerts are only issued when one or more of the aforementioned thresholds are crossed.
 - *Multichannel:* Alerts are disseminated via SMS network and mobile application updates.
 - *Localization:* Addressing the requirement for a multi-region system, the CU includes a `publicMessageLang` property, ensuring the alert is translated into the region-specific language. The language is determined based on the `targetRegionCoordinates` parameter inferred within the DPU.
 - *Risk Probability:* The risk score is only shown to public when parameters cross their threshold to prevent unnecessary panic.




Fig. 11. Sequence Diagram illustrating the Aerial Sensing and Decision Logic.

6.3 User Interface and Interaction

To verify the system behavior and visualize the interaction between internal logic and stakeholder outputs, a Graphical User Interface (GUI) was implemented. This interface serves as a real-time dashboard for monitoring sensor health, internal inference states, and alert dissemination status.

The GUI behavior dynamically adapts to the system's internal state, as demonstrated in the following scenarios.

Baseline Operation and Diagnostics Figure 12 illustrates the system in its nominal operating state.




Fig. 12. GUI displaying nominal "Everything is Fine" state with active diagnostics.

In this state:

- **Sensor Diagnostics:** The 'Diagnostic LEDs' for Aerial, Underwater, and Satellite sensors are illuminated (Red/Active), fulfilling the safety requirement for a continuous heartbeat check.
- **Government Output:** The 'Government/Authorities Message' display reads "Everything is Fine", indicating that while data is flowing, no risk thresholds have been breached.
- **Visual Instrumentation:** Key parameters such as Wind Speed (digital counter), Storm Position (x.y coordinates), and Water Pressure (gauge) are visualized in real-time to allow human operators to verify sensor outputs.

Storm Detection Scenario When the system detects atmospheric anomalies, the interface updates immediately to reflect the specific hazard type. Figure 13 shows the system response when the ML Storm Intensity Inference crosses its defined threshold. Key behavioral changes include:

- **Specific Alerting:** The Government Message updates to "Possible storm detected; enact emergency protocol 1," providing actionable intelligence rather than raw data.
- **Public Warning:** The SMS and Mobile App alert fields display "Possible storm detected; please remain indoors," verifying the requirement for multi-channel dissemination.
- **Threshold Logic:** The 'Threshold Analysis' panel visually indicates that the Storm Intensity value (0.501) has exceeded the set limit, triggering the alerts.




Fig. 13. GUI Alert State triggering "Emergency Protocol 1" due to Storm Intensity threshold breach.

Tsunami Detection Scenario Figure 14 demonstrates the scenario of a multi-modal high-risk event. This verifies the safety requirement to cross-validate high-level tsunami alerts using at least two different sensor modalities:

- **Dual Confirmation:** The GUI shows that both 'ML Seismic Activity Inference' and 'ML Water Pressure Inference' have crossed their respective thresholds.
- **Multilingual Support:** The 'Public Message Language' field switches displays between "Romanian" and "English" confirming the system's ability to identify the target region's primary language and prepare alerts accordingly.
- **Urgent Messaging:** The public alerts escalate to "Possible tsunami detected; please evacuate," differentiating the response from the storm scenario.




Fig. 14. GUI Tsunami Alert triggered by dual-threshold breach (Seismic + Water Pressure).

7 Conclusion

The Smart Monitoring System for Weather and Tsunami Detection (SMSTWD) represents a significant advancement in disaster management technology. By integrating heterogeneous data sources like satellite, aerial, and underwater into a unified processing framework, the system addresses the critical need for real-time, actionable intelligence in the face of natural disasters.

Throughout this project, we applied a systems engineering approach to create an architecture fit for the task at hand. The utilization of the 9-Box analysis allowed us to contextualize the system's evolution, ensuring the design is future-proofed for integration with autonomous infrastructure and smart cities. Furthermore, the application of the TRIZ Inventive Principles provided a structured method to resolve engineering contradictions, balancing the trade-offs between system reliability, energy efficiency, and operational complexity in noisy environments.

The architectural design, formalized through SysML Block Definition and Internal Block Diagrams, is a modular structure capable of handling high-throughput data fusion and probabilistic risk scoring. State Machine diagrams and the GUI demonstrate the SMSTWD's ability to dynamically adapt to changing risk levels, enforce safety protocols, and effectively communicate alerts across multiple languages and channels.

Ultimately, the SMSTWD successfully meets its primary mission, i.e to bridge the gap between raw environmental data and public safety, transforming accurate monitoring into life-saving alerts that protect both communities and critical infrastructure.

References

1. Assignment Deliverables for SMSTWD, 2025.
2. Lecture notes and materials by Prof. Dr.Ion Barosan