

FRAMSYNT

A Systems Analysis of the COVID 19 Pandemic Response

Part 1 – The Overview Model

David Slater, Erik Hollnagel, Ralph Mackinnon, Mark Sujan, Andy Carson-Stevens, Alistair Ross and Paul Bowie

A Systems Analysis of the COVID 19 Pandemic Response:
Part 1 – The overall model.

David Slater, Erik Hollnagel, Ralph Mackinnon, Mark Sujan, Andy Carson-Stevens, Alistair Ross and Paul Bowie

ABSTRACT

The most common reaction to suggesting that we could learn valuable lessons from the way the current pandemic has been/ is being handled, is to discourage the attempt; as it is suggested that it can all be done more accurately and authoritatively after the inevitable Public Inquiry (Bennet). *On the other hand, a more constructive approach, aimed at improving what worked, rather than blaming people for what went wrong, has the potential to contribute more successfully to controlling the consequences of the current crisis. Such an approach should thus be aimed at detecting and feeding back lessons from emerging and probably unexpected behaviours and helping to design the system to adapt better to counter the effects.*

This paper thus attempts a systems analysis approach to set developments in the UK's handling of the coronavirus pandemic in this context. The methodology employed, a "Functional" approach, enables easier identification of where the system and its various interdependent functions, as we have designed it for an "imaginary" situation, could be improved and strengthened; if not immediately, at least for the future. Along these lines suggestions for adding key resilience functions are additionally identified and outlined.

After the MERS pandemic, the South Korean National Disaster and Safety Status Centre used such an approach and attribute their outstandingly effective response to the current crisis, to the insights they had gained (Min, 2020)

This paper presents such an analysis for peer review, as an overall framework for a series of projects that are planned to look in more detail at some of the key issues identified, using experience and team members who were / are actually involved in the response.

Background – The Problem

Responding to outbreaks of new forms of infectious diseases, is a major challenge in today's global societies: being networks of complex interconnected sociotechnical systems. Since the turn of the century, we have seen a number of cases of declared (WHO), pandemics which have illustrated how difficult and diverse these challenges have been, namely SARS (2002/3), Swine Flu (2009), Polio (2014), Ebola (2014), MERS (2015), Zika (2016), Kivu Ebola(2018) and now COVID – 19 (2019). The problems are exacerbated by very rapid propagation (72 hours to global infections – American Assoc. 2014), and unforeseen and unexpected behaviours and unique characteristics, causing varying degrees of medical, social and economic catastrophes.

This behaviour and the speed of spread of these pandemics is the outcome of the myriad of complex interactions between vectors and societies, as well as the type, timing and effectiveness of society's responses. Sound epidemiological modelling based on experience in previous outbreaks is vital, but these complex multiple interactions inevitably result in unforeseen and unexpected developments, which predetermined models cannot always predict and their predirected responses cannot often cope with.

The military recognise these realities in such well known sayings as - “no plan survives first contact with the enemy”, and “Generals are always initially fighting the battles of the last war”! So, we have come to realise more and more, the need for a complementary approach to identify and cope with the realities of random, unexpected “emergent” behaviours in such complex systems, particularly those with Life or death implications.

An approach has been developed (Hollnagel E.), which seeks to describe and analyse the effects and outcomes of such multifaceted interactions in real systems, better to understand and predict the emergence of these surprises. It identifies and addresses a natural variability in the way “functions” interact in the real world, (as is), rather than assume they will always behave as imagined, in any predetermined “model” on which we are predicting “normal” outcomes. Understanding how these functions actually interact then allows the scope for ensuring sufficient resilience in the system to cope with the actual (“normal”), variability to be expected.

International Context and National Interest

This approach has been applied successfully to the way the South Korean Authorities responded to the 2015 MERS outbreak (Min, 2020). The aim of the study was to improve the system for the next pandemic and is attributed by the Koreans as improving their performance in responding to the current COVID - 19 pandemic.

The Koreans will be extending the study now to look in detail for lessons that can be learned from the current Pandemic, again using the same FRAM approach and involving Professor Hollnagel. Learning from this, the Swedish Government is considering a parallel study to examine how they have handled the current pandemic to see how they can improve their response for the next time. Similar proposals are being considered in other countries. In Australia, for example, there has also been circulated a suggested protocol for keeping “diaries” for significant observations on responses to emergent behaviours and “surprises”! (Braithwaite, 2020)

This is particularly relevant as the project group includes Professor Hollnagel who was involved in the South Korean study and will play a similar role in the proposed Swedish (and possibly Australian and now the Italians have enquired to coordinate their FRAM study)) similar studies. This will then enable different National responses to be examined more meaningfully on a common, consistent basis.

This initial work is presented as an overview of the UK’s experience in a similar FRAM format, as a high level framework for a series of projects; where it is proposed to utilise this international experience and expertise to add the experience of the UK to the growing evidence and feedback being accumulated and analysed worldwide – as befits a global pandemic response.

This paper then sets out to provide a macro system description and model as a common framework for UK contributions, to ensure all the details fit into a consistent picture, so that all the lessons learned can be upwardly compatible with this and other similar international studies. It uses the FRAM methodology to describe the way in which the overall National pandemic response and management functions were developed and deployed in the current UK COVID 19 response as a basis for spinning out and drilling down into a series of subprojects ; and building in resilience and learnings to better cope with the next pandemic.

There is already a core capability in the UK in deploying this approach successfully. For example on the Sepsis problem (McNab, 2019), Response to emergency trauma cases – following the Manchester Arena experience and tackling the apparent inefficiency of external applications of CPR (MacKinnon, 2019). This group (the Safety Innovation Research Network (SIREN (Slater D. , 2020)) are committed to working on a number of projects using the FRAM approach to explore specific aspects of the UK response in more detail.

Approach

There will be many studies which will aim to highlight issues and problems to be identified as the "root causes" of any failures pinpointed as responsible for how the system reacted to, or failed to cope, with the current crisis. But fixing single point failures to address current behaviours is no guarantee that they will solve the problems thrown up by the one to come.

This is where FRAM can be used to make a model of how the systems in place in the UK should have functioned and to observe how the effects of unusual variability in expected conditions affected them. This can then be used to provide a blueprint for how an epidemic could be better managed (in the future). That will provide a basis for describing what actually happened, focusing on which particular functions were adversely affected by the variabilities encountered. (The MERS paper set out to do this).

But we are trying to document what actually is happening/ has happened in the current crisis, given that we are still in the middle of it. We hope to achieve this by strictly applying a FRAM approach aimed at reaping the benefit of actual "Work as Done", (WAD) experiences: this will rely on professional insights into what went well as what went wrong , exploring how we could use the model to improve our performance and resilience for the next pandemic. Again, to emphasize, this is attempted without focus on what went well or wrong, but simply what was done.

The Method Employed

FRAM (the Functional Resonance Analysis Method), (Hollnagel E. , 2012), is an extension of this methodology and is now a well-established approach for modelling and analysing what goes on in highly intensive and hazardous operations of systems highly dependent on human performance to make them work successfully. Key examples of its application can be found in the Healthcare, Marine and Air Traffic control operations. A recent review has provided a useful reference list of the various different areas of application and the key centres of its ongoing development (Patriarca, 2020). It builds on the well-established SADT (Structured Analysis and Design Technique) with the crucial difference in that it can additionally cope with dynamic interactions between functions such as Timing and Emergence.

In principle, the methodology allows the analyst to build a "mind map" of the functions of the system and imposes a discipline of systematically and logically tracing exactly how the functions rely on their interactions with all the other functions; and what these interdependencies do to its ability to complete successfully, the task it was designed for. A fuller description is given in the manual (Hollnagel E. S., 2018). In most applications, the analyst constructs the system of functions from information researched on its purpose and designed operation (as imagined?). Issues identified are then followed up with the people actually doing the work and the practical insights can then be used to improve the system (and the FRAM visualisation – "as is").

It has usually been carried out as a qualitative probe, with the insights gained, triggered by the analyst systematically working through the mind map, or in discussion, where the FRAM visualisation forms a common picture as the basis for authentication with the operators. Recent developments (Slater) are working on enabling the automatic interrogation of the propagation of effects in FRAM models and the dynamic display of issues and "resonances" with specific links to aid the analyst in the systematic identification and communication of insights and issues. In this application, because of the complexity of the systems, the analyses had to be qualitative, using the FRAM models as mind maps. The key principles of these models can be seen in the following figures.

Then, activities in these complex systems are modelled solely as a set of hexagonal nodes of the required network of the necessary FRAM functions and not the physical agents, or components that implement the actions involved. This greatly simplifies the process being studied into a visualization of such activities as a series of interactions of these functions and their reliance for successful operation on critical (and naturally variable) interdependencies. These interdependencies, or Aspects of the function have been grouped into sets of six generic categories to help the analyst and these are set out below.



Fig. 1 – The categorisation of the “Aspects”

A HIGH-LEVEL FRAM MODEL

The response system for emergencies in Government, involves a myriad of interacting people, Ministries, Agencies, committees and front-line responders. To deal with such a complex picture, the FRAM approach can then, as SADT, be employed to look at different aspects and various levels of detail. Recognising this, this paper sets out the high level, National Overview model, in order to provide the framework needed to tease out the contributions of identified critical aspects which the teams will investigate. But both the framework and the individually developed sub modules, will have all been developed using a consistent application of the FRAM methodology. This will involve a number of steps: -

Step 1 – Acquire Real time Records and Experiences

The first step will be to try to assemble a record of the experiences of the teams actually involved in the healthcare responses in the current locations. (Work as done). A useful blueprint and suggested pro-forma “diary” pages are outlined in Braithwaite et al – “Learning from COVID – 19 in real time: Expressions of Resilient Performance during the Pandemic” (ref). Adopting this common, globally initiated template approach, will give us the possibility of using a wide range of data from different countries as a resource.

Step 2 – Model the System

The second step is to build and analyse the FRAM model: -

1. Identify the essential functions active in the process.
2. From the Timeline observed, identify the critical points in the process where there was a distinct change in how the system behaved – the instantiations
3. Determine and assign the observed variabilities in function interactions and how these propagated to affect other functions
4. Trace out and evaluate how these variabilities affect and propagate through the various critical instantiations involved.
5. Identify, analyse and test how the system and critical function performance reliability can be improved; and how resilience can be added as additional and organisational resilience functions.

Step 3 – Development and Assessment of Improvement Options

This step will draw on the experience of the team, the insights from this and other approaches to develop and assess options for ensuring a better and more resilient systems. This will be discussed and tested against experiences and learnings from other countries approaches

RESULTS

Model Completeness and Correctness.

A number of sources (UK, 2020) were used to identify the Key functions. The following model (Figure 5) was then produced as the first step in the overall project. It is planned to produce a more detailed analysis, fleshing out steps 2. And 3, when the results of some of the more detailed studies become available. The focus of this paper though, is to build and validate the overarching model, which will set the framework and provide the Background functions for all the detailed studies proposed as follow up. For a model this complex, it is not possible to trace reliably and check systematically, every interaction between the functions identified and specified. As these non-linear interdependencies are critical to the way in which the model will predict how the "as imagined" system will operate and respond, a formal and systematic check of the model's viability has been undertaken. The FMI (FRAM Model Interpreter) method employed has been developed by Hollnagel (Hollnagel E.), as a way of analysing the implications from the model presented. The methodology sets out to explore how changes to upstream functions affect the downstream functions. This can show how the dependencies defined by the aspects, determine the order of activation. the FMI is thus basically a set of production rules. Production rule systems, an approach widely used in artificial intelligence in the 1980s, are defined as follows:

"A production system (or production rule system) is a computer program typically used to provide some form of artificial intelligence, which consists primarily of a set of rules about behaviour but it also includes the mechanism necessary to follow those rules as the system responds to states of the world."

The basic principle is that each function "looks" for the conditions that may activate or "trigger" it. If those conditions exist, the functions is activated and the output is generated. This output will then be detected by other (downstream) functions, which then will become activated, and so on. In this way the activity is propagated through the model according to how the relations between functions have been specified, i.e., according to the potential couplings defined by the aspects.

Table 1 – Overview Model Validation

FMI log
Begin initialisation
Entry function <To cause a significant infectious disease outbreak>
Exit function <To control the Pandemic>
--- MODEL INITIALISATION COMPLETED.
BEGIN CYCLE 1
Function <To provide expert Advice> has been activated.
Function <To Provide Policy Advice> has been activated.
Function <To initiate an infection custer> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 2
Function <To Decide Response> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 3
Function <To Decide the National Interest> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 4
Function <To Authorise National Response> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 5
Function <To Manage Response> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 6
Function <To communicate Policy> has been activated.
Function <To provide medical needs> has been activated.
Function <To prevent UK outbreak> has been activated.
Function <To Provide Testing Facilities> has been activated.
Function <Description:Drug Companies> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 7
Function <To respond to Events> has been activated.
Function <To supply PPE> has been activated.
Function <To supply Ventilators> has been activated.
Function <To supply Oxygen> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 8
Function <To produce an effective treatment> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 9
Function <To manage healthcare> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 10
Function <To Provide Social Care> has been activated.
Function <To provide community Care> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 11
Function <To provide Clinical response> has been activated.
Function <To administer Intensive care> has been activated.
Function <To Test for Virus> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 12
Function <To Trace and isolate Contacts> has been activated.
Function <To Prevent Importing Cases> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 13
Function <To Quarantine Cases> has been activated.
Function <To ensure compliance> has been activated.
BEGIN CYCLE 14
Function <To monitor the effects> has been activated.

The Table shows the FMI analysis results for the overview system FRAM produced here, consisting of 33 functions, (Appendix 1) and shown below in Figure 2.

An initial “walk-through” of the way the analysis describes the way the system has actually behaved, gives us confidence that it is sufficient to employ as a first pass. This model will be further developed to act as a linking narrative for all the Future Work planned.

Fig. 2 – The Overall Umbrella FRAM



FUTURE WORK PLANNED

There are many important issues at many levels of operation, such that some overall structure needs to be established to try and see the overall picture. As this approach can let us drill down into the inner workings and details of the response, it is proposed that this overview FRAM (Suitably peer reviewed!) will form the overall "umbrella" schematic for a learning project along the lines of the MERS 2015 Korean study and report. This will establish the framework and background boundary functions for a number of follow up projects developing the details of specific aspects.

Within this framework we therefore, we propose to highlight a number of key areas as sub projects. These will include: -

1. The Pandemic behaviour monitoring program - Cardiff
2. The Clinical ICU focus – "Responding to an unknown disease" – Manchester lead
3. The management of team performance - the prolonged effects of crisis on the responders – Epsom Trust and HSIB
4. The PPE issue – The specification, adaptation and supply – Cardiff
5. The Development of Guidance- The rapidly manufactured Ventilator Response – CIHEF
6. The social care outcomes – Glasgow

These points of interest are identified in this Umbrella Framework – National Response to COVID 19 - illustrated below.



Fig 3 – The Detailed areas for analysis

To ensure consistency of approach of the individual sub projects' models, both within the framework of this project and the future compatibility and comparison with the other international FRAM Projects, it is proposed to have a central coordinating group and peer review process. It will be based on a supervisory "Review Board" structure, chaired by Professor Erik Hollnagel and to include Donna Forsyth (NHS), Tracy O' Herlihey (Head of Investigation) Laura Pickup (National Investigator) – HSIB and Paul Bowie (CIEHF and Safety, Skills and Improvement Research Collaborative – NHS Education for Scotland), to ensure academic rigour and Institutional value in the study.

The board will offer an independent review of the process and findings from the study to ensure academic rigour and optimal learning for NHS organisations.

The project is the result of initial discussions and contributions from the UK's Safety Innovation and Research Network (SIREN), whose members will form the participants in the project teams.
These projects will run separately and concurrently with individual teams and team leaders.

Conclusions

The paper describes an application of a system modelling approach to help in the understanding and improving response to pandemic emergencies based on the current experience. This initial project was undertaken, primarily to produce an overall umbrella FRAM model of the way in which the organisation was intended to respond to the pandemic and what actually worked. It is aimed at offering a systematic way of understanding the structuring and the expected modes of operation of the original overall system "as designed". It is hoped that such an objective systems analysis can provide insights as to what we learned in adapting to provide the resilience needed in practice. Such insights are greatly aided by a clear visualisation of the complex interactions and interdependencies involved. It is envisaged that It will also be of great help for the designers of the better system needed for the next pandemic to have this kind of FRAM system visualisation as a clear and commonly understood engineering blueprint or P & I D (Piping and Instrumentation Diagram) to work with.

REFERENCES

Braithwaite, J. H. (2020). Learning from COVID 19 in real time: Expressions of resilient performance during the pandemic. .

Foundation, T. H. (2020).

Hollnagel, E. (2012). *FRAM: The Functional Resonance Analysis Method: Modelling Complex Socio-technical Systems* . Ashgate.

Hollnagel, E. (2020, June). *The FRAM Model Interpreter - Basic Version*. Retrieved from The Functional Resonance Analysis Methodology: http://www.functionalresonance.com

Hollnagel, E.S.(2018)*h*ttps://www.researchgate.net/publication/325825191_THE_FUNCTIONAL_RESONANCE_ANALYSIS_METHOD_AND_MANUAL_VERSION_2.

MacKinnon, R. S. (2019). *FRAMily 2019.*

Marca, D. M. (1987). *SADT: structured analysis and design technique.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

McNab, D., Freestone, J., Black, C. et al., (2019) Participatory design of an improvement intervention for the primary care management of possible sepsis using the Functional Resonance Analysis Method. BMC Med 16, 174 (2018).

Min, J. Y. (2020). A Study on South Korea's emergency response to the MERS outbreak, using the Functional Resonance Analysis Method. *Safety Science* , submitted.

Patriarca, R. e. (2020). Framing the FRAM: A literature review on the functional resonance analysis. *Safety Science*, 104827 (129).

Santos, P. M. (2016). Modelling ATM; Reality in Action MARIA. *FRAMily 2016.* Lisbon.

Slater, D. (2020, May). *The Safety Innovation Research Network*. Retrieved from SIREN: www.sirendipity.one

APPENDIX 1 – FUNCTION LIST

Function Number	Description	Comment
0	To cause a significant infectious disease outbreak	Entry Function
1	To Decide Response	
2	To provide expert Advice	
3	To Provide Policy Advice	
4	To Manage Response	
5	To manage healthcare	
6	To communicate Policy	
7	To provide Clinical response	
8	To provide medical needs	
9	To Provide Social Care	
10	To provide community Care	
11	To Authorise National Response	
12	To monitor the effects	
13	To respond to Events	
14	To initiate an infection cluster	
15	To prevent UK outbreak	
16	To supply PPE	
17	To supply Ventilators	
18	To produce an effective treatment	
19	To administer Intensive care	
20	To Test for Virus	
21	To Trace and isolate Contacts	
22	To Provide Testing Facilities	
23	To Quarantine Cases	
24	To ensure compliance	
25	To Prevent Importing Cases	
26	To carry out Research	
27	To supply Drugs, Vaccines	
28	To set Policy - Party in Parliament	
29	To Hold to account	
30	To provide Epidemiology, Disease Modelling expertise	
31	To control the Pandemic	Exit Function
32	To Decide the National Interest	
33	To supply Oxygen	