

<b>Technique</b>	<b>Origin / Standard</b>	<b>Primary Purpose</b>	<b>ISO 14971 Phase(s)</b>	<b>Typical Outputs / Artifacts</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Limitations</b>	<b>Best-Fit Use Cases</b>	<b>Audit / Regulatory Value</b>
<b>Item / System Definition</b>	ISO 26262	Define scope, boundaries, modes	Intended use, hazard ID	System boundaries, interfaces, modes	Prevents missed hazards	Requires early rigor	Complex E/E/EP & software devices	Demonstrates completeness
<b>Preliminary Hazard Analysis (PHA)</b>	System Safety	Early hazard identification	Hazard ID	Initial hazard list	Fast, proactive	High-level only	Concept phase	Shows early safety thinking
<b>HAZID</b>	System Safety	Structured hazard brainstorming	Hazard ID	Hazard register	Simple, inclusive	Team dependent	Early reviews	Common & accepted
<b>Scenario-Based Hazard Analysis (HARA-style)</b>	ISO 26262	Hazard + malfunction + scenario	Hazard ID, risk analysis	Hazardous situations, sequences	Excellent context modeling	Requires discipline	Multi-use or workflow-heavy devices	Strong ISO 14971 alignment
<b>DFMEA</b>	AIAG / ISO	Bottom-up design failures	Risk analysis	Failure modes, effects, controls	Structured, traceable	Misses systemic hazards	Components, subsystems	Expected but insufficient alone
<b>PFMEA</b>	AIAG / ISO	Manufacturing/process risk	Risk analysis	Process failure risks	Strong production focus	Not design-centric	Assembly & manufacturing	Strong production evidence

<b>UFMEA / Use-Related Risk Analysis</b>	IEC 62366-1	Use error identification	Hazard ID, risk analysis	Use error scenarios	Mandatory for usability	User-focused only	User-facing devices	High regulatory scrutiny
<b>Software Hazard Analysis / SFMEA</b>	IEC 62304	Software-related hazards	Risk analysis	Software hazard list	Software focus	Needs top-down complement	Embedded & SaMD	Expected for SW devices
<b>Fault Tree Analysis (FTA)</b>	System Safety / ISO 26262	Top-down causal analysis	Risk analysis	Fault trees, cut sets	Identifies root causes	Needs defined top event	High-severity hazards	Very persuasive
<b>Quantitative FTA</b>	ISO 26262	Probability modeling	Risk analysis, residual risk	Event probabilities	Strong evidence	Data intensive	Safety-critical hazards	Exceptional credibility
<b>Event Tree Analysis (ETA)</b>	System Safety	Consequence modeling	Risk evaluation	Event sequences	Captures escalation	Not root-cause focused	Protective response analysis	Strong sequence clarity
<b>Cause-Consequence Analysis (CCA)</b>	System Safety	Combine FTA + ETA	Risk analysis	Integrated causal maps	Holistic view	Modeling effort	Complex systems	Advanced rigor
<b>Common Cause / Dependent Failure</b>	ISO 26262	Identify shared failures	Risk analysis	Dependency lists	Exposes hidden risks	Often overlooked	Redundant systems	Addresses auditor red flags

<b>Analysis (CCFA / DFA)</b>								
<b>FMEDA</b>	ISO 26262	Diagnostic effectiveness	Risk analysis, verification	Diagnostic coverage, failure rates	Quantifies detection	Data heavy	Sensors, actuators, alarms	Strong risk control evidence
<b>Reliability Block Diagrams (RBD)</b>	Functional Safety	Architecture reliability	Risk evaluation	Reliability estimates	Visual architecture logic	Simplifying assumptions	Redundancy decisions	Good design justification
<b>Markov / State-Based Analysis</b>	Functional Safety	Time-dependent risk	Risk analysis	State transition models	Handles repair/degraded states	Specialized skill	Maintenance-dependent devices	Advanced but credible
<b>HAZOP</b>	Process Safety	Deviation-based analysis	Risk analysis	Deviations, causes, effects	Very systematic	Time-intensive	Complex processes	Strong rigor signal
<b>Sneak Circuit Analysis</b>	System Safety	Unintended behaviors	Risk analysis	Sneak paths	Finds hidden logic	Niche	Safety-critical electronics	Niche but powerful
<b>Functional Safety Concept (FSC)</b>	ISO 26262	Define safety goals	Risk control option analysis	Safety goals, FS requirements	Clear intent	Formal	High-severity hazards	Excellent traceability
<b>Technical Safety Concept (TSC)</b>	ISO 26262	Allocate safety controls	Risk control implementation	Allocated requirements	Strong design linkage	Overhead	Complex architectures	Audit-proof design linkage

<b>Safety Mechanism Pattern Analysis</b>	ISO 26262	Apply proven patterns	Risk control implementation	Watchdogs, checks	Reusable knowledge	Must justify fit	Embedded systems	Strong engineering practice
<b>Independence / Decomposition Analysis</b>	ISO 26262	Split risk across controls	Risk control option analysis	Independence rationale	Prevents single-point failure	Independence must be proven	Dual-channel systems	Highly respected
<b>Freedom from Interference Analysis</b>	ISO 26262	Prevent SW cross-impact	Risk control implementation	Partitioning evidence	Essential for mixed-criticality	Architectural effort	AI / multifunction devices	Increasingly expected
<b>Risk Graphs / Risk Matrices</b>	ISO 14971	Risk acceptability	Risk evaluation	Risk classification	Transparent decisions	Subjective	All devices	Accepted if justified
<b>Benefit-Risk Analysis</b>	ISO 14971	Residual risk justification	Residual risk evaluation	Benefit-risk rationale	Enables high-risk devices	Needs strong evidence	Life-saving devices	Mandatory for high risk
<b>Confirmation Measures (Independent Review)</b>	ISO 26262	Verify controls	RM review, verification	Review & test records	Strong governance	Org maturity needed	Novel / high-risk tech	Excellent audit defense
<b>Safety Case / Structured Argumentation</b>	Functional Safety	Coherent safety argument	RM report	Claim-argument-evidence	Executive & regulatory clarity	Not mandated	Class III / novel tech	Gold-standard communication



<b><i>Complaint Trending &amp; PMS Signal Detection</i></b>	ISO 14971	Detect emerging risks	Post-market	Signals, CAPAs	Lifecycle continuity	Reactive	All marketed devices	Critical compliance element
---	-----------	-----------------------	-------------	-------------------	-------------------------	----------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------