# Hazard Analysis
# Software Engineering

Team 2, SyntaxSentinals
Mohammad Mohsin Khan
Lucas Chen
Dennis Fong
Julian Cecchini
Luigi Quattrociocchi

Table 1: Revision History

| Date | Developer(s) | Change |
|---|---|---|
| Oct 15 | SyntaxSentinels | Initial Revision |
| ... | ... | ... |

# Contents

# 1 Introduction

A hazard is a property or condition in the system together with a condition in the environment that has the potential to cause harm, disrupt operations, or negatively affect the functionality of a system. Hazards can arise from various sources, including system malfunctions, human errors, environmental factors, or security vulnerabilities.

This document is the hazard analysis for the Capstone SyntaxSentinels. This project seeks to create a plagiarism algorithm that relies on NLP techniques of present to account for semantics and prevent primitive circumvention of plagiarism detection, such as the addition of benign lines or variable name changes.

# 2 Scope and Purpose of Hazard Analysis

[You should say what **loss** could be incurred because of the hazards. —SS]

# 3 System Boundaries and Components

[Dividing the system into components will help you brainstorm the hazards. You shouldn't do a full design of the components, just get a feel for the major ones. For projects that involve hardware, the components will typically include each individual piece of hardware. If your software will have a database, or an important library, these are also potential components. —SS]

# 4 Critical Assumptions

- Adequate computational resources exist for the real time analysis of the code snippets

- Users do not intend to misuse the product

- Third party resources that support this product will always be functionally correct

- All components on the cloud will provide sufficient scalability and security

- The system will be maintained regularly with bug fixes/performance enhancements

- The criteria for plagiarism is agreed upon by all users

# 5 Failure Mode and Effect Analysis

| Design Function | Failure Modes | Effects of Failure | Causes of Failure | Detection | Recommended Actions | SR | Ref. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Input Processing | Failure to tokenize text | Model fails to function or gives wrong output | a. Code not in Python<br>b. Tokenizer malfunction | Check file extension to ensure .py suffix | a. Check input beforehand<br>b. Notify user of error occurred | | |
| | Failure to upload file | Plagiarism detection process does not start | a. Invalid file type<br>b. Server error | Error handling | a. Notify user of failed upload | | |
| User Account Handling | Unauthorized access to account | a. Account compromised<br>b. User submissions compromised | a. Weak user authentication measures | | a. Limit unsuccessful login attempts<br>b. Multi-factor authentication | | |
| Result processing and generation | Model is overfitted | Model fails to identify plagiarism for many inputs | a. Small dataset<br>b. Dataset too specific | Test model with test dataset | a. Ensure datasets don't all have similar code | | |
| | Model providing false positives | Submissions incorrectly flagged for plagiarism | a. Inability to recognize common coding practices<br>b. Error in model | Proper tests with test data split | a. Implement good pattern analysis<br>b. Proper testing | | |
| | Comments are tokenized or ignored incorrectly | Comments become extremely easy way to bypass plagiarism detection | a. Bad implementation of model<br>b. Error in code | Found in testing using inputs with comments | a. Ensure code handles comments properly | | |
| Result output display | Results e-mail failed to send | Users who close the tab will not see the results | a. Network issues on either sender/recipient side newline b. Blocked by spam filters<br>c. Incorrect e-mail address | | a. Send e-mail from safe and trusted domains b. Ensure recipient address is filled correctly in script | | |

Table 2: Failure Mode and Effect Analysis

# 6 Safety and Security Requirements

[Newly discovered requirements. These should also be added to the SRS. (A rationale design process how and why to fake it.) —SS]

# 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

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?