

# **Architectural Modeling and Analysis for Safety Engineering**

**A THESIS TOPIC PROPOSAL  
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA  
BY**

Danielle Stewart

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
Doctor of Philosophy

Mats P. E. Heimdahl

May, 2019

© Danielle Stewart 2019  
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

# **Acknowledgements**

## Abstract

Today's software development projects must respond to fierce competition, a constantly changing marketplace, and rapid technological innovation. Agile development processes are popular when attempting to respond to these changes in a controlled manner; however, selecting an ill-suited process may increase project costs and risk. Before adopting a seemingly promising agile approach, we desire to evaluate the approach's applicability in the context of the specific product, organization, and staff. Simulation provides a means to do this. However, in order to simulate agile processes we require both the ability to model individual behavior as well as the decoupling of the process and product. To our knowledge, no existing simulator nor underlying simulation model provide a means to do this.

To address this gap, we propose a process simulation reference model that provides the constructs and relationships for capturing the interactions among the individuals, product, process, and project in a holistic fashion. As a means for evaluating this reference model, we plan to produce a simulation framework on which to execute concrete representations of processes encoded using the reference model.

Our expected contributions are a reference model that can be used to encode simulatable agile process models—models that incorporate the process as well as the project environment—and an initial simulation framework that allows us to execute models encoded using our reference model. This work lays the groundwork for detailed *a priori* process evaluation and enables future research into process development.

# Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>List of Tables</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Figures</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Author Declaration</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.0.1 Objectives and Significance . . . . .	1
1.0.2 Use in Research and System Development . . . . .	1
1.0.3 Intended Contributions . . . . .	1
1.0.4 Evaluation . . . . .	1
1.0.5 Chapters and Organization of the Proposal . . . . .	2
<b>2 Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3 Proposed Approach</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>5</b>

# List of Tables

# List of Figures

# Author Declaration

Some of the material presented within has previously been published in the following papers:

- 

All the work contained within represents the original contribution of the author.



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

System safety analysis is crucial in the development life cycle of critical systems to ensure adequate safety as well as demonstrate compliance with applicable standards. A prerequisite for any safety analysis is a thorough understanding of the system architecture and the behavior of its components; safety engineers use this understanding to explore the system behavior to ensure safe operation, assess the effect of failures on the overall safety objectives, and construct the accompanying safety analysis artifacts. Developing adequate understanding, especially for software components, is a difficult and time consuming endeavor. Given the increase in model-based development in critical systems [6, 15, 17, 21, 22], leveraging the resultant models in the safety analysis process holds great promise in terms of analysis accuracy as well as efficiency.

### 1.1 Objectives and Significance

- The objective of this dissertation is...
- The proposal description
- How the information is used in the safety assessment process

### 1.2 Use in Research and System Development

The certification process in SA and MBSA.

### 1.3 Intended Contributions

Make itemized list with explanatory paragraphs.

## **1.4 Evaluation**

Research questions to evaluate.

## **1.5 Chapters and Organization of the Proposal**

## **Chapter 2**

# **Background**

Related Work

## **Chapter 3**

# **Proposed Approach**

Background information, formal notations, show how these are used in the SA process.

# References

- [1] AIR 6110. Contiguous Aircraft/System Development Process Example, Dec. 2011.
- [2] AS5506C. Architecture Analysis & Design Language (AADL), Jan. 2017.
- [3] P. Bieber, C. Bougnol, C. Castel, J.-P. H. C. Kehren, S. Metge, and C. Seguin. Safety assessment with altairica. In *Building the Information Society*, pages 505–510. Springer, 2004.
- [4] P. Bieber, J.-L. Farges, X. Pucel, L.-M. Sèjeau, and C. Seguin. Model - based safety analysis for co-assessment of operation and system safety: application to specific operations of unmanned aircraft. In *ERTS2*, 2018.
- [5] B. Bittner, M. Bozzano, R. Cavada, A. Cimatti, M. Gario, A. Griggio, C. Mattarei, A. Micheli, and G. Zampedri. The xSAP Safety Analysis Platform. In *TACAS*, 2016.
- [6] M. Bozzano, A. Cimatti, A. Griggio, and C. Mattarei. Efficient Anytime Techniques for Model-Based Safety Analysis. In *Computer Aided Verification*, 2015.
- [7] M. Bozzano, A. Cimatti, J.-P. Katoen, V. Y. Nguyen, T. Noll, and M. Roveri. The COMPASS Approach: Correctness, Modelling and Performability of Aerospace Systems. In *Computer Safety, Reliability, and Security*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [8] M. Bozzano, A. Cimatti, A. F. Pires, D. Jones, G. Kimberly, T. Petri, R. Robinson, and S. Tonetta. Formal Design and Safety Analysis of AIR6110 Wheel Brake System. In *CAV 2015, Proceedings, Part I*, pages 518–535, 2015.
- [9] M. Bozzano and A. Villaflorita. *Design and Safety Assessment of Critical Systems*. Auerbach Publications, Boston, MA, USA, 1st edition, 2010.
- [10] D. Chen, N. Mahmud, M. Walker, L. Feng, H. Lönn, and Y. Papadopoulos. Systems Modeling with EAST-ADL for Fault Tree Analysis through HiP-HOPS\*. *IFAC Proceedings Volumes*, 46(22):91 – 96, 2013.
- [11] D. D. Cofer, A. Gacek, S. P. Miller, M. W. Whalen, B. LaValley, and L. Sha. Compositional Verification of Architectural Models. In *NFM 2012*, volume 7226, pages 126–140, April 2012.

- [12] C. Ericson. Fault tree analysis - a history. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Systems Safety Conference*, 1999.
- [13] P. Feiler and D. Gluch. *Model-Based Engineering with AADL: An Introduction to the SAE Architecture Analysis & Design Language*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2012.
- [14] P. Feiler, J. Hudak, J. Delange, and D. Gluch. Architecture fault modeling and analysis with the error model annex, version 2. Technical Report CMU/SEI-2016-TR-009, Software Engineering Institute, 06 2016.
- [15] M. Gudemann and F. Ortmeier. A framework for qualitative and quantitative formal model-based safety analysis. In *HASE 2010*, 2010.
- [16] N. Halbwachs, P. Caspi, P. Raymond, and D. Pilaud. The Synchronous Dataflow Programming Language Lustre. In *IEEE*, volume 79(9), pages 1305–1320, 1991.
- [17] P. Hönig, R. Lunde, and F. Holzapfel. Model Based Safety Analysis with smartIfflow. *Information*, 8(1), 2017.
- [18] P. Hönig, R. Lunde, and F. Holzapfel. Model Based Safety Analysis with smartIfflow. *Information*, 8(1), 2017.
- [19] A. Joshi and M. P. Heimdahl. Model-Based Safety Analysis of Simulink Models Using SCADE Design Verifier. In *SAFECOMP*, volume 3688 of *LNCS*, page 122, 2005.
- [20] A. Joshi and M. P. Heimdahl. Behavioral Fault Modeling for Model-based Safety Analysis. In *Proceedings of the 10th IEEE High Assurance Systems Engineering Symposium (HASE)*, 2007.
- [21] A. Joshi, S. P. Miller, M. Whalen, and M. P. Heimdahl. A Proposal for Model-Based Safety Analysis. In *In Proceedings of 24th Digital Avionics Systems Conference*, 2005.
- [22] O. Lisagor, T. Kelly, and R. Niu. Model-based safety assessment: Review of the discipline and its challenges. In *The Proceedings of 2011 9th International Conference on Reliability, Maintainability and Safety*, 2011.
- [23] MathWorks. The MathWorks Inc. Simulink Product Web Site. <http://www.mathworks.com/products/simulink>, 2004.
- [24] T. Prosvirnova, M. Batteux, P.-A. Brameret, A. Cherfi, T. Friedlhuber, J.-M. Roussel, and A. Rauzy. The AltaRica 3.0 Project for Model-Based Safety Assessment. *IFAC*, 46(22), 2013.
- [25] E. Ruijters and M. Stoelinga. Fault tree analysis: A survey of the state-of-the-art in modeling, analysis and tools. *Computer science review*, 15-16:29–62, 5 2015.

- [26] SAE ARP 4761. Guidelines and Methods for Conducting the Safety Assessment Process on Civil Airborne Systems and Equipment, December 1996.
- [27] SAE ARP4754A. Guidelines for Development of Civil Aircraft and Systems, December 2010.
- [28] D. Stewart, M. Whalen, D. Cofer, and M. P. Heimdahl. Architectural Modeling and Analysis for Safety Engineering. In *IMBSA 2017*, pages 97–111, 2017.