Appendix A

EL Proof-Step Templates

A.1 The High-Level Template

Proving causality is a recursive procedure, that is, most steps have two substeps which are also assertions of \Rightarrow *. Eventually, however, the recursion must terminate with base step rather than a recursion step.

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ A \hookrightarrow B
Proof:
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. \ A \Longrightarrow^* B
    Proof:
       \langle 3 \rangle 1. \ A \Longrightarrow^* C
       PROOF:
            \langle 4 \rangle 1. A \Longrightarrow^* D_0
            Proof:
                \langle 5 \rangle 1. A \Rightarrow D_0
                Proof:
                    \langle 6 \rangle 1. A \wedge D_0
                    PROOF:
                        \langle 7 \rangle 1. A
                        Proof: ******
                        \langle 7 \rangle 2. D<sub>0</sub>
                        Proof: ******
                        \langle 7 \rangle3. Q.E.D.
                            (\wedge-introduction) from \langle 7 \rangle 1 and \langle 7 \rangle 2.
                    \langle 6 \rangle 2. \neg A \longrightarrow \neg D_0
                    PROOF:
                        *****Lewis semantics and possible worlds reasoning on C and
                        D_0*****.
                    \langle 6 \rangle 3. Q.E.D.
```

```
Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.20 from \langle 6 \rangle 1 and \langle 6 \rangle 2. \Box
          \langle 5 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
             Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.3 from \langle 5 \rangle 1. \Box
      \langle 4 \rangle 2. D_0 \Longrightarrow^* D_1
      PROOF:
          \langle 5 \rangle 1. \ D_0 \Rightarrow D_1
          Proof: *****Similar to this step in \langle 4 \rangle 1^{******}
          \langle 5 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
          Proof:
             Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.3 from \langle 5 \rangle 1. \Box
       \langle 4 \rangle 3. \ D_n \Longrightarrow^* C
      Proof: *****Similar to \langle 4 \rangle 1*****
      \langle 4 \rangle 4. Q.E.D.
          Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.3 from ......
   \langle 3 \rangle 2. C \Longrightarrow^* B
  Proof: *****Similar to \langle 3 \rangle 1******
   \langle 3 \rangle 3. Q.E.D.
      Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.4 from \langle 3 \rangle 1 and \langle 3 \rangle 2.
\langle 2 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
   Directly follows by Inference Rule 14.2 from \langle 2 \rangle 1.
```

A.2 Deontic Proof-Step Template

A.3 CCT as a Derived Meta-Rule

```
\langle 1 \rangle 1. \ C \Longrightarrow B
Proof:
    \langle 2 \rangle 1. C
    Proof: *****
    \langle 2 \rangle 2. \neg C \longrightarrow \neg B
    PROOF:
         \langle 3 \rangle 1. \neg (A_1 \wedge A_2 \wedge A_3 \wedge ... \wedge A_n) \longrightarrow \neg B
        Proof:
             \langle 4 \rangle 1. \ \neg A_1 \lor \neg (A_2 \land A_3 \land ... \land A_n) \Box \rightarrow \neg B
             Proof:
                 \langle 5 \rangle 1. \neg A_1 \Box \rightarrow \neg B
                 Proof:
                      ****
                 \langle 5 \rangle 2. \neg (A_2 \wedge A_3 \wedge ... \wedge A_n) \square \rightarrow B
                 Proof:
                      \langle 6 \rangle 1. \ \neg A_2 \lor \neg (A_3 \land ... \land A_n) \Box \rightarrow \neg B
                      Proof:
                           \langle 7 \rangle 1. \neg A_2 \Box \rightarrow \neg B
                          Proof: *****
                          \langle 7 \rangle 2. \neg (A_3 \wedge ... \wedge A_n) \square \rightarrow \neg B
                          PROOF:
                               \langle 8 \rangle 1. \neg (A_{n-1} \wedge A_n) \square \rightarrow \neg B
                               Proof:
                                   \langle 9 \rangle 1. \ \neg A_{n-1} \vee \neg A_n \square \rightarrow \neg B
                                   Proof:
                                        \langle 10 \rangle 1. \ \neg A_{n-1} \Box \rightarrow \neg B
                                       PROOF: *****
                                        \langle 10 \rangle 2. \neg A_n \Box \rightarrow \neg B
                                       Proof: *****
                                        \langle 10 \rangle 3. Q.E.D.
                                            Follows by Inference Rule 15.6 from \langle 10 \rangle 1 and \langle 10 \rangle 2. \Box
                                    \langle 9 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
                                       Follows by De Morgan's law applied to the antecedent of
                                        \langle 9 \rangle 1. \sqcup
                               \langle 8 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
                                   ****
                           \langle 7 \rangle3. Q.E.D.
                               Follows by Inference Rule 15.6 from \langle 7 \rangle 1 and \langle 7 \rangle 2. \Box
                      \langle 6 \rangle 2. Q.E.D.
```

```
Follows by De Morgan's law applied to the antecedent of \langle 6 \rangle 1. \Box \langle 5 \rangle 3. Q.E.D. Follows by Inference Rule 15.6 from \langle 5 \rangle 1 and \langle 5 \rangle 2. \Box \langle 4 \rangle 2. Q.E.D. Follows by De Morgan's law applied to the antecedent of \langle 4 \rangle 1. \Box \langle 3 \rangle 2. Q.E.D. Follows immediately by the definition of C. \langle 2 \rangle 3. \neg B \Box \rightarrow \neg C Proof: ****** \langle 2 \rangle 4. Q.E.D. Directly follows by Inference Rule 15.5 from \langle 2 \rangle 1, \langle 2 \rangle 2 and \langle 2 \rangle 3. \Box
```

Appendix B

Syntactic Definition of Textual WBGs in Extended BNF

We give the syntactic definition of the textual form of WB-Graphs in Extended Backus-Naur Form in Figure B.1.

```
textgraph
             = node \{node\}.
             = tag tag | tag node_ext node_info |
node
                  tag "\land" node\_ext node\_info { "\land" node\_ext node\_info}.
             = "(" path ")" | "[" path "]" | "(" path ")" | "(" path ")".
= "(-." number ")" | "[-." number "]" | "(-." number ")" |
taq
node\_ext
                  "(-." number ")" | "\langle \langle -." number " \rangle \rangle " | " [-." number "]" |
                   "{{-." number "}}" | "((-." number "))".
             = "/*" descr [add\_flags] "*/".
node_info
             = ["//\#" fail\_type"\#"] \{"//" add\_flags\}.
add\_info
             = number {":" number }.
path
             = digit \mid first digit \{digit\}.
number
             = "@T" timestamp add_flags | "@A" number add_flags | descr_text.
add_{-}flags
timestamp = digit digit ":" digit digit "'" digit digit """.
             = char(0) .. char(127).
anychar
anytext
             = \{anychar\}.
             = anytext EXCEPT ... "*/"...
descr
             = "PERCEPTION" | "ATTENTION" | "REASONING" |
fail_type
                  "DECISION" | "INTENTION" | "ACTION".
             = "1" | "2" | "3" | "4" | "5" | "6" | "7" | "8" | "9" | "0".
digit
                  "1" | "2" | "3" | "4" | "5" | "6" | "7" | "8" | "9".
firstdigit
```

Figure B.1: Textual WB-Graph Syntax representation in EBNF

Appendix C

Glossary

GLOSSARY:

AD : Airworthiness Directive
ADC : Air Data Computer
AFS : Automatic Flight System
ALT : Altitude

ALT SEL : Altitude Selector
AOA : Angle of Attack
AP : Auto-Pilot
APU : Auxiliary Power Unit
A/THR : Automatic Thrust
AT : Auto Throttle

ATC : Air Traffic Control
ATCC : Air Traffic Control Center
ATS : Auto-Throttle System

ATT : Attitude

BATC : Brussels Air Traffic Control
BEA : Bureau Enqu^etes Accidents

BKN : Broken CAP : Captain

CAS : Computed Airspeed

CGCC : Center of Gravity Control Computer

CAT : Category CMD : Command

CN : Consigne de Navigabilite

CRW : Crew

CVR : Cockpit Voice Recorder
CWS : Control Wheel Steering
DFDR : Digital Flight Data Recorder

DGAC : Direction G^en^erale de l' Aviation Civile

DH : Decision Height

ECAM : Electronic Centralized Aircraft Monitoring

BFCU : Electronic Flight Control Unit EFIS : Electronic Flight Instrument System

ENG : Engine

EPR : Engine Pressure Ratio

FAA : Federal Aviation Administration FAC : Flight Augmentation Computer

FADEC : Full Authority Digital Electronic Control

FCC : Flight Control Computer
FCOM : Flight Crew Operating Manual

FCU : Flight Control Unit FD : Flight Director

FI : Flight Information (Flight data and Flight Plan)

456 Glossary

FIDC : Fault Isolation and Detection Computer FIDS : Fault Isolation and Detection System FL: Flight Level FMA : Flight Mode Annunciator FMC : Flight Management Computer FMS : Flight Management System F/0 : First Officer ${\rm FMC}$: Flight Warning Computer : GO AROUND GA GCU : Generator Control Unit : Ground Proximity Warning Computer : Ground Proximity Warning System **GPWC GPWS** GS : Glide Slope HDG : Heading HDG/SEL : Heading Selector : High Pressure Compressor HPT : High Pressure Turbine ICAO : International Civil Aviation Organization IGS : Instrument Guidance System : Inlet Guide Vane IGV IND : Indicator : Instrument Landing System ILS IRS : Inertial Reference System IRU : Inertial Reference Unit : Landing LAND LATC : London Air Traffic Control L/D : Landing : Landing Gear LIG LOC : Localizer LPC : Low Pressure Compressor LPT : Low Pressure Turbine LVL/CH : Level Change : Mean Aerodynamic Chord MAC MAN THR : Manual Thrust : Minimum Decision Altitude MDA MIC : Microphone MTP: Maintenance and Test Panel NAV : Navigation NPA: Non Precision Approach NTSB : National Transportation Safety Board OOT : Out Of Trim OVC : Overcast PCM : Pulse Code Modulation : Pilot Flying PF PFD : Primary Flight Display PlC : Pilot in Command PNF : Pilot Not Flying QNH : Pressure Setting to Indicate Elevation above Mean Sea Level R ALT : Radio Altitude RET : Retract RMI : Radio Magnetic Indicator R.WY : Runway SATC : Shannon Air Traffic Control : Service Bulletin SB SCT : Scattered SGU : Symbol Generator Unit SOP : Standard Operating Procedure SPD : Speed SPD/MAC : Speed/Mach : Speed Reference System SRS SW : Switch TCC : Thrust Control Computer TCD : Ministry of Transport Civil Aviation Bureau Directive

TFC

THR

: Traffic

: Thrust

THR L : Thrust Latch
THS : Trimmable Horizontal Stabilizer
TIPS : Technical Instruction Processing Sheet
TRP : Thrust Rating Panel
VAPP : Approach Target Speed
VOR : VHF Ommidirectional Radio Range
V/S : Vertical Speed
Vs : Stall Speed
VTG : Target Speed
W.STA : Wing Station

Index

$[\mathcal{A}]_f$, 300	INV1 rule, 300
∨-intro rule, 297	INV2 rule, 300
\Rightarrow -elim rule, 297	TLA1 rule, 300
\Rightarrow -intro rule, 297	TLA2 rule, 300
D_O axiom, 301	$\Box \rightarrow$, Lewis semantics for, 212
F axiom, 301	ATCcomm_history module, 244
K axiom, 298	ATCcomm module, 243
K_O axiom, 301	ATCproc module, 242
N_O rule, 301	ATCtrans module, 240
P axiom, 301	INJS resolution, INJSR, 149
S4 axiom, 298	PAD.ATCcomm_history module, 249
S5 axiom, 298	This_ATCcomm_history, 245, 246
T axiom, 298	chain conversion, CC, 149
VC logic, 304	\vee -elim rule, 297
VCU logic, 304	AsNear relation, 306
VCU-EL logic, 306	Attend predicate, 268
\Box -elim rule, 298	CI-Script, 121, 123
□−intro rule, 298	CommProc principle, 217
\square_C , 304	Final approach phase, 280
\diamond , definition, 101	Initial approach phase, 280
\perp_{C} rule, 297	Landing_Axioms module, 325
\perp_{I} rule, 297	Landing_Defs module, 324
∃–elim rule, 298	Landing_Norms module, 327–329
∃−intro rule, 298	Landing_Specs module, 330–334
\forall -elim rule, 297	Landing phase, 280
\forall —intro rule, 297	Mode module, 281
STL1 axiom, 300	NavProc principle, 217
STL2 axiom, 300	PARDIA-Norms module, 278
STL3 axiom, 300	Perceive predicate, 268
STL4 axiom, 300	Phases module, 280, 282
STL5 axiom, 300	Proof-Obligations module, 372
STL6 axiom, 300	RealTimeTheorems module, 322
STL7 axiom, 300	Reason predicate, 266
$\leq W$, 302	$SOP_Specs module, 336, 337$
\succ , 215	\mathcal{E} -elim rule, 297

&-intro rule, 297 base station, mobile phone, 9 \implies , 222 basic formula, 141 accessibility relation, 306 Basle-Mulhouse airport, 177 accessible predicate, 306 battery, phone, 5–7 cid2dot tool, 121 bay, avionics, 7 cid2ft, 137 Bayesian decision theory, 17 dot tool, 121 BBSTS principle, 11, 12, 14 landing mode, 280 behavior, 50, 53, 55 BMP, break multiple paths, 149 nearer to, relation, 57 BMP, see Break Multiple Paths, 149 nearness relation, 306 wb2dot, 395 boundary assumption, 52 boundary, system, 50, 51, 67 AAMP5 processor, 258 Break Multiple Paths, BMP, 149 accident, 3, 8, 12, 16, 65, 66 Brown, Simon, 5, 7, 8 accident, severity, 4 Buga, Colombia, 381 action, 206 Bunkley, Crawford, 9 action - PARDIA, 264 Byzantine fault-tolerant algorithm, 257 action failure, 265 adequate decomposition, 62 cabin, aircraft, 7 Air France administration, 178 Cali, Colombia, 381 Air Traffic Control Handbook, U.S., catastrophic effect, 87 227 Causal Completeness Test, CCT, 219 alethic modality, 192 causal factor, 190 always-eventually property, 142 causal factor, necessary, definition, 110 American Petroleum Institute, 6 causal factor, relation, 117 Amp-hour, milli, 6 causal field, 317 analysis, causal, 5, 13 Causal Influence Diagram, CID, 121, analysis, risk, 8 123, 137 analysis, technical risk (TRA), 11, 12 causal mechanism, 11, 12 arc fault, 7 Causal Sufficiency Criterion, CSC, 219 arc, electrical, 7, 9, 11 Causal System Analysis (CSA), 49, Arrow's Impossibility Theorem, 17 117 artifact, 3, 15 causality, true, 209 CC, see Chain Conversion, 149 artifact, safety-critical, 12 ASRS, Aviation Safety Reporting Sys-CCT, see Causal Completeness Test, tem, 7 asymmetry, of nearness relation, 112 certification basis, 87 ATC, Air Traffic Control, 106 CFIT, 67, 68 attention - PARDIA, 264 CFIT, controlled flight into terrain, attention failure, 264 319, 381 avalanche effect, 6 Chain Conversion, CC, 149 avionics, 7 change, 53 avionics bay, see bay, 7 characteristic axiom, 306

Chicago Convention, 1948, 13, 105 DATR programming language, 393 CHIRPS, 7 debugging, 195 CID, see Causal Influence Diagram, debugging, as causal analysis, 113 121, 123, 137 decision - PARDIA, 264 Civil Aviation Authority, UK, 7 Decision axiom, 280, 281 Class A mishap, USAF, 87 decision failure, 264 closed system, 107 decision problem, 19 closed-world assumption (CWA), 317 Decision Science, 17 Coates, Mark, 8 deontic modality, 192 cockpit voice recorder, 317 deontic operator, 267 combustible substance, 5 deontic reasoning, 215 Communications Advisory Panel, UK, Deontic rule, 216 deontically-correct world, 227 comparable worlds, 112 DEPOSE classification scheme, 62 components, "programmable electronic", DF, Don't Fret, 12, 14 DF, Don't Fret principle, 12 concomitant variation, 90 DFDR, digital flight data recorder, conductor, electrical, 6, 7, 11 317 diachronic contrast, 226 Conflict Exit rule, 311 Conflict Remain rule, 311 Difference Condition, 197, 226, 384 Conflict Resolution rule, 310 digital flight data recorder, 317 discharge, electrical, 7 conservatism, strong, 12 contact, battery, 6, 9, 11 discrete factor, 119, 122 contrastive explanation, 215, 226 discrete sequence, 55 contributing factor, 105 disjunctive normal form, DNF, 141 contributory factor, 190 distributed system, 195 correct fault tree, 140 DNF, see disjunctive normal form, 141 correlation, 90 domain, of a relation, 94 counteracting cause, 215 Douglas, Mary, 20, 21 counterfactual, 109–111, 119, 120, 186 DU (don't use), 11 counterfactual conditional, 192 EL Behavioral Rules, 310, 311 counterfactuals, logic of, 190 EL logic, 140, 192 CRW, flight crew, 199 EL Special Rules, 308, 309 CSC, see Causal Sufficiency Criterion, entry/exit conditions, 279 219 environment, 50 current, electrical, 9 Ericsson, 6 CVR, cockpit voice recorder, 317 escape manoeuvre for GPWS, 382, CWA, see closed-world assumption, 383 317event, 55, 206 Dalton, John, 6 event type, 55, 88, 206 damage, 68 extremely improbable event, definidanger, 68 tion, 86

extremely remote event, definition, 86 hazard, latency, 4 Hazard-1, definition, 71 failure, 66 Hazard-1, intuition, 85 failure analysis, 195 Hazard-2, definition, 71 far change, 56 Hazard-2, intuition, 85 FAR, see Federal Aviation Regula-Hazard-3, definition, 72 tions, 227 Hazard-4, definition, 72 fault tree, 127, 137 Hazard-4, intuition, 86 Fault Tree Analysis, FTA, 17, 127 Hazard-5, definition, 73 FDR, flight data recorder, 178 hazardous airspace, 67 Federal Aviation Administration, U.S., hazardous effect, 87 177Hazop (Hazard and Operations Anal-Federal Aviation Regulations, U.S., ysis), 17 86, 194, 227 Health and Safety Execituve, U.K., 5 field strength, electromagnetic, 5 Health and Safety Executive, U.K., field, electrical, 7 3, 6, 12 fire, 5 heterogeneous system, 107, 195 flight deck, 7 higher-order type theory, 54 Flight Management Computer, FMC, Highway Code, U.K., 8 382 history, 207 flight phases, 279 history variable, 54 fluent, 53 Hume, David, 109, 186, 208 FMC, see Flight Management Comhybrid system, 195 puter, 382 forecourt, gas station, 3, 5, 7–9 ICAO, see International Civil Aviaformalism, 49 tion Organisation, 13, 105, 227 freedoms, infringement of basic, 12 IFIP Working Group 10.4, 87 frequent event, definition, 86 ignition, 8 fusion, 59 ignition, fuel, 6 ignition, of fuel/air mix, 5 Galbraith, John Kenneth, 12 immunity, electromagnetic interference, Ganter, John, 5, 9 gas law, 119, 120 improbable event, definition, 86 go-around mode of autopilot, 423 Inconsistency rule, 310 goal, 15, 16 independence, probabilistic, 4 group, lobbying, 15 information processing model, 193 group, special interest, 15 information-processing model, 263, 273 Guidance, Home Ofice HGN(F)15, 8 INJS factor, 144 Höhl, Michael, 176 INJSR, INJS resolution, 149 Habsheim A320 accident, 175 Institute of Petroleum, UK, 8 hazard, 3, 4, 8, 9, 12, 68, 102 intensional context, 221 hazard condition, 118 intensity, electromagnetic field, 7 hazard level, 68 intention - PARDIA, 264

intention failure, 264 Mackie, John, 316 intention, human, 15 major effect, 87 interactive complexity, 106 MEC, see Minimise Expected Cost interactively complex system, 62 principle, 13 interactively coplex system, 62 mereological sum, 60 interference, electromagnetic (EM), 7 mereology, 59 interlock, 110 Method of Differences, Mill's, 7, 226 International Civil Aviation Organi-Methods of Induction, Mill's, 230 sation, ICAO, 13, 105, 227 mid-air collision, 88 inverse natural deduction, 339 MIL-STD-882, 72 Irish Aviation Authority, 200 Mill, John Stuart, 7, 90, 109, 186, irreflexivity, of nearness relation, 112 197, 208, 215, 226 Minimise Expected Cost principle (MEC), Johnson, Chris, 208 13 Joint Aviation Regulations, European, minor effect, 87 Minuteman ICBM system, 137 Jones, Jim, 21 mix, fuel-air, 7, 11 Jonestown massacre, 21 MJ (Multiple Justification), 11, 12, Joule, milli (mJ), 6, 7 14 Know and Consult principles, 17 mJ, see Joule, milli, 6, 7, 462 Kripke semantics, 210 modality, counterfactual, 13 mode confusion syndrome, 279 Lamport, Leslie, 188 mode, phone standby, 9 Landing procedure state predicates, Moffett, Jonathan, 208 335 money, namely \$ 10,000, 20 latency, hazard, 3, 68 Motorola, 6 levels of analysis, 116 MPR Iteration, MPRI, 148 Leveson, Nancy, 24, 66, 67, 188 MPR, see Multiple Path Reduction, Lewis, David, 109–112, 140, 180, 186, 148 MPRI, see MPR iteration, 148 life, monetary value of, 13 Multiple Path Reduction, MPR, 148 likelihood, accident, 4 myth, urban, 5 likelihood, conditional, 4 likelihood, hazard, 4, 68 N1, engine measure, 178 LIL (like is like), 11 Nagoya, Japan, 423 LIL (Like is Like) principle, 11, 12, narrative of accident, 409 14 National Public Radio, U.S., 5 Lipton, Peter, 226 liveness property, technical, 140 National Research Council, Commitlogic, applied formal, 47 tee on Risk Characterization, loose coupling, 106 22 loss, 4, 20National Transportation Safety Board, loss, expected, 4 U.S., 177, 382

NCA, see necessary causal ancestor, PC (prior coverage), 12, 14 PC (prior coverage) principle, 11, 12, near change, 56 nearness relation, 111, 210 PCJ (Physical Causal Justification), necessary causal ancestor, NCA, 145 12, 14 necessary causal factor, NCF, 143 PED (personal electronic device), 7 perception - PARDIA, 264 necessary implication, 192 negatively causally dependent, 120 perception failure, 264 neolithic causal regularity, 230 Perrow, Charles, 62, 63, 105–107, 185 node, 206 Petroski, Henry, 185 phone, mobile, 3, 5–9 noise, electromagnetic (EM), 7 Nokia, 6 pilot, as aircraft part, 105 non-event, 206 policy, public, 8 Northwest Airlines, 200, 205 policy, safety, 8 NRC, see National Research Council, positive Boolean expression, 138 23 positively causally dependent, 120 possible world, 304 object, 50 Prawitz, Dag, 295 object, atomic, 73 precautionary principle, 11 object, environment, 93 predicate, environment, 94, 95 object, system, 93 predicate, hybrid, 94, 95 object, world, 93 predicate, system, 94, 95 objective judgement, 189 predicate-action diagram, PAD, 233, OHRS, open heterogeneous real-time 247, 256 system, 195 Preface Paradox, 269 open system, 107, 195 preorder, total, 211 ordinal measure, secondinal scale, 302 pressure tank, CSA example, 115 ordinal scale, 58, 302 pressure, air, 6 Ought - see deontic operator, 266 probability, 76 overcounting, 83, 84 probability, conditional, 4 oxygen, 5 probable cause, 105, 190 probable event, definition, 86 PAD, see predicate-action diagram, procedural conflict, 289 233, 247 process, 206 paradoxes of belief, 269 process, "analytic-deliberative", 23 paralysis, social, 12 proof obligations, 372 PARDIA, 263 prophylaxis, 89 PARDIA axioms, 271 PARDIA classification, 192, 193 Qualitative Physics, 120 PARDIA norms, 272 part, of object, 58 radiator, electromagnetic (EM), 5 radio, CB, 9 part, structural, 59 rational choice, 17 path, causal, 14

RCBA, Risk Cost-Benefit Analysis, SOP, Standard Operating Procedures, 13, 21, 22, 41 194, 326 sound causal explanation, 192 reasonably probable event, definition, source, ignition, 5 86 spark, 5, 7, 9 reasoning - PARDIA, 264 spark, incendive, 6, 9 reasoning failure, 264 standard, BS 6656:1991, 5 reasoning, failure, 60 reasoning, inductive, 17 standard, BS 6941:1991, 10 standard, IEC 61508, 3 reflexity property, 211 stasis, 118 relatively sufficient causal explanation, state, 53, 54, 205 192 state description, 53 reliability, 65, 66 state, environment, 95 remote event, definitions, 86 state, hybrid, 95 rigor, 49 state, system, 95 risk, 4, 12, 15 state, world, 95 risk analysis, 12 stealing, sheep, 20 Risk Analysis journal, 13 Steward, Helen, 418 risk assessment, 16, 17 stopping constraint, 101 Risk Cost-Benefit Analysis (RCBA), Strauch, Barry, 399 13, 21, 22, 41 strict implication, 215 risk, acceptable, 18, 19 sufficient causal factor, SCF, 143 risk, characterisation, 22 sufficient cause, 192 risk, definition of, 68 sufficient explanation, 219 risk, fact and value separation, 18, 21 sufficient set of causal factors, 219 risk, knowledge and consent criteria, superfluous nodes, in fault tree, 155 surge, electrical, 7 Royal Society, 22 Sweginnis, Robert, 187, 209 ROZO One arrival to Cali, 382 symmetry property, 211 system, 3 safety, 65, 66 system accident, 106 safety analysis, 3 System S, 74 safety property, technical, 140, 141 system, predator-prey, 15 Sagan, Scott, 106 system, social, 15 Schepper, Willi, 6 system, teleological, 15, 16, 19, 44, 51 semi-component of a graph, 414 servant, 11 technical risk analysis, 13 severity, 4, 20 temporal extent, 207 severity, accident, 3, 4 temporal logic, 140 severity, hazard, 68 temporal strengthening, 118 short circuit, 7 tense-logical operator, 101 Siemens, 6 terminal, battery, 6, 7 SO (switched off), 11 Thimbleby, Harold, 6

tight coupling, 106 tightly coupled system, 62 TLA+ specification language, 192, 233 TLA, the Temporal Logic of Actions, 188 TOGA, Take-off/Go-around thrust, 178 token, 59 totality property, 212 TRA, see analysis, technical risk, 13, 14 TRA, Technical Risk Analysis, 14 TRA, technical risk analysis, 13, 14 transitive closure of a relation, 112, 190 transitivity property, 112, 211 transmission, Radio Frequency (RF), 9, 11 transmitter, Radio Frequency (RF), TRAV, Technical Risk Analysis Validity, 13, 14

U.S. Air Force, 87, 110 undercounting, 84 undercounting problem, 84 Uniformity Condition, 306 universum, definition, 52, 73

value-influence factor, 120, 122 vapor, flammable, 5, 8 VCU logic, 192 Venn diagram, 50 Volt, 6 Volts/meter, 7

Warsaw A320 accident, 175 weak order, 211 Why-Because Analysis (WBA), 50 Wildavsky, Aaron, 20, 21 Wood, Richard, 187, 209

Zermelo-Fraenkel set theory, 54