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|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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| SW Project Manager: | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | |  | |
| SW Architect: | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | |  | |
| Reviewer: | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | |  | |
| Reviewer: | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | |  | |
| Other reviewer(s): | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | |  | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Review type:** | | | | | | | | | | | | | **Project status:** | | |
|  | | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | Phase: |  | |
|  | | | | |  | | | | |  | | |  | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
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| Was the respective analysis review completed successfully (Doors Baseline)? | | | | | |  | |  | | If this checklist is not applicable, you should leave comment and 'NA'.  If you have comment then you should leave comment at this. | | | |
| Is the documentation of the changes up-to-date (PTC Checkpoint)? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Does a comprehensible folder structure exist? Are the files located reasonable? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| The startup of the model environment is automated and all necessary objects will be configured and loaded via startup script? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Update diagram is possible without warnings or errors? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are all naming conventions (Guideline MBSE) fulfilled? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are there data to be protected against unauthorised access to avoid their modification? If so, was this protection implemented? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Were specifications regarding processing speed and timing taken into account, if applicable? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are all interfaces in line with the global SW architecture design? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Were value ranges and default settings of variables on the interface specified? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are only defined input values accepted for further processing? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are origin requirements and implementation easily retraceable? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Is the requirement linkage neither too detailed nor too raw? Make sure, that each requirement is allocated at least by a specification subsystem. | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are all missing issues from the specifications (e.g. tbd) marked accordingly? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Does the design ensure the correct initialisation and further processing after a fault (timeout, range violation etc.)? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are complexity rules of the QA-Plan fulfilled? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Have the Guideline documents for model-based development been taken into consideration? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Are comments in each subsystem to document the content (abbreviations explained etc.)? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |
| Is the usage of the library concept (file splitting) handled in a rational way? | | | | | |  | |  | |  | | | |

| **Checklist 'Review Meeting'**  **Implementation Model** | **OK?** | | **Action/comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **yes** | **no** |
| Was the respective analysis review completed successfully (Doors Baseline)? |  |  | If this checklist is not applicable, you should leave comment and 'NA'.  If you have comment then you should leave comment at this. |
| Is the documentation of the changes up-to-date (PTC Checkpoint)? |  |  |  |
| Did workarounds need to be used to work around limitations of the code generator? Have implemented workarounds been clearly marked and documented (on model level)? |  |  |  |
| Is the architecture between the Function Model and the Implementation Model consistent? (Note: if not it must be documented!) |  |  |  |
| Does a comprehensible folder structure exist? Are the files located reasonable? |  |  |  |
| The startup of the model environment is automated and all necessary objects will be configured and loaded via startup script? |  |  |  |
| Update diagram is possible without warnings or errors? |  |  |  |
| Are all naming conventions (Guideline MBSE) fulfilled? |  |  |  |
| Are there data to be protected against unauthorised access to avoid their modification? If so, was this protection implemented? |  |  |  |
| Were specifications regarding processing speed and timing taken into account, if applicable? |  |  |  |
| Are all interfaces in line with the global SW architecture design? |  |  |  |
| Were value ranges and default settings of variables on the interface specified? |  |  |  |
| Are only defined input values accepted for further processing? |  |  |  |
| The code generation is possible without (unexpected!) component related warnings? |  |  |  |
| "Build Host" is possible without component related warnings? |  |  |  |
| Have the Build Host warnings been checked? |  |  |  |
| The Parse-mechanism in the Data Dictionary Manager doesn't report a warning for the project Data Dictionary? |  |  |  |
| Are all mandatory MISRA rules for MBD fulfilled and violations explained in a suggestive manner? |  |  |  |
| Have the model been checked against identified potential Codegeneration nonconformities? |  |  |  |
| Are origin requirements and implementation easily retraceable? |  |  |  |
| Is the requirement linkage neither too detailed nor too raw? Make sure, that each requirement is allocated at least by a specification subsystem. |  |  |  |
| Are all missing issues from the specifications (tbd) marked accordingly? |  |  |  |
| Does the design ensure the correct initialisation and further processing after a fault (timeout, range violation etc.)? |  |  |  |
| Has repeated and redundant code been avoided? |  |  |  |
| Are complexity rules of the QA-Plan fulfilled? |  |  |  |
| Have the Guideline documents for model based development been taken into consideration? |  |  |  |
| Are comments in each subsystem to document the content (abbreviations explained etc.)? |  |  |  |
| No variables of type float or double are used (deviations must be explained)? |  |  |  |
| Is the usage of the library concept (file splitting) handled in a rational way? |  |  |  |
| Are conspicuous scalings deployed in the model? |  |  |  |
| Has a comparison between floating point and fixed point behaviour been performed? |  |  |  |
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