A Dependability Case Language for a Radiation Therapy System

Michael Ernst, Dan Grossman, Jon Jacky, Calvin Loncaric, Stuart Pernsteiner, Zachary Tatlock, Emina Torlak, Xi Wang

University of Washington



end-to-end verification for safety critical systems





SUPPORTED BY



































Formal







End-to-end

Dependability cases

Integrate diverse sources of evidence check interfaces of design, testing, proof, review

Argue end-to-end claim based on evidence show claim holds across all layers of a system

Focus on physical system properties eases validation and focuses verification effort

Many large software systems display fragility or a lack of dependability caused by inattention to details at various stages of development (e.g., missing data, undocumented assumptions, lack of testing), resulting in a failure to catch errors. This technical note explains how to create a dependability case for a system that helps identify and keep track of such details. A dependability case is defined here as a structured argument providing evidence that a system meets its specified dependability requirements. The technical note describes how to structure the argument and present evidence to support it. A sample problem is presented, as well as issues raised by that problem and future goals.

Many large software systems display fragility or a lack of dependability caused by inattention to details at various stages of development (e.g., missing data, undocumented assumptions, lack of testing), resulting in a failure to catch errors. This technical note explains how to







SUPPORTED BY









End-to-end

Move from specific to general avoid attempt to design "silver bullet"

I. Target specific system

Move from specific to general avoid attempt to design "silver bullet"

- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence
- 4. Design + build DCL



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence
- 4. Design + build DCL



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence
- 4. Design + build DCL

Find general tradeoffs and patterns make simple easy and hard possible

Impact real-world projects bring current PL tech to the trenches



- I. Target specific system
- 2. Develop dep. claims
- 3. Gather evidence
- 4. Design + build DCL

Find general tradeoffs and patterns make simple easy and hard possible

Impact real-world projects bring current PL tech to the trenches



an end-to-end dependability case for CNTS

Clinical Neutron Therapy System (CNTS) at UW

- 30 years of incident-free service.
- Controlled by custom software, built by CNTS engineering staff.
- Third generation of Therapy Control software now being built.



Clinical Neutron Therapy System (CNTS) at UW







EPICS documentation / semantics

The Maximize Severity attribute is one of NMS (Non-Maximize Severity), MS (Maximize Severity), MSS (Maximize Status and Severity) or MSI (Maximize Severity if Invalid). It determines whether alarm severity is propagated across links. If the attribute is MSI only a severity of INVALID_ALARM is propagated; settings of MS or MSS propagate all alarms that are more severe than the record's current severity. For input links the alarm severity of the record referred to by the link is propagated to the record containing the link. For output links the alarm severity of the record containing the link is propagated to the record referred to by the link. If the severity is changed the associated alarm status is set to LINK_ALARM, except if the attribute is MSS when the alarm status will be copied along with the severity.







An end-to-end property that spans the entire system, not just software.

CNTS Couch Safety Property:

The beam will turn off if the couch rotation angle moves out of tolerances during treatment and the operator has not issued the manual override command.



Therapy Control Software



An informal dependability case for couch safety

couch rotates out of tolerances and no manual override => beam shuts off



An informal dependability case for couch safety



18

A formal dependability case for couch safety

couch rotates out of tolerances and no manual override => beam shuts off

PLC disables Therapy Sum relay => beam shuts off all r: Couch.rotation |
 (properties and
 r.angle not in Prescription.tolerance and
 no Event.GantryCouch_Turntable_Override) =>
 some Beam.state & BeamOff

evidence["63c8d380", PLC_Analysis, ..., Proof] =>
all relayState: plc.relay2754 & RelayOpen |
one coilState: plc.sentMsgs & relayState.^next |
coilState.coilNumber = Coil1623
coilState.coilValue = False

Generating evidence for couch safety



Checking couch safety



Deep analysis with <2000 LOC of tool code ...



Found a bug in the Therapy Control software (preventing beam shut off), masked by a bug in the EPICS runtime!

Thanks!

