

1 | TFC-SPL: DOMAIN ENGINEERING PHASE

1.1 | Tiriba SPL Hazard Analysis and Risk Assessment

During Domain HARA, variation in *No pilot commands* and *Value pilot commands* hazards and their risks were identified in both two aforementioned system variants (see Table 1).

TABLE 1 Variability on Tiriba flight control SPL HARA and allocation of safety requirements.

System Variant	Hazard Analysis		Risk Assessment and Allocation of Safety Req.		
	Hazard Defn.	Hazard Causes	Severity	likelihood	DAL
TFC-MAT/ Controlled	No pilot commands	Omission-FSC.filteredControls AND Omission-PWMDecoder.flightControls	Catastrophic	10e – 9	A
TFC-ALL/ Uncontrolled	No pilot commands	Omission-FSC.filteredControls AND Omission-PWMDecoder.flightControls AND Omission-ModeSwitcher.controlMode	Hazardous	10e-7	B
TFC-MAT/ Controlled	Incorrect pilot commands	Value-FSC.filteredControls AND Value-PWMDecoder.flightControls	Hazardous	10e – 7	B
TFC-ALL/ Uncontrolled	Incorrect pilot commands	Value-FSC.filteredControls AND Value-PWMDecoder.flightControls AND Value-ModeSwitcher.controlMode	Hazardous	10e-5	C

1.2 | Allocation and Decomposition of Safety Requirements

Variation in the DALs allocated to mitigate hazards in both Tiriba system variants has direct impact on the development processes to be enacted to comply with safety standards in order to achieve the safety certification of an individual system variant, as illustrated in Table 2.

TABLE 2 Variability in safety-critical system development processes per level of integrity.

Safety Objectives	Standard Requirements	Development Assurance Levels				
	Activities	A	B	C	D	E
The aircraft/system functional hazard is performed with independence	SAE ARP 4754A sec. 5.1.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.4	v	v	-	-	-
The aircraft/system functional hazard is performed	SAE ARP 4754A sec. 5.1.1, 5.2.3, 5.2.4	v	v	v	v	-
Verification of additional code that cannot be traced to the source code is achieved	DO-178C sec. 6.4.4d: Analysis to confirm that all the test cases are traceable to requirements	v	v	-	-	-
High level requirements should comply with system requirements	DO-178C sec. 6.3.1: Analysis of compliance with system requirements	v	v	v	-	-

v : safety objective and activities are **highly recommended** or **recommended** to achieve the given DAL.

- : safety objective and activities are **not required** to achieve the given DAL.

The DALs allocated to TFC hazards can be further decomposed throughout components and their associated failure modes. Table 3 illustrates the decomposition of DALs allocated to *No pilot commands* and *Value pilot commands* in the TFC-MAT system variant (see Table 1) throughout *PWM Decoder* component and its failure modes.

TABLE 3 Variability in the DAL decomposition throughout components and their failure modes.

Component	Failure Mode	FM-DAL: TFC-MAT	DAL: TFC-MAT	FM-DAL: TFC-ALL	DAL:TFC-ALL	DAL: SPL
Barometric Processor	OFailure1	C	C	C	C	C
	OFailure2	C		C		
PWM Decoder	OFailure1	A		C		
	OFailure2	-	A	C	C	A
	VFailure1	E		C		
	VFailure2	-		C		

- : failure mode is absent in the component in a particular system variant.

1.3 | Tiriba SPL Component Fault Modeling

In the TFC-SPL, different component failures may contribute to the occurrence of each identified system hazard in different TFC variants and usage contexts. The component fault modeling was carried out, and 106 failure expressions were added to 47 Tiriba flight control model elements. Table 4 illustrates an example of variation in the specification of component fault models for the BCP component.

TABLE 4 Variability in component fault analysis and modeling.

System Variant	Component	Component Failure Data	
		Output Deviation	Failure Expression
TFC-MAT/ Controlled	BCP	Omission-AutopilotSettings	OFailure1 OR (Omission-BasicCommand OR Omission-SensorData)
		Omission-AutopilotSettings	OFailure1 OR (Omission-BasicCommand AND Omission-SensorData)
TFC-ALL/ Uncontrolled	BCP	Omission-Mode	OFailure2 OR (Omission-BasicCommand AND Omission-SensorData)

2 | TFC-SPL: APPLICATION ENGINEERING PHASE

2.1 | Tiriba Product Hazard Analysis

Table 5 shows an excerpt of TFC-MAT variant-specific hazard analysis. Thus, a delay in receiving pilot commands, with *catastrophic* severity and *low* likelihood ($10e-9$ per hour of operation), can emerge due the occurrence of *late* failures in both *FSC* and *PWM Decoder* component *outputs* in the TFC-MAT system variant when operating under *stormy* weather conditions. On the other hand, the occurrence of an *early* failure in the *FSC.filteredControls*

output or a *commission* failure in the *PWMDecoder.flightControls* output can lead to the *reception of pilot commands earlier as intended* system hazard, with a *hazardous* severity and a probability of occurrence of 10e-7 per hour of operation, when TFC-MAT is assumed to operate under *rainy* weather conditions.

TABLE 5 Application-specific HARA and allocation of safety requirements.

Variant/Context	Hazard Analysis		Risk Assessment and Allocation of Safety Req.		
	Hazard Defn.	Hazard Causes	Severity	likelihood	DAL
TFC-MAT/ Stormy	Delay in receiving pilot commands	Late-FSC.filteredControls AND Late-PWMDecoder.flightControls	Catastrophic	10e – 9	A
TFC-MAT/ Rainy	Pilot commands received earlier as intended	Early-FSC.filteredControls OR Commission-PWMDecoder.flightControls	Hazardous	10e – 7	B

2.2 | Tiriba Product Component Fault Modeling

Table 6 shows the enhanced Tiriba BCP component fault model with additional *output deviations* that may contribute to the occurrence of two additional TFC-MAT application-specific hazards identified during application HARA (see Table 5).

TABLE 6 Application-specific component fault modeling.

Variant/Context	Component	Component Failure Data	
		Output Deviation	Failure Expression
TFC-MAT Stormy	BCP	Late-AutopilotSettings	OFailure1 OR (Late-BasicCommand OR Late-SensorData)
		Commission-AutopilotSettings	CFailure1 OR (Early-BasicCommand OR Commission-SensorData)

2.3 | Tiriba Fault Trees and FMEA Synthesis

Table 7 shows the FMEA results for the Tiriba *PWM Decoder* subsystem component, which might change according to the targeted product variant.



TABLE 7 Variability in Failure Modes and Effects Analysis.

System Variant	Component	Failure Mode	System Effect	Single Point of Failure
TFC-ALL Controlled	PWM Decoder	<i>OFailure1</i>	<i>No pilot commands</i>	False
		<i>OFailure2</i>	<i>No pilot commands</i> <i>Value pilot commands</i>	<i>False</i>
		<i>VFailure1</i>	<i>Value pilot commands</i>	<i>False</i>
		<i>VFailure2</i>	<i>Value pilot commands</i>	<i>False</i>
TFC-MAT Controlled	PWM Decoder	<i>OFailure1</i>	<i>No pilot commands</i>	False
		<i>VFailure1</i>	<i>Value pilot commands</i>	<i>True</i>