### Towards Assurance of a Patient-Specific Network of Medical Devices.

SCC 2015, Rockville Maryland

Sam Procter, John Hatcliff, and Robby SAnToS Lab Kansas State University

Support:

This work is supported in part by the US National Science Foundation (NSF) (#1239543), the NSF US Food and Drug Administration Scholarin-Residence Program (#1355778) and the National Institutes of Health / NIBIB Quantum Program.

### Health Care Involves A Variety of System Components



## **Motivation**

- What are the types of things we could do with device integration?
  - Information forwarding
  - Automation of clinical workflows
  - Closed loop control between devices
- Unlike personal computing, medical devices are not designed to work together
- Integrating medical devices would bring myriad benefits
- how can we do so safely?

## Outline

### Background

- PCA Interlock Scenario
- Medical Application Platforms
- Tooling
- Status Quo
- STPA + AADL
- Impacts / Future

## **PCA Interlock Scenario**

- Patients are commonly given patient-controlled analgesics after surgery
- Crucial to care, but numerous issues related to safety
- Data for disabling the pump exists now (just a system invariant) -- we just need to integrate it



## **PCA Pump Safety Interlock**

Fully leverage device data streams and the ability to control devices



## **Medical Application Platforms**



- A Medical Application Platform is a safety- and securitycritical real-time computing platform for...
  - Integrating heterogeneous devices, medical IT systems, and information displays via communications infrastructure, and
  - Hosting applications ("apps") that provide medical utility via the ability to acquire information from and update/control integrated devices, IT systems, and displays

## **Extension beyond medicine**

- We use medicine in our examples
  - ... but this can extend to other compositional systems
- Core idea:
  - Integration of heterogeneous
    - Sensors,
    - Actuators, and
    - Complete systems,
  - by small chunks of software,
  - in a verifiable manner

### Background

#### PCA Pump Interlock Architecture



## **Tooling Vision**

### **Analyses and Regulatory Artifacts**



## **Tooling Vision**

### **Code Generation**

- A. The app's architecture is specified in a suitable formalism
  - 1. Components as AADL Devices / Processes
  - 2. Connections are specified
  - RT/QoS Parameters are via AADL's propertyspecification mechanism
- B. The app is programmatically translated to Java and XML
  - 1. Only "Business Logic" is written by the developer
- C. The app is launched on a compatible MAP



## **Component Development**



- Development of component architecture using architecture formalism
- Automatic generation of component architecture (skeletons)
- Automatic generation of component layout and app topology (configuration)
  - Development of core behavioral code (business logic) using IDE of choice
- Translator can be retargeted to other languages as desired

## Outline

- Background
- Status Quo
  - Existing Hazard Analyses
  - Application to MAP domain
- STPA + AADL
- Impacts / Future

History: FTA

### FTA: Bell Labs, 1962

Looks for contributory causes to undesired



### History: FMEA

### • FMEA: US Military, 1949

### Analyses impacts of individual components

System: PCA Interlock Scenario			Subsystem: Pulse Oximeter Device				Mode/Phase: Execution			
Function	Failure Mode	Fail Rate	Causal Factors	Effect	System Effect	Detected by	Current Control	Hazard	Risk	Rec. Action
Provide SpO <sub>2</sub>	Fails to Provide	N/A	Network or dev. Failure	No SpO <sub>2</sub> data	Unknown patient state	Арр		Potential OD	3D	Default to KVO
	Provides late	N/A	Network slowness	No SpO <sub>2</sub> data	Unknown patient state	Арр		Potential OD	3C	Default to KVO
	Provides wrong	N/A	Device error	SpO <sub>2</sub> wrong	Wrong patient state	None		Potential OD	1E	Dev. should report data quality
Analyst: Sam Procter			Date: September 26, 2014				Page 3/14			

## Unique aspects of MAP domain

- Software based
  - Hardware is interchangeable
- Component oriented
  - Compositional system needs compositional safety
- Unclear how FTA / FMEA might apply

Early, firm notion of system architecture

### **Formalized Notion of Architecture**

- Formal architecture descriptions become the scaffolding on which:
  - Requirements,
  - Development,
  - Risk management,
  - Deployment, and
  - Ecosphere coordination is organized.

## Outline

- Background
- Status Quo
- STPA + AADL
  - STPA
  - AADL
  - Tool-based Integration: MDCF Architect
- Impacts / Future

Leveraging Semiformal Architectural Descriptions



History: STPA

- STPA: Nancy Leveson / MIT, 2005(ish)
- Applies systems theory, focuses on control...
  - Loops
  - Actions



History: STPA

- STPA: Nancy Leveson / MIT, 2005(ish)
- Applies "Systems" theory, focuses on control...

Loops

Actions



Can STPA be improved?

- STPA enables reasoning about
  - Hardware,
  - Software, and
  - Socio-technical elements
- And is driven by architecture ("Boundary Crossing")
- No open tooling
  - Tooling isn't bound to architecture
- Existing work is largely manual

Why use AADL?

- Architecture Analysis and Design Language
- History of successful safety-critical projects
  - Avionics / Boeing (SAVI): "integrate-thenbuild" approach
- Annexes support a number of regulatory and verification artifacts
  - Hazard Analysis (EM) extends notion of interface to include faults

Model



**System** 



#### System



### **STPA: Fundamentals**

**STPA: Background & Fundamentals** 

- Fundamentals
  - Accident Levels
  - Accidents
  - System
     Boundaries
  - Hazards
  - Safety Constraints
  - Control Actions
  - Control Structure

### **STPA:** Fundamentals

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure

### Example

- 1. A human is killed or seriously injured.
- 2. A medical device's services are unavailable



Tie into ISO 14971's notions of criticality?

### **STPA: Fundamentals**

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure

### Example

- 1. The patient is killed or seriously injured [DeathOrInjury]
- 2. The PCA pump stops responding to commands [DenialOfService]

```
PatientHarmed : constant MAP_Error_Properties::Accident => [
    Number => 1;
    Description => "Patient is killed or seriously injured.";
    Level => PulseOx_Forwarding_Error_Properties::DeathOrInjury;
];
```

### **STPA: Fundamentals**

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents

### System Boundaries

- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure



### **STPA:** Fundamentals

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure

];

### Example

- 1. An inadvertent "Pump Normally" command is sent to the pump [PatientHarmed]
- 2. Commands are sent to the pump too quickly [PCADoS]

InadvertentPumpNormally : constant MAP\_Error\_Properties::Hazard => [
 Number => 1;
 Description => "An inadvertent `Pump Normally` command is sent to the pump.";
 Accident => PulseOx\_Forwarding\_Error\_Properties::PatientHarmed;

### **STPA: Fundamentals**

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure

### Example

- 1. The app must only instruct the pump to run at a normal rate when the patient can tolerate more analgesic [InadvertentPumpNormally]
- 2. The app must wait for a designated length of time between sending pump commands [TooManyCommands]

### **STPA: Fundamentals**

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions
- Control Structure

### Example

- 1. App -> Pump: Pump Normally
- 2. PulseOx -> App:  $SpO_2 = 95$
- 3. App -> Display: Patient = Ok



### **STPA:** Fundamentals

### Fundamentals

- Accident Levels
- Accidents
- System Boundaries
- Hazards
- Safety Constraints
- Control Actions

Control Structure



**STPA: Identifying Hazardous Control Actions** 

### Hazardous Control Action Table

# Cross-product of control actions and STPA guidewords

Control Action	Providing	Not Providing	Applied too Long	Stopped too Soon	Early	Late
App -> Pump: Pump Normally	PH	Not Hazardous	PH	Not Hazardous	РН	Not Hazardous
App -> Disp: Patient Ok	BID	BID	BID	BID	BID	BID
PulseOx->App: Provide SpO <sub>2</sub>	Not Hazardous	PH, BID	Not Hazardous	PH, BID	Not Hazardous	PH, BID
PulseOx->App: Provide Pulse Rate	Not Hazardous	PH, BID	Not Hazardous	PH, BID	Not Hazardous	PH, BID

PH = Patient Harmed BID = Bad Info Displayed

**STPA: Hazardous Causes and Compensations** 

### **Control Action: App -> Pump: Pump Normally**

### Providing:

- Bad Data:
  - Cause:
    - Incorrect values are gathered from one of the physiological sensors
  - Compensation:
    - Rely on multiple sensed physiological parameters to provide redundancy
- Not Providing:
  - Not hazardous

**STPA: Hazardous Causes and Compensations** 

### **Control Action: App -> Pump: Pump Normally**

### Wrong Timing or Order:

Not applicable

### Too Long

- Network Drop
  - Cause:
    - Network drops out, leaving the pump running normally regardless of the patient's health
  - Compensation:
    - Commands to pump normally have an associated maximum time, after which the pump returns to KVO

## **STPA Control Loop**

#### Including Causality Guidewords



#### Returning to our Architectural Model



### Annotating our Architectural Model



### Annotating our Architectural Model

system PCA_Shutoff_System end PCA_Shutoff_System; How would the control action be unsafe?						
system implementation PCA_Shutoff_System.imp subcomponents What hazard would be caused?						
pulseOx : device PulseOx_Interface::ICEpoInterfac appLogic : process PCA_Shutoff_Logic::ICEpcaShut What constraint would be violated?						
spo2_data : port pulse0x.Sp02 -+ appLogic.Sp02; What should the occurrence be named?						
use types PCA_Shutoff_Errors; What would cause this to occur?						
<pre>MAP_Error_Properties::Occurrence =&gt; [ Kind =&gt; AppliedTooLong;</pre> How can this occurrence be compensated for?						
<pre>Hazard =&gt; PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::InadvertentPumpNormally; ViolatedConstraint =&gt; PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::PumpWhenSafe; Title =&gt; "Network Drop";</pre>						
<pre>Cause =&gt; "Network drops out, leaving the Sp02 value pot Compensation =&gt; "Physiological readings have a maximum Impact =&gt; reference(Sp02ValueHigh); applies to spo2_data; **};</pre>						

```
end PCA_Shutoff_System.imp;
end PCA_Shutoff;
```

## **Report Generation Development**



- Development of component architecture using AADL / OSATE2
- Addition of Hazard Analysis Annotations
- Automatic generation of STPA-Styled Hazard Analysis Report

Example "In Progress" Report Online at: http://santoslab.org/pub/mdcf-architect/HazardAnalysis.html

### **Annotating our Architectural Model**

#### **Inside the AADL System Component**

```
package PCA_Shutoff
public
system PCA Shutoff System
end PCA Shutoff System;
system implementation PCA_Shutoff_System.imp
subcomponents
   pulseOx : device PulseOx_Interface::ICEpoInterface.imp;
   appLogic : process PCA Shutoff Logic::ICEpcaShutoffProcess.imp;
connections
   spo2 data : port pulseOx.SpO2 -> appLogic.SpO2;
annex EMV2 {**
   use types PCA_Shutoff_Errors;
                                                 What control action will be affected?
   properties
   MAP Error Properties::Occurrence =>
                                                 What specific fault will result?
      Kind => AppliedTooLong;
      Hazard => PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::InadvertentPumpNormally:
      ViolatedConstraint => PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::PumpWhenSafe;
Title => "Network Drop";
      Cause => "Network drops out, leaving the SpO2 value potentially too high";
      Compensation => "Physiological readings have a maximum time, after which they are no longer valid";
      Impact => reference(SpO2ValueHigh);
                                                                           What can we do with our
   ] applies to spo2 data;
**};
                                                                                model + specific
                                                                                fault information?
end PCA Shutoff System.imp;
end PCA_Shutoff;
```

# Fault Types

### EMV2 Type Hierarchy

Error Library Type	STPA Error Type	App Error Type					
Errors with Physiological Monitors							
LateDelivery	DelayedOperation	SpO2ValueLate					
IncorrectValue	IncorrectInformation	SpO2ValueLow					
N/A	NoInformation	NoSpO2Data					
Errors with App Logic							
ServiceCommission	InnapropriateCtrlAction	InadvertentPumpNormally					
ServiceOmission	MissingCtrlAction	InadvertentPumpMinimally					
AADL Standard Error Types	STPA Error Types	App Specific Error Types					

## **Fault Types**

### App Specific Error Library

package PCA\_Shutoff\_Errors

public

```
annex EMV2
```

{\*\*

#### error types

Application independent: Sourced from STPA

-- These errors aren't associated with unsafe states, but they're here for completeness SpO2ValueLow : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError; RespiratoryRateLow : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError; ETCO2ValueHigh : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError;

-- These errors will cause the app to logic to think the patient is healthy when she isn't SpO2ValueHigh : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError; RespiratoryRateHigh : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError; ETCO2ValueLow : type extends MAP\_Errors::WrongPhysioDataError;

```
-- These are errors with devices
DeviceAlarmFailsOn : type extends MAP_Errors::PhysioDeviceErrorCommission;
DeviceAlarmFailsOff : type extends MAP_Errors::PhysioDeviceErrorOmission;
BadInfoDisplayedToClinician : type extends MAP_Errors::WrongInfoDisplayedError;
InadvertentPumpNormally : type extends MAP_Errors::AppCommission;
InadvertentPumpMinimally : type extends MAP_Errors::AppCommission;
end types;
***};
end PCA_Shutoff_Errors;
```

### Annotating the Architectural Model



#### **Specification Step 1: Propagation**



#### **Specification Step 2: Flow**



#### **Error transformation**



### **Specification Step 3: Error Transformations**



#### **Specification Step 3: Error Transformations**



#### **Error Sinks**



#### **Specification Step 4: Error Sink**



#### **Specification Step 4: Error Sink**



### **OSATE Remembers a Neglected Connection**



#### **OSATE Remembers A Neglected Connection**

```
system implementation PCA_Shutoff_System.imp
subcomponents
    -- Physiological inputs
    pulseOx : device PulseOx_Interface::ICEpoInterface.imp;
    -- App logic
    appLogic : process PCA_Shutoff_Logic::ICEpcaShutoffProcess.imp;
    appDisplay : process PCA_Shutoff_Display::ICEpcaDisplayProcess.imp;
connections
    -- From components to logic
    spo2_logic : port pulse0x.Sp02 -> appLogic.Sp02;
    -- From components to display
    spo2_disp : port pulse0x.Sp02 -> appDisplay.Sp02;
anne A No incoming error propagation from appDisplay for outgoing propagation SpO2(SpO2ValueHigh). Check for
      Unhandled Faults.
    properties
    -- Errors between the PulseOx's SpO2 channel and the App Logic
    MAP_Error_Properties::Occurrence => [
        Kind => ValueHigh:
        Hazard => PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::PatientHarmed;
        ViolatedConstraint => PCA_Shutoff_Error_Properties::PumpWhenSafe;
        Title => "Wrong Values (Undetected)";
        Cause => "Incorrect values are gathered from the physiological sensors";
```

## Tool

### OSATE2

### Open-source, Eclipse-based tool

- Our work is available as a plugin
  - Uses the model-traversal built into OSATE2



### Our model is updated accordingly



### **Interaction between Report and Model**



## Outline

- Background
- Status Quo
- STPA + AADL
- Impacts / Future

## **Contributions (1 of 2)**

- Showing how STPA methods / artifacts can be integrated with a formal architecture modeling framework
- Demonstrating how AADL EM annotations can aid in supporting STPA
- Demonstrating a methodology for carrying out STPA in AADL-defined architectures

## **Contributions** (2 of 2)

- Tool support to automate parts of the methodology
  - And to aid both analysts and reviewers in analysis and review of the generated STPA artifacts.
- Establishing the basis for very strong traceability between
  - Requirements,
  - Architecture,
  - Hazard analysis,
  - Testing / Verification, and
  - Executable code

## **Further Reading**

- Source available online at <u>https://github.com/santoslab/aadl-medical</u>
- Installable into OSATE2 via update site: <u>http://santoslab.org/pub/mdcf-architect/</u> <u>updatesite</u>
- Full documentation online at <u>http://santoslab.org/pub/mdcf-architect</u>
- Publications online at <u>http://people.cis.ksu.edu/~samprocter</u>

### Towards Assurance of a Patient-Specific Network of Medical Devices.

SCC 2015, Rockville Maryland

Sam Procter, John Hatcliff, and Robby SAnToS Lab Kansas State University

Support:

This work is supported in part by the US National Science Foundation (NSF) (#1239543), the NSF US Food and Drug Administration Scholarin-Residence Program (#1355778) and the National Institutes of Health / NIBIB Quantum Program.