

Work-Package 7: “Primary tool chain”

Evaluation of the models and tools against the WP2 requirements

List of criteria on means, models and tools and results on the benchmark

Marielle Petit-Doche

May 2013



This page is intentionally left blank

Work-Package 7: “Primary tool chain”

OETCS/WP7/O7.1.3_O7.1.7 – 00/02
May 2013

Evaluation of the models and tools against the WP2 requirements

List of criteria on means, models and tools and results on the benchmark

Marielle Petit-Doche

Systerel

Definition

This work is licensed under the European Union Public Licence (EUPL v.1.1) a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License.



Prepared for ITEA2 openETCS consortium
Europa

Abstract: This document gives elements to evaluate the means of modeling and the associated tools according WP2 requirements. Evaluation on the models and tools of benchmark is also described.

Disclaimer: This work is licensed under the European Union Public Licence (EUPL v.1.1) and a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 3.0 – (cc by-sa 3.0)

THE WORK IS PROVIDED UNDER THE TERMS OF THIS CREATIVE COMMONS PUBLIC LICENSE ("CCPL" OR "LICENSE"). THE WORK IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAW. ANY USE OF THE WORK OTHER THAN AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS LICENSE OR COPYRIGHT LAW IS PROHIBITED.

BY EXERCISING ANY RIGHTS TO THE WORK PROVIDED HERE, YOU ACCEPT AND AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS LICENSE. TO THE EXTENT THIS LICENSE MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE A CONTRACT, THE LICENSOR GRANTS YOU THE RIGHTS CONTAINED HERE IN CONSIDERATION OF YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/3.0/>
<http://joinup.ec.europa.eu/software/page/eupl/licence-eupl>

Table of Contents

Figures and Tables.....	ix
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Reference Documents.....	2
1.2 Glossary	3
2 Templates	4
2.1 Presentation	4
2.2 Main usage of the approach	5
2.3 Language	5
2.4 System Analysis	6
2.5 Sub-System formal design	7
2.5.1 Semi-formal model.....	7
2.5.2 Strictly formal model.....	8
2.6 Software design	9
2.6.1 Functional design	9
2.6.2 SSIL4 design	9
2.7 Software code generation	10
2.8 Main usage of the tool	10
2.9 Use of the tool	11
2.10 Certifiability.....	11
2.11 Other comments	12
3 Conclusion.....	13
3.1 Main usage of the approach	13
3.2 Language	14
3.3 System Analysis	15
3.4 Sub-System formal design	16
3.4.1 Semi-formal model.....	16
3.4.2 Strictly formal model.....	18
3.5 Software design	19
3.5.1 Functional design	19
3.5.2 SSIL4 design	19
3.6 Software code generation	20
3.7 Main usage of the tool	21
3.8 Use of the tool	22
3.9 Certifiability.....	23
Appendix A: CORE Workstation 5.1	25
A.1 Presentation	25
A.2 Main usage of the approach	26
A.3 Language	26
A.4 System Analysis	27
A.5 Sub-System formal design	28
A.5.1 Semi-formal model.....	28
A.5.2 Strictly formal model.....	29
A.6 Software design	30
A.6.1 Functional design	30

A.6.2 SSIL4 design	30
A.7 Software code generation	31
A.8 Main usage of the tool	31
A.9 Use of the tool	32
A.10 Certifiability	32
A.11 Other comments	33
Appendix B: GOPRR	34
B.1 Presentation	34
B.2 Main usage of the approach	35
B.3 Language	35
B.4 System Analysis	36
B.5 Sub-System formal design	37
B.5.1 Semi-formal model	37
B.5.2 Strictly formal model	38
B.6 Software design	39
B.6.1 Functional design	39
B.6.2 SSIL4 design	39
B.7 Software code generation	40
B.8 Main usage of the tool	40
B.9 Use of the tool	41
B.10 Certifiability	41
B.11 Other comments	42
Appendix C: ERTMSFormalSpecs	43
C.1 Presentation	43
C.2 Main usage of the approach	44
C.3 Language	44
C.4 System Analysis	45
C.5 Sub-System formal design	46
C.5.1 Semi-formal model	46
C.5.2 Strictly formal model	47
C.6 Software design	48
C.6.1 Functional design	48
C.6.2 SSIL4 design	48
C.7 Software code generation	49
C.8 Main usage of the tool	49
C.9 Use of the tool	50
C.10 Certifiability	50
C.11 Other comments	51
Appendix D: SysML with Papyrus	52
D.1 Presentation	52
D.2 Main usage of the approach	53
D.3 Language	53
D.4 System Analysis	54
D.5 Sub-System formal design	55
D.5.1 Semi-formal model	55
D.5.2 Strictly formal model	56
D.6 Software design	57
D.6.1 Functional design	57
D.6.2 SSIL4 design	57
D.7 Software code generation	58

D.8	Main usage of the tool	58
D.9	Use of the tool	59
D.10	Certifiability	59
D.11	Other comments	60
Appendix E: SysML with Enterprise Architect		61
E.1	Presentation	61
E.2	Main usage of the approach	62
E.3	Language	62
E.4	System Analysis	63
E.5	Sub-System formal design	64
E.5.1	Semi-formal model	64
E.5.2	Strictly formal model	65
E.6	Software design	66
E.6.1	Functional design	66
E.6.2	SSIL4 design	66
E.7	Software code generation	67
E.8	Main usage of the tool	67
E.9	Use of the tool	68
E.10	Certifiability	68
E.11	Other comments	69
Appendix F: SCADE		70
F.1	Presentation	70
F.2	Main usage of the approach	71
F.3	Language	71
F.4	System Analysis	72
F.5	Sub-System formal design	73
F.5.1	Semi-formal model	73
F.5.2	Strictly formal model	74
F.6	Software design	75
F.6.1	Functional design	75
F.6.2	SSIL4 design	75
F.7	Software code generation	76
F.8	Main usage of the tool	76
F.9	Use of the tool	77
F.10	Certifiability	77
F.11	Other comments	78
Appendix G: EventB and Rodin		79
G.1	Presentation	79
G.2	Main usage of the approach	80
G.3	Language	80
G.4	System Analysis	81
G.5	Sub-System formal design	82
G.5.1	Semi-formal model	82
G.5.2	Strictly formal model	83
G.6	Software design	84
G.6.1	Functional design	84
G.6.2	SSIL4 design	84
G.7	Software code generation	85
G.8	Main usage of the tool	85
G.9	Use of the tool	86

G.10 Certifiability	86
G.11 Other comments	87
Appendix H: Classical B and Atelier B	88
H.1 Presentation	88
H.2 Main usage of the approach	89
H.3 Language	89
H.4 System Analysis	90
H.5 Sub-System formal design	91
H.5.1 Semi-formal model	91
H.5.2 Strictly formal model	92
H.6 Software design	93
H.6.1 Functional design	93
H.6.2 SSIL4 design	93
H.7 Software code generation	94
H.8 Main usage of the tool	94
H.9 Use of the tool	95
H.10 Certifiability	95
H.11 Other comments	96
Appendix I: Petri Nets	97
I.1 Presentation	97
I.2 Main usage of the approach	98
I.3 Language	98
I.4 System Analysis	99
I.5 Sub-System formal design	100
I.5.1 Semi-formal model	100
I.5.2 Strictly formal model	101
I.6 Software design	102
I.6.1 Functional design	102
I.6.2 SSIL4 design	102
I.7 Software code generation	103
I.8 Main usage of the tool	103
I.9 Use of the tool	104
I.10 Certifiability	104
I.11 Other comments	105
Appendix J: System C	106
J.1 Presentation	106
J.2 Main usage of the approach	107
J.3 Language	107
J.4 System Analysis	108
J.5 Sub-System formal design	109
J.5.1 Semi-formal model	109
J.5.2 Strictly formal model	110
J.6 Software design	111
J.6.1 Functional design	111
J.6.2 SSIL4 design	111
J.7 Software code generation	112
J.8 Main usage of the tool	112
J.9 Use of the tool	113
J.10 Certifiability	113
J.11 Other comments	114

Appendix K: UPPAAL	115
K.1 Presentation	115
K.2 Main usage of the approach	116
K.3 Language	116
K.4 System Analysis	117
K.5 Sub-System formal design	118
K.5.1 Semi-formal model.....	118
K.5.2 Strictly formal model.....	119
K.6 Software design	120
K.6.1 Functional design	120
K.6.2 SSIL4 design	120
K.7 Software code generation	121
K.8 Main usage of the tool	121
K.9 Use of the tool	122
K.10 Certifiability.....	122
K.11 Other comments	123
Appendix L: GNATprove	124
L.1 Presentation	124
L.2 Main usage of the approach	125
L.3 Language	125
L.4 System Analysis	126
L.5 Sub-System formal design	127
L.5.1 Semi-formal model.....	127
L.5.2 Strictly formal model.....	128
L.6 Software design	129
L.6.1 Functional design	129
L.6.2 SSIL4 design	129
L.7 Software code generation	130
L.8 Main usage of the tool	130
L.9 Use of the tool	131
L.10 Certifiability.....	131
L.11 Other comments	132

Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1. Main OpenETCS process 2

Tables

Document information	
Work Package	WP7
Deliverable ID or doc. ref.	O7.3.1_O7.1.7
Document title	Evaluation of the models and tools against the WP2 requirements
Document version	00.02
Document authors (org.)	Marielle Petit-Doche (Systerel)

Review information	
Last version reviewed	00.01
Main reviewers	Uwe Steinke (Siemens) Armand Nachev (CEA) Cyril Cornu (All4Tech) Alexandre Ginisty (All4Tech) Mathieu Perrin (CEA)

Approbation			
	Name	Role	Date
Written by	Marielle Petit-Doche	WP7-T7.1 Sub-Task Leader	
Approved by	Michael Jastram	WP7 leader	

Document evolution			
Version	Date	Author(s)	Justification
00.01	19/04/2013	M. Petit-Doche	Document creation by merging O7.1.3 and O7.1.7
00.02	02/05/2013	M. Petit-Doche	Review remarks Tool evaluation matrix

1 Introduction

The aim of this document is to report the results of the evaluation of the means of description to model the requirements of SUBSET-026 concerning the on-board unit and their associated tools.

This evaluation task is part of work package WP7, task 1 "Primary tool Chain analyses and recommendations". According to the results of WP2, especially the OpenETCS process and the requirements on language and tools, the aim of this task is to determine the best candidates to produce models of the on-board units, following the OpenETCS process

This process is described in details in D2.3 "Description of the openETCS process" and is summed up in the figure 1. Requirements references quoted in the current document are defined in D2.6 "Requirements for openETCS".

Yellow elements are inputs, blue elements are part of the design process, red elements are verification and validation activities, green elements are safety activities. Each line (between dash or full blue lines) is a phase of the process, with a name on the right.

The chapter 2 of this document provides a template to describe the means and tools and a list of criteria according WP2 requirements on language, models and tools. The objectives of this description and criteria are to allow to determine the best means of description and associated tool for a given activities.

The chapter 3 resumes the results of the evaluation at the end of the benchmark activities.

In Appendix, a chapter is dedicated to each models produced during the benchmark activities :

- CORE
- GOPRR
- ERTMSFormalSpecs
- SysML with Papyrus
- SysML with Enterprise Architect
- SCADE
- EventB with Rodin
- Classical B with Atelier B
- Petri Nets
- System C
- GNATprove

For each approach and tool, the initial author of the evaluation is the partner in charge of the modelling. Two assessors, for each approaches, are in charge of the review of the evaluation and can correct it or add comments.



Figure 1. Main OpenETCS process

Tool platform are not covered by this document but in an other output of WP7 : O7.1.9 "Evaluation of each tool platform against WP2 requirements, independent of target tools". Besides, Task 7.1 is focussing on design activities : despite that some means can provide verification artefacts for example, tools and means for validation, verification, test generation,... are in the scope of task 2 and will be analysed later.

1.1 Reference Documents

- CENELEC EN 50126-1 — 01/2000 — *Railways applications — The specification and demonstration of Reliability, Availability, Maintainability and Safety (RAMS) — Part 1: Basic requirements and generic process*
- CENELEC EN 50128 — 10/2011 — *Railway applications – Communication, signalling and processing systems – Software for railway control and protection systems*
- CENELEC EN 50129 — 05/2003 — *Railway applications — Communication, signalling and processing systems — Safety related electronic systems for signalling*
- D2.1 – Report on existing methodologies
- D2.2 – Report on CENELEC standards
- D2.3 – Definition of the overall process for the formal description of ETCS and the rail system it works in
- D2.4 – Definition of the methods used to perform the formal description
- D2.6 – Requirements for OpenETCS

1.2 Glossary

API Application Programming Interface

FME(C)A Failure Mode Effect (and Criticality) Analysis

FIS Functional Interface Specification

HW Hardware

I/O Input/Output

OBU On-Board Unit

PHA Preliminary Hazard Analysis

QA Quality Analysis

RBC Radio Block Center

RTM RunTime Model

SIL Safety Integrity Level

SRS System Requirement Specification

SSHA Sub-System Hazard Analysis

SSRS Sub-System Requirement Specification

SW Software

THR Tolerable Hazard Rate

V&V Verification & Validation

2 Templates

Author Author of the approaches description %%Name - Company%%

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches %%Name - Company%%

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches %%Name - Company%%

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0** not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1** weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2** recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3** highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- *** difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

2.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

2.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

2.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

2.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

2.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

2.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

2.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

2.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

2.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

2.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

2.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

2.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

2.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

2.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

2.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

3 Conclusion

This conclusion give a sum up of the evaluation results for each approach. The detailed results of each approach are given in the appendix.

3.1 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
System Analysis											
Sub-system formal design											
Software design											
Software code generation											

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Documentation											
Modeling											
Design											
Code generation											
Verification											
Validation											
Safety analyses											

3.2 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Informal language											
Semi-formal language											
Formal language											
Structured language											
Modular language											
Textual language											
Mathematical symbols or code											
Graphical language											

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)											
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)											
Scalability : capability to design large model											
Easily translatabe to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)											
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)											
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)											
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)											
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)											
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)											
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)											
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)											
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)											

3.3 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Acoording WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)											
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)											
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)											
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)											
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)											
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)											
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)											
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)											

3.4 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

3.4.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)											
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)											
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)											
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)											
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)											
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)											
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)											
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)											
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)											
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)											
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)											
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-15)											

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)											
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)											
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)											
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)											
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)											
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)											
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)											

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
State machines											
Time-outs											
Truth tables											
Arithmetic											
Braking curves											
Logical statements											
Message and fields											

3.4.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)											
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)											
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)											
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)											
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)											
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)											
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)											
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)											
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)											
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)											
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)											

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
State machines											
Time-outs											
Truth tables											
Arithmetic											
Braking curves											
Logical statements											
Message and fields											

3.5 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

3.5.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Derivation from system semi-formal model											
Software architecture description											
Software constraints											
Traceability											
Executable											

3.5.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model											
Software architecture description											
Software constraints											
Traceability											
Executable											
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2											
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3											
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4											

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Defensive programming											
Fault detection & diagnostic											
Error detecting code											
Failure assertion programming											
Diverse programming											
Memorising executed cases											
Software error effect analysis											
Fully defined interface											
Modelling											
Structured methodology											

3.6 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Formal methods											
Modeling											
Modular approach (mandatory)											
Components											
Design and coding standards (mandatory)											
Strongly typed programming language											

3.7 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Modelling support											
Automatic translation											
Code Generation											
Model verification											
Test generation											
Simulation, execution, debugging											
Formal proof											

3.8 Use of the tool

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)											
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)											
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)											
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)											
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)											
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)											
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)											
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)											
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)											
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)											
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)											
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)											
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)											
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)											
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)											
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)											
Tool chain integration											
Scalability											

3.9 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	CORE	GOPRR	ERTMSFormalSpecs	SysML with Papyrus	SysML with Enterprise Architect	SCADE	EventB	Classical B	Petri Nets	System C	GNATprove
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)											
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)											
Existing industrial usage											
Model verification											
Test generation											
Simulation, execution, debugging											
Formal proof											

Appendix A: CORE Workstation 5.1

Author Author of the approaches description: Cyril Cornu (All4Tec)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Marielle Petit-Doche (Systerel)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches `%%Name - Company%%`

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

A.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name `%%Name of the approach and the tool%%`

Web site `%%if available, how to find information%%`

Licence `%%Kind of licence%%`

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

A.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

A.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

A.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

A.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

A.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

A.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

A.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

A.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

A.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

A.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

A.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

A.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

A.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

A.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix B: GOPRR

Author Author of the approaches description Johannes Feuser (Uni. Bremen)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Alexandre Ginisty (All4Tec)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Matthias Gudemann (Systerel)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

B.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

B.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

B.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

B.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

B.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

B.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

B.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

B.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

B.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

B.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

B.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

B.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

B.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

B.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

B.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix C: ERTMSFormalSpecs

Author Author of the approaches description Stanislas Pinte (ERTMS Solutions)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Renaud De Landtsheer (Alstom Be)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Marielle Petit-Doche (Systerel)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

C.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

C.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

C.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

C.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

C.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

C.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

C.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

C.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

C.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

C.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

C.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

C.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

C.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

C.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

C.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix D: SysML with Papyrus

Author Author of the approaches description Alexander Stante (Fraunhofer)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Renaud De Landtsheer (Alstom BE)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Cyril Cornu (All4Tec)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

D.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

D.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

D.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

D.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

D.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

D.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

D.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

D.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

D.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

D.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

D.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

D.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

D.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

D.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

D.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix E: SysML with Enterprise Architect

Author Author of the approaches description Cécile Braunstein (Uni. Bremen)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Uwe Steinke (Siemens)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Roberto Kretschmer (TWT)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

E.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

E.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

E.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

E.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

E.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

E.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

E.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

E.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

E.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

E.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

E.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

E.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

E.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

E.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

E.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix F: SCADE

Author Author of the approaches description Uwe Steinke (Siemens)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches David Mentré (MERCE)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Cécile Braunstein (Uni. Bremen)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

F.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

F.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

F.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

F.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

F.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

F.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

F.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

F.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

F.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

F.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

F.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

F.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

F.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

F.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

F.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix G: EventB and Rodin

Author Author of the approaches description Matthias Gudemann (Systerel)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches David Mentré (MERCE)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Stanislas Pinte (ERTMS Solutions)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

G.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

G.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

G.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

G.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

G.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

G.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

G.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

G.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

G.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

G.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

G.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

G.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

G.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

G.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

G.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix H: Classical B and Atelier B

Author Author of the approaches description Marielle Petit-Doche (Systerel)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Peter Mahlmann (DB)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches `%%Name - Company%%`

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

H.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name `%%Name of the approach and the tool%%`

Web site `%%if available, how to find information%%`

Licence `%%Kind of licence%%`

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

H.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

H.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

H.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

H.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

H.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

H.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

H.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

H.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

H.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

H.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

H.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

H.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

H.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

H.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix I: Petri Nets

Author Author of the approaches description Jan Welte (TU-BS)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches %%Name - Company%%

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches %%Name - Company%%

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author. Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0** not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1** weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2** recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3** highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- *** difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

I.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

I.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

I.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

I.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

I.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

I.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

I.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

I.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

I.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

I.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

I.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

I.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

I.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

I.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

I.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix J: System C

Author Author of the approaches description Stefan Rieger (TWT)/ Frank Golatowski (Uni Rostock)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Cecile Braunstein (Uni. Bremen)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Silvano DalZilio / LAAS

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0** not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1** weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2** recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3** highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- *** difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

J.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

J.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

J.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

J.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

J.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

J.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

J.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

J.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

J.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

J.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

J.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

J.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

J.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

J.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

J.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix K: UPPAAL

Author Author of the approaches description Stefan Rieger (TWT)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches Cecile Braunstein (Uni. Bremen)

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Silvano DalZilio / LAAS

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

K.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name %%Name of the approach and the tool%%

Web site %%if available, how to find information%%

Licence %%Kind of licence%%

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

K.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

K.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

K.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

K.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

K.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

K.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

K.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

K.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

K.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

K.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

K.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

K.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

K.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

K.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.

Appendix L: GNATprove

Author Author of the approaches description David Mentré (MERCE)

Assessor 1 First assessor of the approaches `%%Name - Company%%`

Assessor 2 Second assessor of the approaches Matthias Gudemann (Systerel)

In the sequel, main text is under the responsibilities of the author.

Author: Author can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 1. First assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

Assessor 2. Second assessor can add comments using this format at any place.

When a note is required, please follow this list :

- 0 not recommended, not adapted, rejected
- 1 weakly recommended, adapted after major improvements, weakly rejected
- 2 recommended, adapted (with light improvements if necessary) weakly accepted
- 3 highly recommended, well adapted, strongly accepted
- * difficult to evaluate with a note (please add a comment under the table)

All the notes can be commented under each table.

L.1 Presentation

This section gives a quick presentation of the approach and the tool.

Name `%%Name of the approach and the tool%%`

Web site `%%if available, how to find information%%`

Licence `%%Kind of licence%%`

Abstract

Short abstract on the approach and tool (10 lines max)

Publications

Short list of publications on the approach (5 max)

L.2 Main usage of the approach

This section discusses the main usage of the approach.

According to the figure 1, for which phases do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
System Analysis				
Sub-system formal design				
Software design				
Software code generation				

According to the figure 1, for which type of activities do you recommend the approach (give a note from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Documentation				
Modeling				
Design				
Code generation				
Verification				
Validation				
Safety analyses				

Known usages

Have you some examples of usage of this approach to compare with the OpenETCS objectives ?

L.3 Language

This section discusses the main element of the language.

Which are the main characteristics of the language :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Informal language				
Semi-formal language				
Formal language				
Structured language				
Modular language				
Textual language				
Mathematical symbols or code				
Graphical language				

According WP2 requirements, give a note for the capabilities of the language (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Declarative formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28)				
Simple formalization of properties (D.2.6-X-28.1)				
Scalability : capability to design large model				
Easily translatable to other languages (D.2.6-X-30)				
Executable directly (D.2.6-X-33)				
Executable after translation to a code (D.2.6-X-33) (precise if the translation is automatic)				
Simulation, animation (D.2.6-X-33)				
Easily understandable (D.2.6-X-27)				
Expertise level needed (0 High level, 3 few level)				
Standardization (D.2.6-X-29)				
Documented (D.2.6-X-29)				
Extensible language (D.2.6-01-28)				

Documentation

Describe how the language is documented, the existing guidelines, coding rules, standardization...

Language usage

Describe the possible restriction on the language

L.4 System Analysis

This section discusses the usage of the approach for system analysis. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

According WP2 requirements, how the approach can be involved for the sub-system requirement specification ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Independent System functions definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.1)				
System architecture design (D.2.6-X-10.2)				
System data flow identification (D.2.6-X-10.2.3)				
Sub-system focus (D.2.6-X-10.2.4)				
System interfaces definition (D.2.6-X-10.2.5)				
System requirement allocation (D.2.6-X-10.3)				
Traceability with SRS (D.2.6-X-10.5)				
Traceability with Safety activities (D.2.6-X-11)				

L.5 Sub-System formal design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for sub-system formal design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Two kinds of model can be planned during this phase: semi-formal models to cover the SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.1) and strictly formal models to focuss on some functional and safety aspects (D.2.6-X-14). Obviously some strictly formal means can be used to define the semi-formal model.

L.5.1 Semi-formal model

Concerning semi-formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.1)				
Coverage of SSHA (D.2.6-X-12.2.2)				
Management of requirement justification (D.2.6-X-12.2.3)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-12.2.5)				
Traceability of exported requirements (D.2.6-X-12.2.6)				
Simulation or animation (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Execution (D.2.6-X-13 partial)				
Extensible to strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Easy to refine towards strictly formal model (D.2.6-X-14.4)				
Extensible and modular design (D.2.6-X-15)				
Extensible to software architecture and design (D.2.6-X-30)				

Concerning safety properties management, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.2)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Check of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.1)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-31):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your semi-formal model is sufficient to cover a safe design of the on-board unit until code generation ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

L.5.2 Strictly formal model

Concerning strictly formal model, how the WP2 requirements are covered ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Consistency to SFM (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Coverage of SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.2)				
Traceability to SSRS (D.2.6-X-14.3)				
Extensible to software design (D.2.6-X-16)				
Safety function isolation (D.2.6-X-17)				
Safety properties formalisation (D.2.6-X-22)				
Logical expression (D.2.6-X-28.2.2)				
Timing constraints (D.2.6-X-28.2.3)				
Safety properties validation (D.2.6-X-23.3)				
Logical properties assertion (D.2.6-X-34)				
Proof of assertions (D.2.6-X-34.2)				

Does the language allow to formalize (D.2.6-X-32):

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
State machines				
Time-outs				
Truth tables				
Arithmetic				
Braking curves				
Logical statements				
Message and fields				

Additional comments on semi-formal model

Do you think your strictly formal model can be directly defined from the SSRS ? All comments on links to other models, validation and verification activities are welcomed.

L.6 Software design

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software design. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

L.6.1 Functional design

How the approach allows to produce a functional software model of the on-board unit ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				

L.6.2 SSIL4 design

How the approach allows to produce in safety a software model ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Derivation from system semi-formal or strictly formal model				
Software architecture description				
Software constraints				
Traceability				
Executable				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.2				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.3				
Conformance to EN50128 § 7.4				

Which criteria for software architecture are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Defensive programming				
Fault detection & diagnostic				
Error detecting code				
Failure assertion programming				
Diverse programming				
Memorising executed cases				
Software error effect analysis				
Fully defined interface				
Modelling				
Structured methodology				

L.7 Software code generation

This section discusses the usage of the approach for software code generation. It can be skipped depending the results of L.8.

Which criteria for software design and implementation are covered by the methodology (see EN50128 table A.4) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Formal methods				
Modeling				
Modular approach (mandatory)				
Components				
Design and coding standards (mandatory)				
Strongly typed programming language				

L.8 Main usage of the tool

This section discusses the main usage of the tool.

Which task are covered by the tool ?

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Modelling support				
Automatic translation				
Code Generation				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Modelling support

Does the tool provide a textual or a graphical editor ?

Automatic translation and code generation

Which translation or code generation is supported by the tool ?

Model verification

Which verification on models are provided by the tool?

Test generation

Does the tool allow to generate tests ? For which purpose ?

Simulation, execution, debugging

Does the tool allow to simulate or to debug step by step a model or a code ?

Formal proof

Does the tool allow formal proof ? How ?

L.9 Use of the tool

According WP2 requirements, give a note for characteristics of the use of the tool (from 0 to 3) :

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Open Source (D2.6-X-36)				
Portability to operating systems (D2.6-X-37)				
Cooperation of tools (D2.6-X-38)				
Robustness (D2.6-X-41)				
Modularity (D2.6-X-41.1)				
Documentation management (D.2.6-X-41.2)				
Distributed software development (D.2.6-X-41.3)				
Simultaneous multi-users (D.2.6-X-41.4)				
Issue tracking (D.2.6-X-41.5)				
Differences between models (D.2.6-X-41.6)				
Version management (D.2.6-X-41.7)				
Concurrent version development (D.2.6-X-41.8)				
Model-based version control (D.2.6-X-41.9)				
Role traceability (D.2.6-X-41.10)				
Safety version traceability (D.2.6-X-41.11)				
Model traceability (D.2.6-01-035)				
Tool chain integration				
Scalability				

L.10 Certifiability

This section discusses how the tool can be classified according EN50128 requirements (D.2.6-X-50).

	Author	Assessor 1	Assessor 2	Total
Tool manual (D.2.6-01-42.02)				
Proof of correctness (D.2.6-01-42.03)				
Existing industrial usage				
Model verification				
Test generation				
Simulation, execution, debugging				
Formal proof				

Other elements for tool certification

L.11 Other comments

Please to give free comments on the approach.