**Project documentation**

**Emergency call button**

Date: **14/02-11**

Advisor: Kim Bjerge

Project participants: Jørgen Vrou Hansen (20042728)

Saiid Shah Alizadeh (19963592)

Anders Hvidgaard Poder (19951439)

Revision: **A**

Document ID: **PRODDOC**

# Introduction

This document details the process, decisions and result of the Emergency button project. A prerequisite for reading this document is to have read the project proposal and the one-page intro.

The document begins by describing the process and then continues to describe the individual parts of the project as it progresses through the process. Naturally the process is iterative in nature, yet in the document any changes will be described under the section they relate to, and the document may therefore not be seen as a chronological detail of the process. Where changes occurs the point of origin will naturally be described along with its affect to earlier section in the change log.

# Process

1. Analyse project proposal and create SRD
   1. Domain model
   2. System level requirements
      1. Use cases.
      2. Sequence diagrams where needed.
      3. Non-functional requirements.
2. Refine SRD to SRS
   1. State and activity diagrams to clarify use cases.
   2. Detailed requirements from system requirements – Should we do this?
   3. Requirement traceability from system to detailed requirements.
   4. Traceability for changed requirements.
3. Overall architectural design
   1. Identify blocks and create overall structure
   2. Mapping of blocks to requirements, both in diagram and RVTM (V is not part of report)
   3. Create internal block diagram for important blocks.
   4. Create activity, state, sequence and other diagrams where needed.
   5. Modify requirements if needed.

3a. SySMl for SoC and design and SystemC transformation

* 1. Relate SySML block to SystemC module
  2. SystemC notation on SysMl diagrams
  3. Partitioning SysML blocks into 1 or more SystemC modules.
  4. Describe the process, important considerations

1. SystemC TLM of overall architectural design
   1. Map functional blocks to SystemC module.
   2. Create communication channels (mostly standard FIFO).
   3. Modify architecture/requirements if needed.
2. Architecture mapping
   1. Identify alternative architectures.
   2. Create architectural design for each alternative.
3. Process mapping for each alternative architecture
   1. Identify processes.
   2. Identify communication.
   3. Map Processes to PE and Communication channels to CE
4. SystemC Timed TLM for each alternative architectures
   1. Update and refine SystemC to the alternative architecture
   2. Identify delayes in the proceses and communication channel based on rough estimation.
   3. Implement delays in SystemC.
   4. Simulate the system and compare the results.
5. Conclusion
   1. Evaluate the pros and cons of the alternative architectures.
   2. Evaluate the process.

# Domain model



Figure 1 - Domain model drawing

In Figure 1 may be seen the overall parts of the Emergency call system including their communication paths. Only a small part of the above is part of this project, yet it is important to realize the domain in which the project operates.

The system functions as follows:

1. An emergency call base is installed in the home of the person receiving care and an emergency call button is issued to that person.
2. The Emergency button communicates with the emergency call base using the ISM network.
3. The emergency call base communicates with the phone company server using its built-in GSM modem and SIM card via a Base Tranceiver Station (BTS).
4. The phone company server forwards the communication via the internet to/from the emergency call server (naturally in a properly protected tunnel).
5. The emergency call server forwards the communication to/from the interested parties; technician, care giver or both.

The above may be formalized in a SysML Domain Basic Block Diagram as shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2 - Emergency call system Domain

In Figure 2 may be seen not only the System Of Interest, but also the environment in which it operates and the blocks with which it interconnects.

The environment in which the emergency call button operates is one where it may be operated by an elderly or disabled person, and may therefore be exposed to some degree of moisture and shocks, as well as worn continuously for a long time.

The ISM network naturally suffers from limited range, noise and interference, which is all part of the ISM network.

The Emergency call base is the communication gateway between the Emergency call server and the Emergency call button. It also has other responsibilities, yet they are irrelevant for this project. The communication goes via the GSM network, which also suffers from limited range, noise and interference as well as a third party service provider (the phone company). In the target area it is believed that with a sufficiently large and well placed GSM antenna a sufficient signal may always be achieved (assumption). Furthermore the GSM network has been thoroughly tested and the service providers have strong incentives to keep a very high availability.

The Emergency call server is placed in a protected environment with sufficient power and network access, and can reach the technician and caregiver on duty using either the head-office LAN , SMS Gateways and/or other third party services.

Focussing on the System-Of-Interest a set of requirements may be created from the project proposal. As the focus on this project is proof-of-concept some of the detail requirements (e.g. colour) will be excluded just like only the critical requirements, especially those containing implemtational risks, will be broken down in the architecture.

# Requirements

This section contains both the overall system requirements (SRD) and the refined requirements (SRS) in one, as the project is an in-house project with close proximity to the “customer”. It therefore does not make sense to create two separate documents, but is far more efficient to simply create the SRS right away.

Again the requirements are only the system requirements and do not include all detailed requirements, yet should contain sufficient data to complete a proof-of-concept.

Before we dive into the creation of the requirements we should look at the Quality attributes of importance to this system, as well as the challenges in meeting these requirements.

## Quality attributes

There are several schools of system architecture, many of which define their own set of quality attributes. A well known and recognized set is the one defined by [BASS] as follow:

* Availability
* Modifiability
* Performance
* Security
* Testability
* Usability

Many add an extra attribute:

* Safety

Naturally all of these are important, but some are more important than others, and some are also more likely to cause trouble. It is therefore important to include a risk assessment in the quality attribute analysis.

Naturally Safety is vitally important, but at the same time as this product focuses almost entirely on communication, most of the safety aspect is contained in Availability, and the only true Safety aspect is pinching ones finger in the button, scratching oneself on the frame or the battery blowing up. Looking at cell phone manufacturers the last safety aspect is actually a real one, especially as the emergency call button might get damp and warn close to the skin. We do however believe that the current EU regulations cover these aspects, and that sufficient experience exists to avoid this problem, and the risk of violating requirements for the safety attribute is low.

Second come Availability. The button must “always” be able to report an emergency (including battery low situations). Naturally there is no such thing as “always”, so an acceptable probability of failure must be agreed to. In the present system there is no fault detection, but the “buttons” are made so simple that a very high Mean-Time-Between-Failure (MTBF) can be achieved. In this must also be included the probability of a failure later in the communication path, but as these units are on a continuous power supply they can maintain a much higher fault detection frequency. It is believed that the probability of mechanical failure (the button gets stuck or the micro switch fails) can be considered negligible, making the state of the microcontroller a sufficiently deep fault detection.

Usability is also vitally important. Here the experience from existing system may be used to determine the optimal size, colour, location and feel of the button itself. Charging the emergency call button is a much more interesting aspect, as the existing “buttons” very rarely needs to have their battery replaced.

Testability is interesting in the sense that it is important to verify especially the Availability requirements, so it should be considered when writing the test cases and also when implementing the product.

Naturally a certain level of Performance is required, but the response times that is expected lies well below the technical capabilities of the technology available, and the risks here are therefore minor.

Modifiability is more of a nice to have as the cost of the individual emergency call button is such that the entire button may simply be replaced in lieu of updating the firmware, and also gaining access to the buttons themselves are relatively simple, as central lists of their whereabouts are kept at the municipalities.

Finally there is Security, and for this project it is not important. No confidential information should be exchanged on this medium and the desire for someone to want to impersonate an emergency call button is most likely quite small. Naturally the emergency call buttons must be distinguishable from each other, but protection against someone intentionally trying to spoof an emergency call button is not required.

## Rationale

Diving into the actual requirements we can derive a lot of the information directly from the project proposal, current legislation, existing solutions, and some from the specification of the emergency call base. Other requirements, like the maximum allowed time between failure detection, are derived from a combination of risk assessment and acceptable delays as indicated by the caregivers. By estimating a mean time between failures (MTBF) and an acceptable response delay and failure probability it is possible to calculate the required fault detection interval in order to meet the indicated fault probability figure.

This calculation can be done as follow:

* MTBF = 365 days.
* Acceptable extra delay = 30 minutes (a total response time of 60 minutes).
* Acceptable probability that 60 minute requirement is not met = 0,1%.
* A city has an average of 1000 emergency buttons.

The probability that the error occurs in the time more than 30 minutes from a fault detection is (X – 30) / (365 \* 24\* 60) => (X – 30) / 525600, where X is the interval between fault detection. The probability that one of the thousand emergency buttons fail is ((X – 30) / 525600) \* 1000 => (X – 30) / 525.6. Combining this with the required probability gives (X – 30) /525.6 = 0.001 => X – 30 = 0.5256 => X = 30.5256, there must be something wrong with the calculation?




## Content

Please refer to [REQSPEC] for the actual requirements.

TODO: Should we insert the requirements here, or refer to the document?

# Architecture







\*\*\*In the heartbeat it is possible to report status information, e.g. battery level.