

ERTMS Formal Specs Workbench

Coding Guidelines, Version: 0.3

Moritz Dorka (MD)

14/12/2013

DRAFT

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author(s)	Description
0.1	31/10/2013	MD	initial draft
0.2	12/11/2013	MD	add "How to use this file", "Comments", "Glossary", "Bibliography"
0.3	14/12/2013	MD	add "Committer checklist"

Contents

How to read this file	4
Typographical conventions	4
1. Domain specific language	5
1.1. General	5
2. Model	6
2.1. General	6
2.2. Functions	6
2.2.1. Cases	6
2.2.1.1. General	6
2.2.1.2. Pre-conditions	6
3. Tests	7
3.1. Structure	7
3.2. Naming conventions	7
4. Comments	8
4.1. General	8
5. Git	9
5.1. General	9
5.2. Commits	9
5.2.1. General	9
5.2.2. commit description texts	9
Appendix A. Committer checklist	10
Glossary	10
Bibliography	12
List of Corrections	13
List of PDF comments	14

How to read this file

This document lists rules to be followed when coding in the Domain Specific Language (DSL) of the ERTMS Formal Specs Workbench (EFS) tool. It is targeted at both model developers and test-case designers. ...

It will not cover the technical implementation of the underlying DSL or give general instructions on how to use the EFS-tool. For this refer to the Technical design [1] and the user guide [2], respectively.

In the appendix A a short checklist may be found which describes how to correctly prepare a commit for the ERTMSFormalSpecs repository on GitHub.

TODO_{MD}

Typographical conventions

Rule texts

Each rule has a unique identifier composed of the current section and a running number. Words to be used verbatim within the rule texts are printed in *emphasized* letters. Rule texts conclude with the initials of the rule author and the date of the last change of the rule.

Code examples

Code of the DSL used for examples within the rules is printed in typewriter font with

- language keywords in **bold**,
- pre-defined functions underlined,
- placeholders *emphasized* and
- string literals in a sans-serif font.

For a documentation of the keywords and the pre-defined functions see [1].

1. Domain specific language

1.1. General

1.1.1. **TODO_{MD}** `EMPTY` vs. `NOT Available()` vs. `[]`

MD, 31/10/2013

1.1.2. `SUM List USING X` shall be preferred over `REDUCE List USING X + RESULT`.

MD, 31/10/2013

1.1.3. `THERE_IS_IN List | Condition` shall be preferred over `MAP List | Condition` **■**
`USING X`.

MD, 31/10/2013

2. Model

2.1. General

- 2.1.1. All decisions made by the modeler which are not purely cosmetic (i.e. using a Function instead of a Procedure), but have an influence on the actual behavior of the model shall be documented in the section *Design Choices* of the Specification View and linked to the respective code.

MD, 12/11/2013

2.2. Functions

2.2.1. Cases

2.2.1.1. General

- 2.2.1.1.1. **TBD_{MD}** Cases shall only contain trivial expressions (i.e. all logic shall be defined inside pre-conditions).

MD, 31/10/2013

- 2.2.1.1.2. **TBD_{MD}** Complex expressions and pre-conditions shall not be used together.
this rule is mutually exclusive to 2.2.1.1.1.*MD*

MD, 31/10/2013

2.2.1.2. Pre-conditions

- 2.2.1.2.1. Cases with no pre-condition assigned shall always come as the very last case.


MD, 31/10/2013

- 2.2.1.2.2. Cases with no pre-condition assigned shall always be named *Otherwise*.

MD, 31/10/2013

3. Tests

3.1. Structure

3.1.1. **TBD_{MD}**  Sub-step shall either contain Actions or Expectations but not both.
MD, 12/11/2013

3.1.2. The first Sub-step of the first step of a test frame shall only contain the expression
`Kernel.InitializeTestEnvironment()`.
MD, 31/10/2013

3.1.2.1. There shall be no Expectation associated with this Sub-step.
MD, 31/10/2013

3.2. Naming conventions

3.2.1. Individual test steps shall be named *Step n - explanation*.
Explanation is a user-defined text to summarize the actions and expectations of the current step.
MD, 31/10/2013

4. Comments

4.1. General

- 4.1.1. Comments shall be used wherever the inner workings of a code are not directly obvious from the documentation provided by the linked requirements or design choices.

MD, 12/11/2013

- 4.1.2. Comments shall always be assigned to the narrowest possible scope to which they apply (i.e. to an individual test-step rather than to the entire test).

MD, 12/11/2013

- 4.1.3. Comments shall not be used to justify Design Choices. See rule 2.1.1. instead.

MD, 12/11/2013

- 4.1.4. Comments shall always end with `#<github_username>, yy/mm/dd`. Where `<github_username>` is to be replaced with the actual username of the comment-author and `yy/mm/dd` with the current date.

MD, 12/11/2013

5. Git

5.1. General

- 5.1.1. Own edits shall always be committed into a personal fork of the EFS repository and then transferred by issuing a pull-request.

MD, 31/10/2013

5.2. Commits

5.2.1. General

- 5.2.1.1. numerous small commits dealing with a single issue are preferable over few huge commits possibly dealing with many different issues.

MD, 31/10/2013

5.2.2. commit description texts

- 5.2.2.1. The text shall not contain line-breaks (i.e. consist of a single line only).

MD, 31/10/2013

- 5.2.2.2. Commits dealing with the modeling part of the tool shall begin with *EA_MODEL* followed by a reference to the sections of the subset the commit is related to and a descriptive text.

MD, 31/10/2013

- 5.2.2.3. Commits dealing with the testing part of the tool shall begin with *EA_TEST* followed by a reference to the sections of the subset the commit is related to and a descriptive text.

MD, 31/10/2013

A. Committer checklist

This is a short checklist that everyone willing to push code onto the ERTMSFormalSpec repository should go through before every commit.

1. **make small commits**

Each commit should only change one logical thing (i.e. one test-case at a time). See 5.2.1.1.

MD, 14/12/2013

2. **use meaningful titles for new nodes**

For tests see 3.2. For the model: be creative!

MD, 14/12/2013

3. **link to requirements**

Always link your tests and model-code with the respective requirements.

MD, 14/12/2013

4. **set implementation-flag**

If you implemented any requirements make sure to mark their respective nodes in the specification view with *Implementation Status: Implemented*.

Reviewed: True should also have to be set if you verified the requirement text matches with that of the original word document of subset-026 [3].

MD, 14/12/2013

5. **check model**

Please hit *CTRL+R* in EFS and see if there are any errors introduced by your work. If so, fix them.

MD, 14/12/2013

6. **commit to your own fork**

Commit your changes to your own fork of the ERTMSFormalSpec repository and then create a pull request. See 5.1.1.

MD, 14/12/2013

7. **use meaningful commit messages**

It is merely impossible to change them afterwards so please obey 5.2.2.

MD, 14/12/2013

Glossary

DSL Domain Specific Language

EFS ERTMS Formal Specs Workbench

Bibliography

- [1] ERTMS Solutions, Brussels. *ERTMSFormalSpec Workbench Technical design*, 2013.
- [2] ERTMS Solutions, Brussels. *ERTMSFormalSpec Workbench User Guide*, 2013.
- [3] European Railway Agency. System requirements specification (subset-026). <http://www.era.europa.eu/Document-Register/Pages/New-Annex-A-for-ETCS-Baseline-3-and-GSM-R-Baseline-0.aspx>, 2013. [Online; accessed 14/12/2013].

List of Corrections

MD: TODO	4
MD: TODO	5
MD: TBD	6
MD: TBD	6
MD: this rule is mutually exclusive to 2.2.1.1.1.	6
MD: TBD	7

List of PDF comments

Moritz Dorka: Unfortunately this is not possible in all cases. Require justification if rule cannot be obeyed?	7
--	---