

Model based safety assessment of space operations

Toward integration of failure analysis of system and operation

22/10/2015

JP Blanquart Airbus Defence & Space AIRBUS C. Seguin, P. Bieber ONERA



retour sur innovation

- Our understanding of MBSA principles
- Joint lessons learnt by ONERA/Airbus Defence & Space for space operations
- Conclusion



MBSA Principle – 1/3

- Principle 1: RAMS model closer to design models
 - Achieve failure propagation model to support RAMS analysis
 - Structure the failure propagation model as the nominal reference model

Braking system example: high level view of the physical architecture



Fault tree with top level event "Loss of all whee braking"

Unannunciated Loss



MBSA Principle – 2/3

- Principle 2: Component based model to master the complexity
 - Encapsulate in components the knowledge about static/dynamic failure propagation rules
 - Make explicit the interfaces/internal states impacting propagation



MBSA Principles - 3/3

- Principle 3: Tool based assessment of formal models
 - Associate component models with *formal semantics* to specify rigorously how the failures are propagated in the overall system
 - Use tools to automatically perform on the formal semantics usual RAMS computation

Example of formal model: AltaRica mode automata



Computation supported by AltaRica

- Simulation / failure injection
- Fault tree / sequence of events generation
- Stochastic simulation
- Model-checking

Example of related tools

- Industrial tools: Cecilia OCAS (Dassault Aviation) / SIMFIA (APSYS)
- Academic tools : LaBri, FBK, ONERA, IRT Systemix ...



Lessons learnt for Space System Safety

- Application to safety/FDIR of technical systems
 - ATV control system (European project ASSERT)
 - Formation flying (CNES project)
 - FDIR validation: for AOCS with TAS / for Thermic & Power system with Airbus Defence & Space
- Feedback:
 - MBSA mature for safety assessment and early validation of FDIR principles
 - Need for complementary models & tools for analysis of detailed design
 - Formal models closer to physics exists: timed / hybrid automata
 - Robust & scalable assessment tools
 are still needed



Figure 26: AltaRica model Top-level view of ATV architecture 37



Lessons learnt for Space Operation Safety

- Application to safety analysis of socio-technical systems (project ESA IFA, DGA EXDRO)
 - Satellite operation, organization of space debris management
 - UAV operation (collision avoidance)
- Feedback:
 - MBSA principles valid also for socio-technical systems
 - Encouraging results about models of human tasks and organization
 - Integrated analysis of technical and social views
 - Composition principle very useful
 - But very big models: support needed to browse, extract subpart, build view from models.





Conclusion

- Positive feedback on MBSA in several cases
 - a key success point is to find the relevant formal semantics for the modelling and analysis purpose
 - Opportunity to exchange with COMPASS team to take the best from each one of the underlying formal models?
- A lot of tools available with different status
 - Tested on our side: mature tool for safety assessment (e.g. OCAS)
 - Less test on tools for other RAMS needs or more detailed analysis
 - Opportunity to exchange with COMPASS to test
 - Testability/diagnosability tools
 - Duration analysis for FDIR validation
- More general new trends
 - Adapt principles developed for technical system safety assessment to address now also the socio-technical aspects
 - Need not only for computation tools but also tools to browse, consult, extract and recompose models more efficiently