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Introduction

- Fault Tree Analysis: Recap.
- Software Fault Trees.
- Software Probabilistic Risk Assessment.
Fault Trees: Recap

Fault Tree Gates

Fault Tree Events
Fault Tree Analysis

- Each tree considers 1 failure:
  - Carefully choose top event;
  - Carefully choose system boundaries.

- Assign probabilities to basic events:
  - Stop if you have the data;
  - Circles denote basic events.

- Simple but tool support is critical.
Fault Tree Analysis: Hardware

- No water from Line 1
  - No water through valve
    - V1
  - No water to valve
    - P1
      - Pipe blocked
      - P1
        - Filter blocked
          - F1
        - No water
          - W
• Each failure has several modes:
  – ‘different routes to top event’.

• Cut set:
  – basic events that lead to top event.

• Minimal cut set:
  – removing a basic event avoids failure.

• Path set:
  – basic events that avoid top event;
  – list of components that ensure safety.
Fault Tree Analysis - Cut Sets

- Top_Event = K1 + K2 + ... K_n
  - K_i minimal cut sets, + is logical OR.

- K_i = X_1 . X_2 . X_n
  - MCS are conjuncts of basic events.
Fault Tree Analysis - Cut Sets

• Top-down approach:
  – replace event by expression below;
  – simply if possible (C.C = C).

• Can use Karnaugh map techniques;
  – cf logic circuit design;
  – recruit tool support in practice.

• Notice there is no negation.

• Notice there is no XOR.
1. Assign unique label to each gate.
2. Label each basic event.
3. Create a two dimensional array A.
4. Initialise A(1,1) to top event.
5. Scan array to find an OR/AND gate:
   If current position in A is OR gate...
   - replace current position with a column;
   - put gate's input events in new row of that column.
   - replace current position with a row;
   - put gate's input events in new column of that row.
6. Repeat 5 until no gates remain in array.
7. Remove any non-minimal cut sets.
Fault Trees: MOCUS Cut Set Algorithm
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T1 = BE1 + BE2.BE3 + BE4.BE5 + BE6
Fault Trees: Probabilistic Analysis

For simplicity assume probability of all basic events is 0.1

\[
P(G1) = P(BE2).P(BE3) = 0.1 \times 0.1 = 0.01.
\]

\[
P(G2) = P(BE4).P(BE5) = 0.1 + 0.1 = 0.2.
\]

\[
P(T1) = 0.01 + 0.2 + P(BE1) + P(BE2)
= 0.01 + 0.2 + 0.1 + 0.1
= 0.41
\]
• Beware: independence assumption.

“If the same event occurs multiple times/places in a tree, any quantitative calculation must correctly reduce the boolean equation to account for these multiple occurrences. Independence merely means that the event is not caused due to the failure of another event or component, which then moves into the realm of conditional probabilities.”

Clif Ericson, ISSS.

• Inclusion-exclusion expansion (Andrews & Moss).
Fault Tree Analysis: Applied to Systems

- Usually applied to hardware...
- Can be used for software (later).
• House events; “switch” true or false.

• OR gates - multiple fault paths.
Fault Tree Analysis: Applied to Systems

- Probabilistic inhibit gates.
- Used with Monte Carlo techniques
  - True if random number < probability.
• As you'd expect.

• Starts with top-level failure
  – Trace events leading to failure.

• But:
  – Don't use probabilistic assessments;

• If you find software fault path REMOVE IT!

- Backwards reasoning.
- Weakest pre-condition approach.
- Similar to theorem proving.
- Uses language dependent templates.
Software Fault Trees

Assignment causes event

- Change in value causes event.
- Exception causes event.
- Operand evaluation causes event.
Software Fault Trees

If-Then-Else

Condition TRUE, THEN-part causes event.

Condition evaluation causes event.

Condition FALSE, ELSE-part causes event.

Condition TRUE before IF-THEN-ELSE statement.

THEN-part causes event.

Condition FALSE before IF-THEN-ELSE statement.

ELSE-part causes event.
Software Fault Trees

WHILE statement causes event.

Statement not executed

Event before WHILE statement

Condition false before WHILE

Statement executed \( n \) times.

Condition true before WHILE.

\( n \)th iteration causes event
Software Fault Trees

\[ P_c(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n) \]
causes event.

- Evaluation of parameters causes event.
- Execution of \( P_c \) with \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_n \) causes event.
- Failure of \( P_c \) causes event.
Example Software Fault Tree

```plaintext
while X_Pos < Limit do
  begin
    X_Pos := X_Pos + 1;
    Y_Pos := Y_Pos + 1;
  end;

-- Let's assume dangerous condition
-- Y_Pos > 10
```

---

WHILE statement causes Y_Pos > 10

Statement not executed.

Y_Pos > 10 before WHILE statement.

X_Pos := Limit before WHILE.

Statement executed \( n \) times.

X_Pos < Limit before WHILE.

Y_Pos + Limit - X_Pos > 10 before WHILE.
Exception template for Ada83

Exception causes failure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exception body causes failure.</th>
<th>Exception was raised.</th>
<th>Exception handler exists.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exception was propagated.</td>
<td>Exception raised locally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exception template for Ada95

- Exception causes failure
  - Locally raised exception causes failure.
  - A propagating exception causes failure.
    - Exception raised locally.
    - Failure in exception.
      - Evaluation of parameter causes failure
      - Execution of handler body causes failure.
    - Exception handler exists.

• John Musa's work at Bell Labs.

• Failure rate of software before tests.

• Faults per unit of time $\lambda_0$:
  – function of faults over infinite time.

• Based on execution time:
  – not calendar time as in hardware;
  – so no overall system predictions.
Musa's PRA for Software

\[ \lambda_0 = K \times P \times W_0 \]

- **K**: Constant that accounts for the dynamic structure of the program and the varying Machines, \( k = 4.2E-7 \).

- **P**: Estimate of the number of executions per time unit, \( p = r/SLOC/ER \)

- **r**: Average instruction execution rate, determined from the manufacturer or Benchmarking, Constant

- **SLOC**: Source lines of code (not including reused code).
Musa's PRA for Software

- \( \lambda_0 = K \times P \times W_0 \)

- ER: Expansion ratio constant per programming language: Assembler, 1.0; Macro Assembler, 1.5; C, 2.5; COBAL, FORTRAN, 3; Ada, 4.5

- \( W_0 \): Estimate of the initial number of faults in the program. Can be calculated using: \( w0 = N \times B \), or a default of 6 faults/1000 SLOC can be assumed

- \( N \): Total number of inherent faults. Estimated based upon judgment or past experience.

- \( B \): Fault to failure conversion rate; proportion of faults that become failures. Proportion of faults not corrected before the product is delivered. Assume \( B = .95 \); i.e., 95% of the faults undetected at delivery become failures after delivery
• Considerable debate about this:
  – No account for experience of coders?
  – No account for number of teams?
  – No account for complexity of requirements?
  – What about configuration management?

• Many variants on the theme.

• Metrics are crude…

• In meantime, be sceptical.
Conclusions

• Fault Trees:
  – cut sets, cut paths;
  – quantitative analysis.

• Software Fault Trees:
  – language dependent templates;
  – if you see faults, remove them!

• Software PRA: the Musa formula…
Any Questions…