18. Technical Risk Analysis – Exploiting the Power of MBSE

Despina Tramoundanis¹, Wayne Power¹ and Daniel Spencer² ¹Weapons Systems Division, DSTO and ²Aerospace Concepts

Abstract

In his 2003 review into Defence procurement, Kinnaird recommended that for new acquisitions Defence undertake a 'comprehensive analysis of technology, cost and schedule risks' and that 'Government needs to be assured that adequate scrutiny is undertakenby DSTO on technology feasibility, maturity and overall technical risk'. As a result, DSTO performs Technical Risk Assessments (TRA) to inform major acquisition decisions during the Requirements phase of the Capability Development process.

Instructions for preparing the TRA are found in the Technical Risk Assessment Handbook (TRAH)¹⁷. These instructions provide useful guidance on the nature of technology and technical risks and means for risk discovery and assessment.

The current TRA development practice has several shortcomings, including:

- Existing templates do not necessarily fit every type of acquisition project.
- At the early stages of capability definition, before a materiel solution has been selected, system decomposition is not always possible.
- The level of discipline and rigour applied to risk analysis is variable depending on the skills of individuals.
- System integration risk does not receive adequate coverage.
- The TRA is a stand-alone document meaning that the risk analysis is not necessarily integrated with the capability definition.
- It is not easy to see how risks in one part of the system impact risks in other parts of the system that may be directly or indirectly coupled.

To address several of these shortcomings, this paper introduces the concept of Functional Risk Analysis (FRA) conducted within a Model Based Systems Engineering (MBSE) environment. FRA is a rigorous technique used to explore potential effects of functional failures or degradation that result from insufficient technical readiness, both within and between parts of a system and across system interfaces. (FRA is analogous to Functional Hazard Analysis, a technique applied in the aerospace domain.) The underlying method of FRA uses an Enhanced Functional Flow Block Diagram (EFFBD) representation of the system functionality and follows the following procedure:

- 1. Perform the following steps on each function in turn:
 - a. Define the purpose and behaviour of the function.
 - b. Consider the technologies inherent in the function and the potential failure modes that may result based on an understanding of the technology readiness,

¹⁷ DSTO, Technical Risk Assessment Handbook, Version 1.1, 2010

| Report Documentation Page | | | | | Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188 | |
|--|------------------|---|----------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. | | | | | | |
| 1. REPORT DATE | | 2. REPORT TYPE | | 3. DATES COVE | RED | |
| FEB 2013 | | N/A | | - | | |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE | | | 5a. CONTRACT | NUMBER | | |
| Technical Risk An | he Power of MBSE | â | 5b. GRANT NUMBER | | | |
| | | | | 5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER | | |
| 6. AUTHOR(S) | | 5d. PROJECT NUMBER | | | | |
| | | | | 5e. TASK NUMBER | | |
| | | | 5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER | | | |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANI 1Weapons Systems | | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER | | | | |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITO | | 10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S) | | | | |
| | | | | 11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S) | | |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited | | | | | | |
| 13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADA585222. Proceedings of the 2012 Model-Based Systems Engineering Symposium, 27 - 28 November 2012, DSTO Edinburgh, South Australia., The original document contains color images. | | | | | | |
| ^{14. ABSTRACT} In his 2003 review into Defence procurement, Kinnaird recommended that for new acquisitions Defence undertake a âcomprehensive analysis of technology, cost and schedule risksâ and that âGovernment needs to be assured that adequate scrutiny is undertaken âl.by DSTO on technology feasibility, maturity and overall technical riskâ. As a result, DSTO performs Technical Risk Assessments (TRA) to inform major acquisition decisions during the Requirements phase of the Capability Development process. | | | | | | |
| 15. SUBJECT TERMS | | | | | | |
| 16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF: 17. LIMITATION OF 18. NUMBER 19a. NAME OF | | | | | | |
| a. REPORT | b. ABSTRACT | c. THIS PAGE | ABSTRACT SAR | OF PAGES 22 | RESPONSIBLE PERSON | |
| unclassified | unclassified | unclassified | 5711 | | | |

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98) Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

e.g. 'complete loss of function', 'degraded performance', 'incorrect operation (e.g. high, low, fast, slow etc ...)'.

- c. Represent functional failure modes within MBSE model.
- 2. Simulate or interrogate the functional model to assess the potential impact of functional failures on downstream functions and guide detailed system analysis.
- 3. Record in the MBSE model the identified risks (i.e. the potential effect in terms of severity and probability of occurrence).

Once the physical system has been designed or selected, the FRA procedure can be repeated using the system architecture to assess and explore the effects of component failures or degradation that result from insufficient system readiness. The results of the FRA are recorded in the MBSE model from which the TRA report is auto-generated via the running of scripts. This paper will use a generic weapon system example to illustrate the FRA technique.

Presenter Biography

Despina Tramoundanis was a Royal Australian Air Force Armaments Engineer for 20 years before joining DSTO's Weapons Systems Division. She is currently the S&T advisor for a Ground-Based Air and Missile Defence project. Her current research interests include development of the Whole-of-System Analytical Framework, a Model-Based Capability Engineering methodology for the provision of cross-Defence modeling, simulation, analysis and Capability Development activities. She holds a Bachelor of Engineering (Chemical) from Monash University, an MSc in Explosives Engineering from Cranfield University (UK), a Master of Defence Studies from UNSW and a Master of Defence Operations Research from UNSW.

Wayne Power graduated with honours from the Queensland University of Technology (QUT) with a Bachelor of Engineering (Aerospace Avionics), minor in Systems Engineering. He has spent the last six years working in Weapons Capability Analysis within DSTO's Weapons Systems Division (WSD). His work in WSD has included weapon system integration modelling and analysis, but the major focus of his work has revolved around researching and developing the Whole-of-System Analytical Framework (WSAF). The WSAF employs a Model-Based Systems Engineering approach for the provision of cross-Defence modelling, simulation, analysis and Capability Development activities.

Daniel Spencer works as a systems engineer for Aerospace Concepts Pty Ltd. He has over a decade of experience in design and development of systems solutions across a broad range of industries, both in Australia and the United Kingdom. Dan holds a Bachelor of Engineering in Information Technology and Telecommunications from the University of Adelaide. He has been working with Australian Defence clients developing and refining tools and methods for a repeatable and comprehensive MBSE method, while using this approach for real-world capability definition and development projects.

Presentation



DSTO-GD-0734

















DSTO-GD-0734





UNCLASSIFIED - For Public Release



DSTO-GD-0734







DSTO-GD-0734



DSTO-GD-0734





DSTO-GD-0734



UNCLASSIFIED – For Public Release

Benefits of methodology/ Conculsions

| Issues with current practice | FRA Benefit | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| TRA templates do not fit e∨ery type of acquisition | Focus of risk analysis is on a model of the capability of interest, not on a document template. Documentation is derived from the risk analysis, not the other way around. | | | |
| Need to assume a materiel solution | FRA can be applied to a functional description of a system using knowledge of available technologies (pre-2 nd pass) and is repeated for physical systems at 2 nd Pass. | | | |
| Quality depends on the skills of individuals | Provides a rigorous process to assist in the analysis of whole of system technical risk | | | |
| Inadequate analysis of: System integration risk Risk coupling | Process guides analyst through the potential influence of technologies on other systems and sub- systems. Focus is on potential impact of integration risk | | | |
| TRA is a stand-alone document | Analysis performed in and risks recorded in the same model OCD and FPS definitions. Completely traceable: a single source of truth. | | | |

