**First Review:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **2 Wire Common Top Works** |
| **Subsystem under Review:** | **NV\_MEM Subsystem** |
| **Revision:** | **1.2.1** |
| **Review Date:** | **2012-12-24** |

**Review-Participant:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Dept.* | *Name* | *Date* |
| Lenno | Andrea Venturini | 2012-12-24 |
|  |  |  |

**Decision of the Review:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Decision* | *next steps* |
| ■ | Inspection passed ***without restrictions*** | Phase finished |
|  | Inspection passed ***with restrictions*** | some changes must be done |
|  | Inspection ***not*** passed | Inspection must be repeated |

**Changes are proved:** The Reviewer confirms that all changes are done:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| proved Rev: | Date: | Reviewer: |
| 1.3.0 | 2013-02-08 | Andrea Venturini |

**Check list:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | yes | no |
| 1. | Review the code for conformance with the coding guideline. | **Y** |  |
| 2. | Check that erroneous data inputs are covered correctly. | **Y** |  |
| 3. | Check that parameter passing by reference is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 4. | Check that all specified outputs are produced. | **Y** |  |
| 5. | Check that all functions are clear to understand. | **Y** |  |
| 6. | Check that the program sequencing is proper. | **Y** |  |
| 7. | Check that all type casts are correct. | **Y** |  |
| 8. | Check that conditional compile is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 9. | Check that the module test has passed successful and covered the implementation. | **Y** |  |
| 10. | Check that the code is successful checked by a lint-tool (passed warning level 3 for SIL2 ) | **Y** |  |
| 11. | Check that all related safety measures based on the safety analysis are covered. | **Y** |  |
| 12. | Check that known problems and limitations of compiler, linker and operating system are   considered by the developer. | **Y** |  |
| 13. | Are all open issues transferred to the defects table? | **Y** |  |

**Remarks:**

**Defects**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Checkpoint | Description | Major Defect | done  Date |
| 1 |  | chip\_handler.c::151  in GetAddress function, no assert check is execute against TUSIGN8 page and TUSIGN16 segNum parameters as done in ReadData\_CHIPHANDLER  assert( page<CH\_NUMOFPAGES );  assert( segNum<CH\_SEGMENTS\_PER\_PAGE );  It could be done. But I have checked all the functions that calls *GetAddress*, before the calling, it will do *page* and *segNum* check.  Changed as below: | No | 2012-12-24 |
| 2 |  | chip\_handler.c::271  While( result==CH\_DATA\_ERROR && retryCnt<=CH\_NUM\_RETRY);  Return code CH\_ADR\_ERROR is not explicitly managed inside the ReadSegment function  It did not need to be changed;  As The while loop is only enabled for data error, for address error, it will not have while loop. | No | 2012-12-24 |
| 3 |  | I2C\_test.c::47, 50, 53  Entire array, as input parameter, is passed by address  Changed as below:  err = WriteSlave\_I2C(slaveAddr,&dataW[0],sizeof(dataW));  if ( err ) return(err);  err = ReadSlave\_I2C(slaveAddr,&dataR[0],sizeof(dataR)-2);  if ( err ) return(err);  err = CombinedComSlave\_I2C(slaveAddr,&dataAddr[0],sizeof(dataAddr),&dataR,sizeof(dataR)-2 ); | Yes | 2012-12-24 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Second Review:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **VT5** |
| **Subsystem under Review:** | **NV\_MEM Subsystem** |
| **Revision:** | **SVN revision 3872** |
| **Review Date:** | **2014-02-26** |

**Review-Participant:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Dept.* | *Name* | *Date* |
| PAMP | Merrick Huang, Jax Yang | 2014-02-26 |
|  |  |  |

**Decision of the Review:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Decision* | *next steps* |
| ■ | Inspection passed ***without restrictions*** | Phase finished |
|  | Inspection passed ***with restrictions*** | some changes must be done |
|  | Inspection ***not*** passed | Inspection must be repeated |

**Changes are proved:** The Reviewer confirms that all changes are done:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| proved Rev: | Date: | Reviewer: |
| SVN revision 3872 | 2014-02-26 | Merrick Huang, Jax Yang |

**Check list:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | yes | no |
| 1. | Review the code for conformance with the coding guideline. | **Y** |  |
| 2. | Check that erroneous data inputs are covered correctly. | **Y** |  |
| 3. | Check that parameter passing by reference is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 4. | Check that all specified outputs are produced. | **Y** |  |
| 5. | Check that all functions are clear to understand. | **Y** |  |
| 6. | Check that the program sequencing is proper. | **Y** |  |
| 7. | Check that all type casts are correct. | **Y** |  |
| 8. | Check that conditional compile is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 9. | Check that the module test has passed successful and covered the implementation. | **Y** |  |
| 10. | Check that the code is successful checked by a lint-tool (passed warning level 3 for SIL2 ) | **Y** |  |
| 11. | Check that all related safety measures based on the safety analysis are covered. | **Y** |  |
| 12. | Check that known problems and limitations of compiler, linker and operating system are   considered by the developer. | **Y** |  |
| 13. | Are all open issues transferred to the defects table? | **Y** |  |

**Remarks:**

**Defects**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Checkpoint | Description | Major Defect | done  Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Third Review:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project:** | **VT5** |
| **Subsystem under Review:** | **NV\_MEM Subsystem** |
| **Revision:** | **V1.3.1** |
| **Review Date:** | **2014-06-16** |

**Review-Participant:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Dept.* | *Name* | *Date* |
| PAMP | Merrick Huang, Jax Yang | 2014-06-16 |
|  |  |  |

**Decision of the Review:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Decision* | *next steps* |
| ■ | Inspection passed ***without restrictions*** | Phase finished |
|  | Inspection passed ***with restrictions*** | some changes must be done |
|  | Inspection ***not*** passed | Inspection must be repeated |

**Changes are proved:** The Reviewer confirms that all changes are done:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| proved Rev: | Date: | Reviewer: |
| V1.3.1 | 2014-06-16 | Merrick Huang, Jax Yang |

**Check list:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | yes | no |
| 1. | Review the code for conformance with the coding guideline. | **Y** |  |
| 2. | Check that erroneous data inputs are covered correctly. | **Y** |  |
| 3. | Check that parameter passing by reference is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 4. | Check that all specified outputs are produced. | **Y** |  |
| 5. | Check that all functions are clear to understand. | **Y** |  |
| 6. | Check that the program sequencing is proper. | **Y** |  |
| 7. | Check that all type casts are correct. | **Y** |  |
| 8. | Check that conditional compile is correctly used. | **Y** |  |
| 9. | Check that the module test has passed successful and covered the implementation. | **Y** |  |
| 10. | Check that the code is successful checked by a lint-tool (passed warning level 3 for SIL2 ) | **Y** |  |
| 11. | Check that all related safety measures based on the safety analysis are covered. | **Y** |  |
| 12. | Check that known problems and limitations of compiler, linker and operating system are   considered by the developer. | **Y** |  |
| 13. | Are all open issues transferred to the defects table? | **Y** |  |

**Remarks:**

**Defects**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Checkpoint | Description | Major Defect | done  Date |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |