# Review Report

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Reporter: | Carsten Schmidt (CSH) | | | |
| Reviewer(s): | CSH, LHC, JHO | | | |
| Reviewed Document: | Common Timer Base (Detailed Specification) | | | |
| Document Number: | 8434.516.02.004 | | | |
| Review Date: | 11 marts, 2003 | | | |
| Comments: | Total: 48 | Critical: 0 | Major: 26 | Minor: 22 |
| Duration: | 60 minutes. | | | |
| Conclusion: | Accepted after rework.<br>The TAP and TST DTS part should be reviewed in Berlin after rework. | | | |

This document contains a review report for a document under version control. Included are comments from the reviewers. This report is used as a part of the review procedure described in:

[TI 8352.230.02.001]

This report includes decisions for all issues raised by the reviewers. These decisions will be reflected in the changes made to the document under review.

## Summary

| Comment ID | Comment | Section | Page | Severity | Class | Decision | Consult |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CSH006 | What about other calls that are using ti | - | 15 | Major | Missing | A | |
| CSH007 | What about VCMS ? | - | 15 | Minor | Missing | A | |
| LHC001 | The ref [C 8434.514] should be changed t | 1 | 4 | Major | Standard | A | |
| LHC002 | The text says that "Besides the design s | 1 | 4 | Major | Standard | A | |
| LHC003 | In all places where PAL is mentioned, su | 1 | 4 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| LHC004 | This section, in particular the text bel | 1.1 | 5 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC005 | Correct reference to [TI..]. Also mentio | 1.2 | 5 | Major | Standard | A | |
| CSH002 | I can really see no difference in simpli | 1.2.1 | 5 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| JHO001 | should be (acording to spell checker)<br>Te | 1.2.2 | 5 | Minor | Wrong | A | |
| LHC006 | The section title is "Testing with Anrit | 1.2.2 | 5 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| JHO002 | Missing footnote on what no longer need | 2 | 7 | Minor | Missing | A | |
| JHO003 | what about target e.g. entity test cases | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | R | |
| JHO004 | should be:<br>and an “external” frame tick | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| JHO005 | should be:<br>MUTE events (Idle for the tim | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| JHO006 | should be:<br>AWAIT events (IDLE time is us | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | R | |
| JHO007 | Should be:<br>The stack executes time until | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| JHO008 | please reformulate | 2 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC007 | "The requirements for a CTB solution hav | 2 | 7 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC008 | Last sentence: "The PAL should also have | 2 | 7 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| JHO009 | use:<br>when the PAL wants the frame to tri | 2.1 | 7 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC009 | "A common test scenario were (sic) PAL a | 2.1 | 7 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC010 | "We don't want..."<br><br>Please avoid using w | 2.1 | 8 | Major | Unclear | A | |

| Comment ID | Comment | Section | Page | Severity | Class | Decision | Consult |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| JHO010 | Can't you just make one? | 3 | 9 | Major | Unclear | FR | |
| JHO011 | What is the ID | 3.1 | 9 | Major | Unclear | FR | |
| JHO015 | use PS (capitalized) | 3.1 | 9 | Minor | Wrong | A | |
| JHO016 | when used by TST? | 3.3 | 9 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC011 | The Short name is wrong. | 3.4 | 10 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| JHO012 | earlier you on say PS TST consider use P | 3.5 | 10 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| JHO013 | is it time in ticks or milliseconds | 3.5 | 10 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC012 | Please rephrase the two sentences in the | 3.5 | 10 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC013 | Is the time parameter in ticks or in ms | 3.5 | 10 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| CSH004 | What is the unit of the time parameter i | 3.5 | 10 | Minor | Missing | A | |
| JHO014 | done you mean done_time | 3.6 | 10 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| LHC014 | The Long name says "Done ticks" but the | 3.6 | 10 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC015 | Q: How was the ID 0x00000010 chosen? Why | 3.7 | 11 | Minor | Unclear | FR | |
| JHO017 | MSC missing (for check of process id I d | 4.1 | 12 | Major | Missing | A | |
| LHC016 | The MSC shows in signal 3 and 6 that a | 4.3 | 14 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC017 | Last sentence "Pal (sic) has to await 5 | 4.3 | 14 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| LHC018 | Please remove the smiley. | 5.1 | 15 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC019 | The section title says "Idle task (PHO)" | 5.4 | 15 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| JHO018 | use this? Common for all idle states are | 5.5 | 15 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| CSH003 | Just incrementing the clock in MUTE and | 5.5 | 15 | Major | Wrong | A | |
| JHO019 | This do not look like well structured co | 5.5 | 16 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| LHC020 | "Upon exit the TAP should always reconfi | 5.5 | 16 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| CSH001 | In the Figure 7 explaining the wrapper f | 5.5 | 16 | Major | Unclear | A | |
| CSH005 | TIMEOUT uses vsi_t_sleep | 5.5 | 16 | Minor | Unclear | A | |
| LHC021 | I don't understand the | 5.5 | 17 | Major | Unclear | A | |

| Comment ID | Comment | Section | Page | Severity | Class | Decision | Consult |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | second sentence o | | | | | | |
| JHO020 | Do you mean (The changes are very simpl | 5.6 | 17 | Minor | Unclear | A | |

## Comments

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO001 | |
| **Page:** 5 | **Section:** 1.2.2 | **Class:** Wrong | **Severity:** Minor |
| **Original text:** Testing with Anritsu is not realtime. | | | |
| **Comment:** should be (acording to spell checker) Testing with Anritsu is not real-time. | | | |
| **Decision:** A | | **Consult:** | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO002 | |
| **Page:** 7 | **Section:** 2 | **Class:** Missing | **Severity:** Minor |
| **Original text:** CTB is now only required for host testing, together with the TAP or together with PAL. | | | |
| **Comment:** Missing footnote on what no longer need CTB | | | |
| **Decision:** A | | **Consult:** | |
| **Argumentation:** If it makes you happy :) | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO003 | |
| **Page:** 7 | **Section:** 2 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Minor |
| **Original text:** CTB is now only required for host testing, together with the TAP or together with PAL. | | | |
| **Comment:** what about target e.g. entity test cases on target | | | |
| **Decision:** R | | **Consult:** | |
| **Argumentation:** Add a kickoff meeting it was decided that this was out of of scope. The real problems are host testing with TAP/Anritsu.<br><br>It is very unlikely that we will use Anritsu VST for target testing. Besides it would make the CTB implementation much more difficult. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO004 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| and an “external” frame configuration were the ticks only occur | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| should be:<br>and an “external” frame tick configuration were the ticks only occur | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO005 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| MUTE events (Idle for the given time parameter) | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| should be:<br>MUTE events (Idle for the time given as parameter to MUTE)<br>Same problem with WAIT_TIMEOUT and TIMEOUT | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO006 | |
| **Page:** 7 | **Section:** 2 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Minor |

**Original text:**

AWAIT events (IDLE time is the default timeout specified when starting the TAP)

**Comment:**

should be:

AWAIT events (IDLE time is usual the default timeout specified when starting the TAP)

Same problem with WAIT_TIMEOUT and TIMEOUT

note: this is the only line in the list where IDLE is capatilised

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| R | |

**Argumentation:**

It is ALWAYS the default timeout specified when starting the TAP for AWAIT's.

IDLE will be de capitilized

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO007 | |
| **Page:** 7 | **Section:** 2 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Minor |

**Original text:**

The stack executes time until something is sent back to TAP or until the requested time has been executed

**Comment:**

Should be:

The stack executes time until something is sent back to TAP or until the requested time has been executed (what ever come first)

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

 

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO008 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| the stack are then told to skip this time until something is sent back to the TAP. | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| please reformulate | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| A: | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO009 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2.1 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| when the PAL wants the frame to trig (this was always like this). | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| use:<br>when the PAL wants the frame to trig (for PAL ir was always like this). | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| ir = it | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO010 | |
| **Page:** 9 | **Section:** 3 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Major |

**Original text:**

Because of missing Service Access Points in the frame configuration we need to define the interface “manually”.

**Comment:**

Can't you just make one?

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| FR | |

**Argumentation:**

Actually you are right. But this is out of scope for this project. Besides this would require changes in our SAP tool chain - I don't think the tool chain supports system primtives.

All handled system primtives should be specified in SAP. Make a CQ issue.

The issues also goes for CONFIG system primitives.

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO011 | |
| **Page:** 9 | **Section:** 3.1 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Major |

**Original text:**

Definition:

| Short name | ID | Direction |
|---|---|---|
| EXT_TICK_MODE_REQ | - | TAP / PAL -> PS TST |

**Comment:**

What is the ID

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| FR | |

**Argumentation:**

Jep - you got it. This is a lack in our tool chain - you can't specify system primitives here – they don’t have an ID.

In the ID section SYS_PRIM will be added.

See JHO010.

 

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO012 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.5 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| This system primitive should be sent to the ps TST requiring spending of time. | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| earlier you on say<br>PS TST<br>consider use<br>PS-TST<br>but at least alwas the same | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO013 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.5 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| Maximum time | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| is it time in ticks or milliseconds | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Milliseconds. Comment will be added | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO014 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.6 | Wrong | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| done_ttme | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| done you mean done_time | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Will be corrected | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO015 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 9 | 3.1 | Wrong | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| This system primitive should be sent to ps frame to configure CTB | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| use PS (capitalized) | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO016 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 9 | 3.3 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| INT_TICK_MODE_REQ | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| when used by TST? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Old stuff from previous design. Will be removed. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO017 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 12 | 4.1 | Missing | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| . The process id should be used to see if the stack executable still is running. | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| MSC missing (for check of process id I don't think it is just nice)<br><br>MSC whith other conditions decribed near this text would be nice too | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| The process id is a part of the EXT_TIME_MODE_CNF, as indicated on the MSC.<br>A little more text will be added.<br><br>Besides this the windows function call will be described in the TAP dts section. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO018 | |
| **Page:** 15 | **Section:** 5.5 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Minor |
| **Original text:** Common for all these states are that the | | | |
| **Comment:** use this? Common for all idle states are that the | | | |
| **Decision:** A | | **Consult:** | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO019 | |
| **Page:** 16 | **Section:** 5.5 | **Class:** Unclear | **Severity:** Major |
| **Original text:** Figure 7 tap_ctb_await_prim() | | | |
| **Comment:** This do not look like well structured code! redrawing shows it to be not as bad as it look! especial "while(!prim)" outsid a box confuse me<br><br>PS. would prefer pseudo code | | | |
| **Decision:** A | | **Consult:** | |
| **Argumentation:** I will rework this drawing according to our discussion.... | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jens Hvelplund Odborg | | JHO020 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 17 | 5.6 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| (very simple….). | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| Do you mean<br>(The changes are very simple)<br>Or<br>(Simply out of scope)<br>? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Will be clarified | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC001 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 4 | 1 | Standard | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| The ref [C 8434.514] should be changed to [TI ...] | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC002 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 4 | 1 | Standard | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

The text says that "Besides the design specification this documents (sic) also includes a high level part.."

I would say 90% of this document is high level design and analysis. Only figure 7 is really detailed specification.

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

The introduction section would be rephrased and I would make references to the TAP DTS and the TST DTS :)

Besides this the detailed specification section would be enhanced a litle.

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC003 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 4 | 1 | Wrong | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

In all places where PAL is mentioned, substitute with "PAL2" (except if talking about PAL before CTB).
Also PAL2 is an abbreviation for "Protocol Adaptation Layer"

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC004 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 5 | 1.1 | Unclear | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

This section, in particular the text below figure 3, talks about "the future", "the first CTB version", "not seen today". Usually, when we do some work it is to achieve something in the future! This part could be relevant in an analysis document but is not appropriate in the detailed specification, where I think all these discussions should have been settled, so the DTS should focus on the design.

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

The introduction to the document will be changed, so that this document will be an analysis, highlevel design and a detailed specification.

The analysis part is continues from XXXXXX document.

However the comment "This could be relevant in the future" will be removed :)

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC005 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 5 | 1.2 | Standard | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

Correct reference to [TI..]. Also mention the title of the document. Otherwise, one has no idea what document you are referring to without doing a file search.

Also, shouldn't the reference be to an 8010 document rather than a 7010 document?

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC006 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 5 | 1.2.2 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| The section title is "Testing with Anritsu", but Anritsu is a company. What you mean is "Anritsu VST". Also correct this in the MSC in figure 6. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC007 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| "The requirements for a CTB solution have changed since the beginning of this project"<br><br>And section 2.1: “This new concept... contrary to the old CTB design”.<br><br>!!<br><br>Why does this matter now? If one wants to look at earlier requirements, one could look at the appropriate version of the document in clearcase, I assume? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Accepted - comments will be removed. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC008 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| Last sentence: "The PAL should also have parameter for enabling of CTB".<br><br>Why? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Pal should not enable CTB. This should be in PHY. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC009 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 7 | 2.1 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| "A common test scenario were (sic) PAL and TAP are used together is not taken into account, since the PAL will be the master in these cases."<br><br>Why not? If it is common, it should be taken into account! Also, the last comment in the sentence above seems to say that it IS in fact taken into account? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Yeah - you are right. I state nothing has to be done in these cases, so it should be taken into account. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC010 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 8 | 2.1 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| "We don't want..."<br><br>Please avoid using words like "we" and "I".<br><br>Also page 15 second last sentence, and page 17 second sentence. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Okay - okay | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC011 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.4 | Wrong | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| The Short name is wrong. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC012 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.5 | Unclear | Minor |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

Please rephrase the two sentences in the Description, especially the last sentence. "The amount of time should be the maximum for the frame to do" is too vague. I hope you don't mean that the frame should do time because that is usually said in another context!

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC013 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.5 | Unclear | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

Is the time parameter in ticks or in ms?

If the latter, what if the value is not a multiple of 50 ms?

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

Before being sent from the TAP it is converted into a mulitple of 50 ms.

Comment will be added.

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC014 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.6 | Unclear | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

The Long name says "Done ticks" but the name of the parameter is "done_ttme" (sic) which seems to imply it is in ms. Which is it?

Also, a better name for the parameter would perhaps be "elapsed_time"

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

elapsed time will be used.

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC015 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 11 | 3.7 | Unclear | Minor |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

Q: How was the ID 0x00000010 chosen? Why not just 0?

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| FR | |

**Argumentation:**

See issue JHO010.

Select a ID range for FRAME/TST

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC016 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 14 | 4.3 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| The MSC shows in signal 3 and 6 that a time of 10 ms is indicated to PS-TST, but the text box says that TST ticks 50 ms. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| MSC will be corrected.... | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC017 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 14 | 4.3 | Wrong | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| Last sentence "Pal (sic) has to await 5 of these before sending the PHYSTUB_FRAME_TRIG_REQ" is incorrect. A PHYSTUB_FRAME_TRIG_REQ from PAL2 *always* corresponds to 10 ms. If TST can only step in multiples of 50 ms, then PHY needs to have its own idle task. Four out of fíve times, PHY's own idle task is trigged, and one of out five times, PHY instead sends a TIMER_TICK_REQ to TST. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| MSC for PAL testing will be corrected. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC018 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 15 | 5.1 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| Please remove the smiley. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC019 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 15 | 5.4 | Wrong | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| The section title says "Idle task (PHO)" but this is not the PHO task. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC020 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 16 | 5.5 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| "Upon exit the TAP should always reconfigure the stack to run in internal tick mode, by sending the INT_TICK_MODE_REQ".<br><br>What happens if no INT_TICK_MODE_CNF is received? E.g. maybe the user has started a PS that doesn't support CTB. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Comment will be added. The TAP fails with a warning, stating that CTB is not supported. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Lars Christensen | | LHC021 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 17 | 5.5 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| I don't understand the second sentence on page 17. | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Here's missing some comments. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH001 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 16 | 5.5 | Unclear | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| In the Figure 7 explaining the wrapper function tap_ctb_await_prim,<br>it is not clear when vsi_c_await is called. In particular in the<br>first action (if (MSG in queue)): is vsi_c_await called here?<br>If yes, with which timeout value; if no what happens else? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| The drawing will be reworked. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH002 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 5 | 1.2.1 | Wrong | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| With TDC (test description code) it is possible to debug test cases from Visual Studio (more easily than in TDS). | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| I can really see no difference in simplicitiy between debugging TDC and debugging TDS/TCSL (page 5, ch. 1.2.1). | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| Sentence will be reprashed. Debug should be changed to "setting breakpoints" in test cases. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH003 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 15 | 5.5 | Wrong | Major |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

Just incrementing the clock in MUTE and WAIT_TIMEOUT may produce false-positive verdicts:

These statements are testing for silence, i.e. it is a 'fail' if the stack sends someting during this waiting period. Now, if you just increment the clock, the stack - by definition - cannot send anything in between can never fail.

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

I don't understand this issue, atleast I cannot see the problem.

In case of MUTE or WAIT_TIMEOUT the TAP tells the PS to tick for the giving amount of time. The TAP awaits a respons (TIMER_TICK_CNF) and if something else is received in between it will fail, just like normal.

It seems as the concept is not understood. Some more "work" is needed in order to explain the basic concept.....

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH004 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 10 | 3.5 | Missing | Minor |

**Original text:**

**Comment:**

What is the unit of the time parameter in TIMER_TICK_REQ/CNF ? Ticks ?, msecs ?

| Decision: | Consult: |
|---|---|
| A | |

**Argumentation:**

Milliseconds. Comment will be added.

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH005 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 16 | 5.5 | Unclear | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| TIMEOUT uses vsi_t_sleep | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| The concept will be explained more detailed..... | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH006 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 15 | - | Missing | Major |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| What about other calls that are using timeout parameters (e.g. writing to a queue, requesting a semaphore ...) | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| The concept needs to explained better. | | | |

| Reviewer: | | Comment ID: | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Carsten Schmidt | | CSH007 | |
| **Page:** | **Section:** | **Class:** | **Severity:** |
| 15 | - | Missing | Minor |
| **Original text:** | | | |
| | | | |
| **Comment:** | | | |
| What about VCMS ? | | | |
| **Decision:** | | **Consult:** | |
| A | | | |
| **Argumentation:** | | | |
| The concept needs to be explained. | | | |