

Review of openETCS D2.3 (Requirements) (Responses)

Timestamp	Your full name	Overall Evaluation	Evaluation Comment	Confidence	Detailed Evaluation: Goals (Chapter 5)	Detailed Evaluation: Project Outline (Chapter 6)	Detailed Evaluation: Requirements (Chapter 7)	Detailed Evaluation: Verification, Validation and Safety issues (Chapter 8)	Detailed Evaluation: Language and formalism (Chapter 9)	Detailed Evaluation: Tool chain (Chapter 10)
2/7/2013 17:17:09	Jonas Helming	1 Weak Accept	All4tec is not a WP2 stakeholder.	1 High	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept	0 Borderline	1 Weak Accept	0 Borderline	0 Borderline
2/8/2013 11:49:04	Cyril Cornu (All4tec)	1 Weak Accept	Our reviewing activity is only related to the CENELEC requirements compliancy of the WP2 requirement documentation. Regarding the fact that it's a work in progress, I consider the current status as a first step.	1 High	1 Weak Accept	0 Borderline	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept
2/8/2013 16:56:56	Cecile Braunstein	1 Weak Accept	What I miss to be able to use it, is a better structure of the requirements list. Within a section, the requirements do not always refer to same view. This is especially true for the language and toolchain requirements, user, developer or qualification point of view are described all together.	1 High	2 Accept	2 Accept	0 Borderline	0 Borderline	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept
2/13/2013 9:54:00	David Mentré (MERCE)	2 Accept	I agree with overall document structure and content. I strongly agree with Project Outline. Small typos: "suls" -> "sums" (p. 4) "this goals" -> "these goals" (p. 7) Add "SRS" to Glossary. What is the difference between "R-WP2/D2.3.0-X-31.3" and "R-WP2/D2.3.0-X-31.6"? Weak accept on chapter 10 because a few points are still open to me.	2 Expert	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	1 Weak Accept
2/13/2013 10:18:07	Stefan Rieger (TWT)	1 Weak Accept	5.2: The heading mentions EN 50128 but not 50126 or 50129 5.3: Goal 3 is not very detailed 5.4: I assume these "safety properties" are derived from the standard? So they are formalized requirements? Some more details would be desirable here. In which WP are those safety properties defined? WP2? 5.5: Not really clear to me, but it is seemingly an open issue 5.6: Is the only promotion goal the standardization? 6: Figure 2 and the explanation regarding the safety analyses could be improved as they are not really clear. The validation and verification steps are somehow misleading. Is not verification to check whether the system fulfills the requirements and validation the check of the requirements themselves? It seems that validation and verification is confused here. 7.1: EN 50129 is not mentioned in the goals section. R-WP2/D2.3.0-X-3.6: If not all output documents required by the standards are generated, the project does not comply with them. So I assume that there is a contradiction or this RQ has to be regarded as relaxation w.r.t. R-WP2/D2.3.0-X-{1,2,3}. 7.2: Introduction in general not very clear and detailed (e.g., definition of API: "This is the functions/primitives required to complete the Runtime model", or: What is the KERNEL?) 7.2.1: R-WP2/D2.3.0-X-9: This is better called fault injection 8: Still quite incomplete? 8.1: Is this complete? Or are all safety issues treated in the safety plan and the standard requirements? 8.2: "If we use a formal method with automatic code generation, there is no need of unit testing." => Only if all code can be generated and the generation algorithm is proven correct. I doubt though, that all code can be generated... 9: What about requirement formalization? (Still incomplete) 10: Quite detailed. It will be difficult though to fulfill all of those requirements with our toolchain...	1 High	1 Weak Accept	1 Weak Accept	0 Borderline	0 Borderline	0 Borderline	2 Accept
2/13/2013 11:41:32	Stanislas Pinte	2 Accept	In addition: Parts of the RQ document are difficult to read due to English orthography or grammar issues.	2 Expert	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept	2 Accept
2/13/2013 20:08:01	Uwe Steinke	-1 Weak Reject	The actual req_synthesis.pdf is a necessary very first step and serves to get a common understanding about the project goals that shall be achieved. So far ok. But the requirements itself have to become much more detailed and concrete until they can be accepted by the WPs following WP2. Therefore my overall decision is a friendly reject with the goal to provide detailed and concrete requirements for the other WPs.	1 High	1 Weak Accept	0 Borderline	-2 Reject	-2 Reject	-1 Weak Reject	-2 Reject