

Document Title	Complete Change Documentation 1.5.0 - 1.5.1
Document Owner	AUTOSAR
Document Responsibility	AUTOSAR
Document Identification No	885

Document Status	Final
Part of AUTOSAR Standard	Foundation
Part of Standard Release	1.5.1

Table of Contents

1	PRS_E2EProtocol	6
1.1	Specification Item PRS_E2E_UC_00466	6
2	PRS_LogAndTraceProtocol	7
3	PRS_NetworkManagementProtocol	7
4	PRS_SOMEIPProtocol	7
5	PRS_SOMEIPServiceDiscoveryProtocol	7
6	PRS_TimeSyncProtocol	7
7	RS_E2E	7
7.1	Specification Item RS_E2E_08527	7
7.2	Specification Item RS_E2E_08528	9
7.3	Specification Item RS_E2E_08529	10
7.4	Specification Item RS_E2E_08530	12
7.5	Specification Item RS_E2E_08533	14
7.6	Specification Item RS_E2E_08534	15
7.7	Specification Item RS_E2E_08539	17
7.8	Specification Item RS_E2E_08540	19
7.9	Specification Item RS_E2E_08541	23
7.10	Specification Item RS_E2E_08542	25
7.11	Specification Item RS_E2E_08543	27
7.12	Specification Item RS_E2E_08544	28
7.13	Specification Item RS_E2E_08545	29
7.14	Specification Item RS_E2E_08546	30
7.15	Specification Item RS_E2E_08547	31
7.16	Specification Item RS_E2E_08548	32
8	RS_FoundationDebugTraceProfile	33
9	RS_HealthMonitoring	33
10	RS_LogAndTrace	33
11	RS_Main	33
12	RS_Methodology	33
13	RS_NetworkManagement	33

14 RS_ProjectObjectives	33
15 RS_SOMEIPProtocol	33
16 RS_SOMEIPServiceDiscoveryProtocol	33
17 RS_TimeSync	33
18 SRS_Diagnostics	33
19 SWS_HealthMonitoring	33
19.1 Specification Item SWS_HM_00050	33
19.2 Specification Item SWS_HM_00051	36
19.3 Specification Item SWS_HM_00052	39
19.4 Specification Item SWS_HM_00053	41
19.5 Specification Item SWS_HM_00054	44
19.6 Specification Item SWS_HM_00055	46
19.7 Specification Item SWS_HM_00056	49
19.8 Specification Item SWS_HM_00057	52
19.9 Specification Item SWS_HM_00058	54
19.10 Specification Item SWS_HM_00059	57
19.11 Specification Item SWS_HM_00060	60
19.12 Specification Item SWS_HM_00062	62
19.13 Specification Item SWS_HM_00063	65
19.14 Specification Item SWS_HM_00064	67
19.15 Specification Item SWS_HM_00065	70
19.16 Specification Item SWS_HM_00066	73
19.17 Specification Item SWS_HM_00067	76
19.18 Specification Item SWS_HM_00068	78
19.19 Specification Item SWS_HM_00069	81
19.20 Specification Item SWS_HM_00070	83
19.21 Specification Item SWS_HM_00071	86
19.22 Specification Item SWS_HM_00072	89
19.23 Specification Item SWS_HM_00073	92
19.24 Specification Item SWS_HM_00074	95
19.25 Specification Item SWS_HM_00075	97
19.26 Specification Item SWS_HM_00076	100
19.27 Specification Item SWS_HM_00077	103
19.28 Specification Item SWS_HM_00078	105
19.29 Specification Item SWS_HM_00079	108
19.30 Specification Item SWS_HM_00080	111
19.31 Specification Item SWS_HM_00083	114
19.32 Specification Item SWS_HM_00098	116

19.33	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00115	119
19.34	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00117	122
19.35	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00139	124
19.36	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00182	127
19.37	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00200	130
19.38	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00201	132
19.39	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00202	135
19.40	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00203	138
19.41	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00204	141
19.42	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00205	143
19.43	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00206	146
19.44	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00207	149
19.45	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00208	152
19.46	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00209	154
19.47	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00213	157
19.48	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00214	159
19.49	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00215	162
19.50	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00216	165
19.51	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00217	168
19.52	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00218	170
19.53	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00219	173
19.54	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00220	176
19.55	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00221	178
19.56	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00228	181
19.57	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00229	184
19.58	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00252	187
19.59	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00268	190
19.60	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00269	193
19.61	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00271	196
19.62	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00273	198
19.63	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00285	201
19.64	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00286	204
19.65	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00291	207
19.66	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00294	209
19.67	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00295	212
19.68	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00296	215
19.69	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00297	218
19.70	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00299	220
19.71	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00300	223
19.72	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00315	226
19.73	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00316	229
19.74	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00331	232
19.75	Specification Item	SWS_HM_00354	235

19.76	Specification Item SWS_HM_00387	238
19.77	Specification Item SWS_HM_00440	240
19.78	Specification Item SWS_HM_00441	243
19.79	Specification Item SWS_HM_00447	245
19.80	Specification Item SWS_HM_00448	248
19.81	Specification Item SWS_HM_00449	251
19.82	Specification Item SWS_HM_00450	253
19.83	Specification Item SWS_HM_00451	256
19.84	Specification Item SWS_HM_00455	259
19.85	Specification Item SWS_HM_00456	261
19.86	Specification Item SWS_HM_00457	264
19.87	Specification Item SWS_HM_00458	267
19.88	Specification Item SWS_HM_00460	270
19.89	Specification Item SWS_HM_00461	273
19.90	Specification Item SWS_HM_NA	275

1 PRS_E2EProtocol

1.1 Specification Item PRS_E2E_UC_00466

Trace References:

RS_E2E_08528

Content:

In case of inter-ECU communication over FlexRay, CAN, CAN FD, Ethernet suggested max. data length can be adopted (extended or reduced) if it can be justified by an analysis of a particular use case or network architecture.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86162: [E2E] change supported message length for E2E P2

Problem description:

change supported message length for E2E P2

Agreed solution:

change Table 9.1: E2E maximum data length:

change column heading "Max applicable length including control fields for inter-ECU communication" to "Suggested maximum applicable length including control fields for inter-ECU communication".

[PRS_E2E_UC_00051] -In case of inter-ECU communication over FlexRay, the length of the complete Data (including application data, CRC and counter) protected by E2E Profile 1 should not exceed {color:# ff0000}32 {color}bytes.- don't change

[PRS_E2E_UC_000xx] -In case of inter-ECU communication over FlexRay, the length of the complete Data (including application data, CRC and counter) protected by E2E Profile 2 should not exceed {color:# ff0000}64 {color}bytes.- In case of inter-ECU communication over FlexRay, CAN, CAN FD, Ethernet suggested max. data length can be adopted (extended or reduced) if it can be justified by an analysis of a particular use case or network architecture.

additionally, put a general hint for analysis upfront table with numbers for supported data lengths:

"All length values stated in this section are based on assumptions on suitable hamming distances for specific scenarios, without explicitly listing those as-

sumptions. As such, actual suitable values may differ based on the use case scenarios."

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

2 PRS_LogAndTraceProtocol

3 PRS_NetworkManagementProtocol

4 PRS_SOMEIPProtocol

5 PRS_SOMEIPServiceDiscoveryProtocol

6 PRS_TimeSyncProtocol

7 RS_E2E

7.1 Specification Item RS_E2E_08527

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	The protocols E2E protocol shall provide error detection for communicating safety related data according to ISO 26262 ISO_2d_26262_2d_1_2e_0.
Rationale:	E2E communication protection is state-of-art in automotive safety-related series products.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU.



**Supporting
Material:**

—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requi] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.2 Specification Item RS_E2E_08528

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall provide E2E profiles, where each E2E profile completely defines a particular safety protocol (including header structure, behavior as state machine, error handling etc). Each E2E profile shall be an efficient solution for a particular communication stack used underneath (which are either FlexRay, CAN, CAN FD, LIN or Ethernet), used data length and data frequency, and the required integrity level (see ISO_2d_26262_2d_1_2e_0) of the exchanged data. Note: Each communication stack (e.g. FlexRay) has different BER, which depend on for example:
Rationale:	Interoperability of safety-related communication partners, usage of QM communication communication system.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Profile with 8-bit CRC for CAN, and 16-bit CRC for long FlexRay signals, 32/64-bit CRC for Ethernet.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

- 1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.
- 2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.3 Specification Item RS_E2E_08529

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	Each of the defined E2E profiles shall use an appropriate subset of the following mechanisms:
Rationale:	These are typical mechanisms used by safety protocols, and they can be realized by AUTOSAR.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP





Use Case:	Mechanisms used in an exemplary profile: 4-bit sequence counter, CRC8, Data ID, timeout.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.4 Specification Item RS_E2E_08530

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	Each E2Eprofile defined within the library shall:
Rationale:	A profile is not just a list of mechanisms (e.g CRC8 + sequence number), but the whole logic managing the process. Standardization of header is by far not sufficient. Standardized behaviour is needed to achieve interoperability.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Usually one state machine per profile per communicating partner (sender, receiver, client server) is sufficient. ECU1 and ECU2 communicating. ECU1 has different implementation of E2E Profile than ECU2.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the `_AppliesTo_` fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

- 1) [All Requi] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.
- 2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-639: [E2E] RS_E2E review result

Problem description:

- * Page 6, 3 Acronyms and Abbreviations: "AUTOSAR_RS_AdaptiveE2E" in the sentence should be "AUTOSAR_RS_E2E".
- * Page 8, 5 Requirements tracing: The following do not match. If traceability is correct, I think that expression should be unified.
[RS_Main_01003] Description: "data-oriented communication", [RS_E2E_08540] Rationale: "message oriented communication", [RS_E2E_08541] Rationale: "service oriented communication"
- * Page 9, [RS_E2E_08540] Description: What does "mixed-periodic" mean? I think that explanation is necessary.
- * Page 9, [RS_E2E_08541] Description: "Note: This is currently not supported." Does this sentence need to be deleted?
- * Page 10, [RS_E2E_08542] Description: What does "dynamic restart" mean? I think that explanation is necessary.
- * Page 11, [RS_E2E_08530] Description: What does "unique ID" refer to? Data ID? Profile ID? I think it should be clarified.
- * Page 13, [RS_E2E_08537]: This does not seem to be a requirement for E2E. Also, which SWS is associated with this requirement? I think that SWS is difficult to associate.

Agreed solution:

- 1) 3 Acronyms and Abbreviations: change "AUTOSAR_RS_AdaptiveE2E" to "AUTOSAR_RS_E2E".
- 2) [RS_E2E_08541] delete "Note: This is currently not supported." ; change Use Case to "Service- oriented /client-server communication via SOME/IP methods."
- 3) [RS_E2E_08530] change "unique ID" to "unique Profile ID"

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.5 Specification Item RS_E2E_08533

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	CRC used in each E2E profile shall be different than the CRC used by the underlying communication protocols (FlexRay, CAN, CAN FD, LIN, Ethernet), for which the given profile is supposed to be used with.
Rationale:	Using the same polynomials twice (once in com stack and again in E2E) provides significantly lower joint detection rate than using two different polynomials.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	If profile X is supposed to be used only for FlexRay, then its CRC shall be different than the one of FlexRay.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E

protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.6 Specification Item RS_E2E_08534

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall provide E2E status of a single checked data to the application layerthe error information about the detected communication failure.
Rationale:	Error handling strategies are “application dependent”, and cannot be “a priori defined”.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Enable error-dependent reaction of the application using E2E Protocol.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.7 Specification Item RS_E2E_08539

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	<p>This The E2E mechanism protocol shall support protection of short (ex. 8 bytes) up to and large (4kBex. 4KB, up to 4MB, as application requires), composite data with dynamic-length over TCP/IP and over LIN/CAN/CAN TP/CAN FD/Flex Ray/Ethernet. Note: The max length of protected data depends on the architecture and needs to be evaluated by quantitative analysis within the project using the E2E protocol profile.</p>
Rationale:	Large, composite data need specific protection mechanisms.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU. (to be detailed)
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement.

Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-1672: [E2E] Review findings: mix of "E2E Protocol shall" with "E2E mechanism shall"

Problem description:

Some requirements in their head use "E2E Protocol shall" and use "E2E mechanism shall" in the Description body then others use "E2E Protocol shall" everywhere.

Shall it be "E2E Protocol shall" used everywhere?

Agreed solution:

[All requ] change "E2E mechanism shall" to "E2E Protocol shall"

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-85730: [E2E] Extend the RS_E2E_08539 to fit to Profile 7

Problem description:

As discussed in <https://jira.autosar.org/browse/AR-85634>, we found that RS_E2E_08539 should be updated.

Agreed solution:

Proposed Solution:

Change the Description field of [RS_E2E_08539]
from

< This E2E mechanism shall support protection of short (8 bytes) up to large (4kB), composite data with dynamic-length over TCP/IP and over LIN/CAN/CAN-TP/FlexRay/Ethernet.

to

> The E2E protocol shall support protection of short (ex. 8 bytes) and large (ex. 4KB, up to 4MB, as application requires), composite data with dynamic-length over TCP/IP and over LIN/CAN/CAN TP/CAN FD/FlexRay/Ethernet.

> Note: The max length of protected data depends on the architecture and needs to be evaluated by quantitative analysis within the project using the E2E protocol profile.

Change AppliesTo:
from

< AP

to

> AP, CP

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.8 Specification Item RS_E2E_08540

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010, RS_Main_01002, RS_Main_01003

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	This The E2E mechanism Protocol shall support protected periodic communication. This includes the following periodicity:
Rationale:	E2E mechanism for message oriented message-oriented communication
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requi] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-1672: [E2E] Review findings: mix of "E2E Protocol shall" with "E2E mechanism shall"

Problem description:

Some requirements in their head use "E2E Protocol shall" and use "E2E mechanism shall" in the Description body then others use "E2E Protocol shall" everywhere. Shall it be "E2E Protocol shall" used everywhere?

Agreed solution:

[All requ] change "E2E mechanism shall" to "E2E Protocol shall"

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86774: FO_R1.5.1 Document finalization

Problem description:

Before the FO R1.5.1 will be released the document shall get a Change history and shall get a formal check.

Agreed solution:

Please note: the following changes shall be done when all the changes of your document are clear (for R1.5.1)!

Please insert a change history entry for document finalization at the beginning of the Document Change History table in your document and use the content described below. Please keep the entries of the previous changes untouched in the Change History!

Date	Release	Changed by
Change Description		
2019-03-29 1.5.1	AUTOSAR Release Management	[cd]
# # In case your document has not been changed since last release, please use as Change Description [cd] the entry "No content changes".		
# # In case your document will be released for the first time, please use as Change		

Description [cd] the entry "Initial release".

In case your document has been already released (in another standard), please put as first line of Change Description [cd] the following:

Migration of document to standard Foundation.

If none of the previous 3 cases are valid for your document, describe with up to 4 bullet points the major changes for this release. The description shall contain no references to Bugzilla or JIRA issue numbers. This text will make up the Change History of the to-be-released document.

Please send an overview of the technical deficiencies of chapter "4.1 Limitations" to [rm@autosar.org |mailto:tm-ap@autosar.org]by *2019-03-15 EOD*.

For LaTeX documents, please consider the following steps:

perform "rake CheckDocumentSource"

resolve the issues indicated by the upcoming rake task "CheckDocumentSource"

Thereby follow the hints in [<https://www.autosar.org/wiki/doku.php?id=tools:checklatexsource>]

For Word documents, please check your document once more against this checklist:

[https://svn.autosar.org/repos/work/02_ProjectOrganization/06_Templates/AUTOSAR_Checklist_

Please verify also the PDF file as this is the one which will be released (it is automatically generated right next to the Word source document within four hours).

If not already done, please hide the whole internal document change history.

Please check the PDF file and ensure that nothing of the internal document change history is shown. Especially in case of remaining bullet points, please follow this instruction to get rid of those in your Word document, as well:

[https://www.autosar.org/wiki/doku.php?id=collab_guide:hide_internal_changehistory_man]

For MOD documents only

Please create or adapt the folder "contents". That folder shall include all files which will be used for the Release 19-03 (zip-archive). That folder shall also include the two files: "_disclaimer.txt" and "_readme.txt"

The file "_readme.txt" shall include (besides existing information):

Document Title: \{\{DOC LONG NAME\}

Document Owner: AUTOSAR

Document Responsibility: AUTOSAR

Document Identification Number: \{\{UID\}

Document Status: Final

Part of AUTOSAR Standard: Foundation

Part of AUTOSAR Release: 1.5.1

Date: 2019-03-29

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.9 Specification Item RS_E2E_08541

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010, RS_Main_01002, RS_Main_01003

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	This E2E mechanism Protocol shall support protected non-periodic communication. The following shall be supported:
Rationale:	E2E mechanism for service oriented service-oriented communication
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Service oriented/Service-oriented client-server communication as used in AP architectures (to be detailed). Methods implement client-server communication in AP service interfaces via SOME/IP methods.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requi] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-1672: [E2E] Review findings: mix of "E2E Protocol shall" with "E2E mechanism shall"

Problem description:

Some requirements in their head use "E2E Protocol shall" and use "E2E mechanism shall" in the Description body then others use "E2E Protocol shall" everywhere. Shall it be "E2E Protocol shall" used everywhere?

Agreed solution:

[All requ] change "E2E mechanism shall" to "E2E Protocol shall"

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-639: [E2E] RS_E2E review result

Problem description:

* Page 6, 3 Acronyms and Abbreviations: "AUTOSAR_RS_AdaptiveE2E" in the sentence should be "AUTOSAR_RS_E2E".

* Page 8, 5 Requirements tracing: The following do not match. If traceability is correct, I think that expression should be unified.

[RS_Main_01003] Description: "data-oriented communication", [RS_E2E_08540] Rationale: "message oriented communication", [RS_E2E_08541] Rationale: "service oriented communication"

* Page 9, [RS_E2E_08540] Description: What does "mixed-periodic" mean? I think that explanation is necessary.

* Page 9, [RS_E2E_08541] Description: "Note: This is currently not supported." Does this sentence need to be deleted?

* Page 10, [RS_E2E_08542] Description: What does "dynamic restart" mean? I think that explanation is necessary.

* Page 11, [RS_E2E_08530] Description: What does "unique ID" refer to? Data ID? Profile ID? I think it should be clarified.

* Page 13, [RS_E2E_08537]: This does not seem to be a requirement for E2E. Also, which SWS is associated with this requirement? I think that SWS is difficult to associate.

Agreed solution:

- 1) 3 Acronyms and Abbreviations: change "AUTOSAR_RS_AdaptiveE2E" to "AUTOSAR_RS_E2E".
- 2) [RS_E2E_08541] delete "Note: This is currently not supported." ; change Use Case to "Service- oriented /client-server communication via SOME/IP methods."
- 3) [RS_E2E_08530] change "unique ID" to "unique Profile ID"

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.10 Specification Item RS_E2E_08542

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall support:
Rationale:	Depending on the variance in startup behavior and expected message frequency of the communication partners a later start or over/undersampling needs to be handled by the protection mechanism.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP





Use Case:	(Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to be detailed) prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the _AppliesTo_ fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-1269: [RS_E2E] Missing information

Problem description:

Some requirements state _(to be detailed)_ or have empty fields (e.g. Rationale in RS_E2E_08542). This should not be the case in a released document.

Agreed solution:

add Rational in RS_E2E_08542:

Depending on the variance in startup behavior and expected message frequency of the communication partners a later start or over/undersampling needs to be handled by the protection mechanism.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.11 Specification Item RS_E2E_08543

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall support both static and dynamic length of transmitted data.
Rationale:	Depending on the used protocol static or dynamic length of transmitted data needs to be handled by the protection mechanism.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	E2E protected transmission of a variable length array over SOME/IP.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-1252: [E2E] Review Findings: Minor findings

Problem description:

I classify this as minor since it is specified that this is still a draft version.

Some paragraph are colored with red.

Most of the `_AppliesTo_` fields in the table are wrong. E.g. [RS_E2E_08528] "E2E protocol shall provide different E2E profiles." This should apply to both not only to AP. All of them should be reviewed.

[RS_E2E_08527]. the use Case looks like a carry over from another requirement. Should the Use Case be so specific for such a general requirement?

In some other cases Use Cases are still missing, like [RS_E2E_08542].

in chapter 5 "Requirements tracing" the various main requirements do not get the description generated.

Agreed solution:

1) [All Requ] change "AppliesTo" fields in the table to AP/CP.

2) [RS_E2E_08542] change "Use Cases" field to : Communication between applications of main chassis ECU and power steering ECU to prevent an erroneous steering intervention due to a corruption of the transmitted data.

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.12 Specification Item RS_E2E_08544

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall provide a configurable mechanism to detect timeouts and delayed data.
Rationale:	This mechanism can be used to detect loss and delay of communication data, as requested by ISO 26262.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.13 Specification Item RS_E2E_08545

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E protocol shall provide a detection mechanism for corrupted data





Rationale:	This mechanism can be used to detect corrupted communication data, as requested by ISO 26262.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.14 Specification Item RS_E2E_08546**Trace References:**

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E protocol shall provide a detection mechanism for masquerading or incorrect addressing
Rationale:	This mechanism can be used to detect masquerade or incorrect addressing of communication data, as requested by ISO 26262.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP





Use Case:	
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.15 Specification Item RS_E2E_08547**Trace References:**

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E protocol shall provide a detection mechanism for repetition, insertion or incorrect sequence of data
Rationale:	This mechanism can be used to detect repeated, inserted communication data or data with incorrect sequence, as requested by ISO 26262.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

7.16 Specification Item RS_E2E_08548

Trace References:

RS_Main_00010

Content:

Type:	draft
Description:	E2E Protocol shall optionally provide E2E overall state of the so far checked data to the application layer.
Rationale:	Error handling strategies are “application dependent”, and cannot be “a priori defined”.
AppliesTo:	AP, CP
Use Case:	Enable error-dependent reaction of the application using E2E Protocol.
Supporting Material:	—

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86158: [E2E] RS E2E adopt structure to meet harm review findings

Problem description:

adopt structure to meet document harmonization requirements and review findings

Agreed solution:

see attached file in change mode

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

8 RS_FoundationDebugTraceProfile

9 RS_HealthMonitoring

10 RS_LogAndTrace

11 RS_Main

12 RS_Methodology

13 RS_NetworkManagement

14 RS_ProjectObjectives

15 RS_SOMEIPProtocol

16 RS_SOMEIPServiceDiscoveryProtocol

17 RS_TimeSync

18 SRS_Diagnostics

19 SWS_HealthMonitoring

19.1 Specification Item SWS_HM_00050

Trace References:

RS_HM_09257, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Application shall request HealthStatus using the Health Monitoring interface Report HealthStatus.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood

so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.2 Specification Item SWS_HM_00051

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall perform Arbitration based on incoming HealthStatus requests.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.3 Specification Item SWS_HM_00052

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

All HealthStatus requests are handled in the same way by the Health Monitoring. They are configured by selection of the corresponding HealthStatus condition type in the configuration.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.4 Specification Item SWS_HM_00053

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall perform Arbitration using configured Rules.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [\[^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html\]](#) and [\[^Pro-posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip\]](#)

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.5 Specification Item SWS_HM_00054

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Arbitration Rules shall be configurable using the module configuration parameters.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.6 Specification Item SWS_HM_00055

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring is not allowed to use results of previous Arbitration Rule evaluations as input for the LogicalExpression.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood

so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.7 Specification Item SWS_HM_00056

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the container HealthStatusInitValue does not exist or the HealthChannel does not already have an initial value, the Health Monitoring shall treat the corresponding Health Status Condition as undefined and not use it for Arbitration until the corresponding Health Channel has been updated for the first time.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[^T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.8 Specification Item SWS_HM_00057

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring is not required to store or react on any Platform module specific return values on its performed ActionItems.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.9 Specification Item SWS_HM_00058

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall contain a single ActionList or no ActionList, if Rule evaluates to True.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):
See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.10 Specification Item SWS_HM_00059

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall contain a single ActionList or no ActionList, if Rule evaluates to False.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -
[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -
Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input
line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]
Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and

adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.11 Specification Item SWS_HM_00060

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring evaluates its Rules in the context of the Health Monitoring interface ReportHealthStatus.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic

Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.12 Specification Item SWS_HM_00062

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

For each Rule of the Arbitration, Health Monitoring shall be able to execute different Action List based on if the Rule evaluates to True or False.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.13 Specification Item SWS_HM_00063

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The ActionList associated with Rules evaluated in the context of the Health Monitoring interface ReportHealthStatus shall be executed by Health Monitoring synchronously. Care must be taken that it is not blocking the Health Monitoring for too long.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AU-

TOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.14 Specification Item SWS_HM_00064

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If a True ActionList is configured for triggered execution (triggeredOnChange), the Health Monitoring shall only execute it when the evaluation of the corresponding Rule changes from False to True.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AU-

TOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.15 Specification Item SWS_HM_00065

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If a False ActionList is configured for triggered execution (triggeredOnChange), the Health Monitoring shall only execute it when the evaluation of the corresponding Rule changes from True to False.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module de-

scription. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.16 Specification Item SWS_HM_00066

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If a True ActionList is configured for conditional execution (triggeredOnEvaluation), the Health Monitoring shall execute it every time the corresponding Rule is evaluated to True.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[^T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input

line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM -> references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.17 Specification Item SWS_HM_00067

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, RS_HM_09249

Content:

If a False ActionList is configured for conditional execution (triggeredOnEvaluation), the Health Monitoring shall execute it every time the corresponding Rule is evaluated to False.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.
- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.18 Specification Item SWS_HM_00068

Trace References:

RS_HM_09159, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall be able to execute the predefined ActionItem defined by configuration container ActionItem.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [\[^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html\]](#) and [\[^Pro-posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip\]](#)

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.19 Specification Item SWS_HM_00069

Trace References:

RS_HM_09159, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall execute a standard ActionItem mentioned below to recover from the failure.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posar_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.20 Specification Item SWS_HM_00070

Trace References:

RS_HM_09251, RS_HM_09250, RS_HM_09249

Content:

In Adaptive Platform the Health Monitoring shall invoke the standard interface defined in Execution Management or State Management module to Restart an Application or to request changing machine state, function group state or application state.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.21 Specification Item SWS_HM_00071

Trace References:

RS_HM_09251, RS_HM_09249

Content:

In Classic Platform the Health Monitoring shall invoke the API defined in Basic Software Mode Manager module to request restart/shutdown an application.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.22 Specification Item SWS_HM_00072

Trace References:

RS_HM_09169, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall make use of a project specific driver interface or Hypervisor interface to reset the system, based on the complexity of the system.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood

so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.23 Specification Item SWS_HM_00073**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09244, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall use appropriate interface to periodically refresh the watchdog to prevent a watchdog reset.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input

line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.24 Specification Item SWS_HM_00074

Trace References:

RS_HM_09125, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall examine an Alive Counter by checking if it is within the allowed tolerance (Expected - Min Margin; Expected + Max Margin) (see ExpectedAlive Indications, MinMargin, MaxMargin).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.25 Specification Item SWS_HM_00075**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09244, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

When the Health Monitoring fails to refresh the watchdog, this automatically shall cause a watchdog reset (after the time needed to refresh the hardware watchdog elapse).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.26 Specification Item SWS_HM_00076

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_OK, the Local Supervision Status of at least one Supervised Entity is LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED, and no SupervisedEntity is in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED(see [Transition \(2\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and

adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.27 Specification Item SWS_HM_00077

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Supervision Tolerance is configured to a value larger than zero (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED(see [Transition \(7\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.28 Specification Item SWS_HM_00078

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_OK and the Local Supervision Status of all Supervised Entity are either LOCAL_STATATUS_OK or LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED then the Health Monitoring shall keep the Global Supervision Status GLOBAL_STATUS_OK(see [Transitions\(1\)](#) in [Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.29 Specification Item SWS_HM_00079

Trace References:

RS_HM_09159, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall invoke the configured notification mechanism to notify the Safety application to take an appropriate action.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rething

about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-positional_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.30 Specification Item SWS_HM_00080

Trace References:

RS_HM_09255, RS_HM_09249

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall act according to what is stated in Table

RuleInitState	ActionListExecution	Rule evaluated to "true"	Rule evaluated to "false"
undefined	triggeredOnChange	Execute "true" action	Execute "false" action
true	triggeredOnChange	Do nothing	Execute "false" action
false	triggeredOnChange	Execute "true" action	Do nothing
undefined	triggeredOnCondition	Execute "true" action	Execute "false" action
true	triggeredOnCondition	Execute "true" action	Execute "false" action
false	triggeredOnCondition	Execute "true" action	Execute "false" action

Table 19.1: Usage of the RuleInitState configuration parameter

when a Rule is evaluated for the first time after initialization.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described

more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.31 Specification Item SWS_HM_00083

Trace References:

RS_HM_09125, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall not perform the examination of the Alive Counter of a Check-point if no corresponding Alive Supervision (AliveSupervision) is defined in the current Supervision Mode.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.32 Specification Item SWS_HM_00098

Trace References:

RS_HM_09125, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall perform for each Alive Supervision (AliveSupervision) configured in the active Mode, the examination of the Alive Counter of each Checkpoint of the SupervisedEntity. The examination shall be done at the period AliveReferenceCycle of the corresponding Alive Supervision (AliveSupervision).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.33 Specification Item SWS_HM_00115

Trace References:

RS_HM_09125, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Health Monitoring detects a deviation between the counted Alive Indications and the expected amount of alive indications (including tolerance margins), for any Checkpoint of a SupervisedEntity, then Alive Supervision at this AliveReferenceCycle for this Supervised Entity shall be defined as incorrect. Otherwise, it shall be defined as correct.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Au-

tosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.34 Specification Item SWS_HM_00117

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Supervision Tolerance is configured to zero (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED(see [Transition \(8\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.35 Specification Item SWS_HM_00139

Trace References:

RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If changing the supervision mode fails, the Health Monitoring shall assume a global supervision failure and set the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED.
(see Transition (12) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus)

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.36 Specification Item SWS_HM_00182

Trace References:

RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the current global status GLOBAL_STATUS_OK or GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED then for each SupervisedEntity that is activated in the new mode, the Health Monitoring shall retain the current state of the SupervisedEntity. Switching to the mode where a SupervisedEntity is deactivated clears also errors that had resulted with the GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED status.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Au-

tosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.37 Specification Item SWS_HM_00200

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall track the Local Supervision Status of each SupervisedEntity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.38 Specification Item SWS_HM_00201

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If all values in three sets of results of Supervision (results of AliveSupervision, results of DeadlineSupervision, results of LogicalSupervision) for the SupervisedEntity are correct and the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_OK, then

the Health Monitoring shall leave the SupervisedEntity in the Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_OK(see [Transition 1 in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application

where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.39 Specification Item SWS_HM_00202

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_OK AND:

1. (At least one result of AliveSupervision of the SupervisedEntity is incorrect and a Failure Tolerance of zero is configured (see configuration parameter FailedSupervisionCyclesTolerance) OR
2. If the result of at least one DeadlineSupervision of the SupervisedEntity or the result of at least one Logical Supervision of the SupervisedEntity is incorrect),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED(see [Transition \(2\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.40 Specification Item SWS_HM_00203

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Supervised Entity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_OK AND:

1. (If the result of at least one AliveSupervision of the SupervisedEntity is incorrect and a Failure Tolerance greater than zero is configured (see configuration parameter FailedSupervisionCyclesTolerance) AND
2. If all the results of DeadlineSupervision of the SupervisedEntity and all results of Logical Supervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED and increment the counter for failed supervision reference cycles(see [Transition \(3\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think

does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.41 Specification Item SWS_HM_00204

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED AND:

1. (If the result of at least one AliveSupervision is incorrect and the counter for failed supervision reference cycles does not exceed the configured Failure Tolerance (see parameter FailedSupervisionCyclesTolerance) AND
2. If all the results of Deadline Supervisions of the SupervisedEntity and all the result of LogicalSupervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall keep the Local Supervision Status in LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED and increment the counter for failed supervision reference cycles(see [Transition \(4\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document

version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:
* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):
See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.42 Specification Item SWS_HM_00205

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED AND:

1. (If all the results of AliveSupervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct and the counter for failed supervision reference cycles equals 1) AND
2. If all the results of Deadline Supervisions of the SupervisedEntity and all the results of Logical Supervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_OK and decrement the counter for failed supervision reference cycles(see [Transition \(5\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-positional_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.43 Specification Item SWS_HM_00206

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED AND:

1. (If at least one result of AliveSupervision is incorrect and the counter for failed supervision reference cycles exceeds the configured Failure Tolerance (see configuration parameter FailedSupervisionCyclesTolerance) OR
2. If at least one result of DeadlineSupervision of the SupervisedEntity or at least one the result of Logical Supervision of the SupervisedEntity is incorrect),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED(see [Transition \(6\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.44 Specification Item SWS_HM_00207

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_OK and there is a switch to a mode which deactivates the SupervisedEntity, then the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED (see [Transition \(7\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.45 Specification Item SWS_HM_00208

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in the Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED, the functions ReportCheckpoint [SWS_HM_00447] and the Health Monitoring shall not perform any Supervision Functions for this Supervised Entity and leave the Local Supervision Status in the state LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED. (see [Transition \(8\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#))

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.
- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.46 Specification Item SWS_HM_00209

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED and there is a switch to a mode in which the SupervisedEntity is active, then the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_OK. (see [Transition \(9\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#))

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [\[^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html\]](#) and [\[^Proposal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip\]](#)

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.47 Specification Item SWS_HM_00213

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall have one Global Supervision Status for a software subsystem.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.48 Specification Item SWS_HM_00214

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, **RS_HM_09249**

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall calculate the Global Supervision Status in every Supervision cycle. The function shall compute the Global Supervision Cycle after it computed every Local Supervision Status.

The cyclic update of Global Supervision Status is necessary to trigger the timely transition from GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED to GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic

Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-positional_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.49 Specification Item SWS_HM_00215

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_OK, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Supervision Tolerance is configured to a value larger than zero (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED(see [Transition \(3\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Proposal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.50 Specification Item SWS_HM_00216

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_OK, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Supervision Tolerance is configured to zero (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED(see [Transition \(4\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and

adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.51 Specification Item SWS_HM_00217

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCALCAL_STATUS_FAILED, and no SupervisedEntity is in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, then the Health Monitoring shall remain in Global Supervision Status GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED. (see [Transition \(5\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#))

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.
- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.52 Specification Item SWS_HM_00218

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED and the Local Supervision Status of all Supervised Entity is either LOCAL_STATUS_OK or LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_OK(see [Transition \(6\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#))

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.53 Specification Item SWS_HM_00219

Trace References:

RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Cycle Counter is less or equal to the configured Expired Supervision Tolerance (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall keep Global Supervision Status GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED and increment the Expired Cycle Counter(see [Transition \(9\) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\ } T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.54 Specification Item SWS_HM_00220**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09163, RS_HM_09249

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, the Local Supervision Status of at least one SupervisedEntity is LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, and the Expired Cycle Counter is larger than the configured Expired Supervision Tolerance (see configuration parameter ExpiredSupervisionCyclesTolerance), then the Health Monitoring shall change the Global Supervision Status to GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED(see Transition (10) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

```
+*rake buildpdf*+
```

```
[ WARN] for details see line 316 -
```

```
[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states
```

```
[ WARN] for details see line 520 -
```

```
Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input  
line 634.
```

```
<use logo.pdf> [41.41]
```

```
Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).
```

```
SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.
```

```
Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.
```

```
logfilter: errors = 0
```

```
logfilter: warnings = 2
```

```
C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health
```


Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AU-

TOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.55 Specification Item SWS_HM_00221

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED, then the Health Monitoring shall remain in Global Supervision Status GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED (see Transition (11) in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module de-

scription. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.56 Specification Item SWS_HM_00228

Trace References:

RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Target Checkpoint is not reached before the maximum limit (MaxDeadline), then the result of DeadlineSupervision for this SupervisedEntity shall be defined as incorrect.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html
https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.57 Specification Item SWS_HM_00229

Trace References:

RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

When a given Source Checkpoint is reached two or more times before the expiration of the maximum limit without reaching the corresponding Target Checkpoint, this shall be considered as an error and the result of the DeadlineSupervision for this SupervisedEntity shall be considered as incorrect.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html
https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.58 Specification Item SWS_HM_00252

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The function ReportCheckpoint shall verify if the reported Checkpoint belonging to a Graph is a correct one by the following checks:

1. If the Graph of the reported Checkpoint is inactive, then:
 - a. If the Checkpoint is an Initial Checkpoint (see LogicalSupervision), then the result of this Logical Supervision within the SupervisedEntity of the reported Checkpoint is correct, otherwise incorrect.
2. Else (i.e. the Graph is active), then:
 - a. If the reported Checkpoint is a successor of the stored Checkpoint within the Graph of the reported Checkpoint (this means there is a Transition with Source and Target), then the result of this Logical Supervision for SupervisedEntity of the re-

ported Checkpoint is correct, otherwise incorrect. The above requirement means that in case of an incorrect transition, the SupervisedEntity that is considered as erroneous is the one that reported the incorrect Checkpoint.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

- * Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AU-

TOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.59 Specification Item SWS_HM_00268

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If Health Monitoring successfully initialized, then for each SupervisedEntity that is referenced from the Initial Supervision Mode (InitialMode) (i.e. each SupervisedEntity that is activated in the initial mode), the Health Monitoring shall set the Local Supervision Status for this SupervisedEntity to LOCAL_STATUS_OK. (see [Transition 10 in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.60 Specification Item SWS_HM_00269

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If Health Monitoring successfully initialized, then for each SupervisedEntity that is not referenced from the Initial Mode (InitialMode), the Health Monitoring shall set the Local Supervision Status for this SupervisedEntity to LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED([see Transition 11 in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.61 Specification Item SWS_HM_00271

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall maintain the activity status of each Graph.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.62 Specification Item SWS_HM_00273

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the function ReportCheckpoint determines that the result of the Logical Supervision for the given Checkpoint is true, and the Checkpoint is the initial one (see LogicalSupervision), then the Graph corresponding to the Checkpoint shall be considered as active.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.63 Specification Item SWS_HM_00285

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Health Monitoring was successfully initialized, the Global Supervision Status shall be set to GLOBAL_STATUS_OK(see [Transition \(13\)](#) in [Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervision Status](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.64 Specification Item SWS_HM_00286

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the Global Supervision Status was GLOBAL_STATUS_OK and the Health Monitoring is deactivated, then the Global Supervision Status shall be set to GLOBAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED(see [Transition \(14\)](#), [\(15\)](#), [\(16\)](#) and [\(17\)](#) in [Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervision Status](#)) .

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of shareing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* tracebility to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.65 Specification Item SWS_HM_00291

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED and there is a switch to a mode in which the SupervisedEntity is Deactivated, then the Health Monitoring shall change the Local Supervision Status to LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED (see Transition (12) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release

17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.66 Specification Item SWS_HM_00294**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the time difference between the Target Checkpoint and the Source Checkpoint is not within the minimum and the maximum limits (MinDeadline and MaxDeadline), then the result of DeadlineSupervision for this SupervisedEntity shall be defined as incorrect. Otherwise, it shall be defined as correct.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.
- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.67 Specification Item SWS_HM_00295

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The function ReportCheckpoint shall identify to which one Graph a reached Checkpoint belongs.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[] T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[^00_Acronyms.tex]
[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.68 Specification Item SWS_HM_00296

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

At the initialization, the Health Monitoring shall consider each Graph as inactive.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described

more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [\[^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html\]](#) and [\[^Proposals_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip\]](#)

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.69 Specification Item SWS_HM_00297

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

For any reported Checkpoint that does not belong to any Graph, the function Report Checkpoint shall ignore it and not update the result of the Logical Supervision for the SupervisedEntity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.70 Specification Item SWS_HM_00299

Trace References:

RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

For any reported Checkpoint that is neither a Source Checkpoint nor a Target Checkpoint, the function ReportCheckpoint shall ignore this Checkpoint and not update the result of the Deadline Supervision for the Supervised Entity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.71 Specification Item SWS_HM_00300

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09163, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the SupervisedEntity was in Local Supervision Status LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED AND:

1. (If all the results of AliveSupervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct and the counter for failed supervision reference cycles is > 1) AND
2. If all the result of DeadlineSupervision of the SupervisedEntity and all the result of Logical Supervision of the SupervisedEntity are correct),

THEN the Health Monitoring shall keep the Local Supervision Status in LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED and decrement the counter for failed supervision reference cycles(see [Transition \(4\) in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release

17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.72 Specification Item SWS_HM_00315**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09253, RS_HM_09249

Content:

If the current global status is GLOBAL_STATUS_OK or GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED then for each SupervisedEntity that is deactivated in the new mode, the Health Monitoring shall change the state of the SupervisedEntity to LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED; It shall set its Results of Active, Deadline and Logical Supervision to correct; It shall also clear its failed reference cycle counter to 0.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [\[^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html\]](#) and [\[^Proposal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip\]](#)

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.73 Specification Item SWS_HM_00316

Trace References:

RS_HM_09253, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

If the current global status is not GLOBAL_STATUS_OK nor GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED then the Health Monitoring shall not perform any actions at the Supervision Mode change.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.74 Specification Item SWS_HM_00331

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09249

Content:

If the result of the Logical Supervision triggered by ReportCheckpoint is correct and the Checkpoint is defined as a final one, then the function ReportCheckpoint shall set Graph as inactive. After a final checkpoint, only initial checkpoints are possible.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.75 Specification Item SWS_HM_00354

Trace References:

RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09249

Content:

When a given Target Checkpoint is reached before the occurrence of the corresponding Source Checkpoint, the function ReportCheckpoint [SWS_HM_00447] shall ignore this Checkpoint and not update the result of the Deadline Supervision for the Supervised Entity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and

adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.76 Specification Item SWS_HM_00387

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Global Supervision Status shall be statically initialized with GLOBAL_STATUS_DE-ACTIVATED (see [Transition \(18\)](#) in [Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus](#)).

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic

Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.77 Specification Item SWS_HM_00440

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall have the global statuses **specified in Figure REF fig_3a_GlobalSupervisionStatus** GLOBAL_STATUS_OK, GLOBAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED, GLOBAL_STATUS_FAILED, GLOBAL_STATUS_EXPIRED, GLOBAL_STATUS_STOPPED.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described

more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.78 Specification Item SWS_HM_00441

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09249

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall have the local statuses defined in Figure REF fig_3a_LocalSupervisionStatusLOCAL_STATUS_OK, LOCAL_STATUS_DEACTIVATED, LOCAL_STATUS_EXPIRED and LOCAL_STATUS_FAILED.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and [^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.79 Specification Item SWS_HM_00447

Trace References:

RS_HM_09254, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to report the current code location, represented by a Checkpoint

```
1
2 ReportCheckpoint (CheckpointID id)
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-positional_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.80 Specification Item SWS_HM_00448

Trace References:

RS_HM_09257, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to report the health status information

```

1
2 ReportHealthStatus(HealthStatusID id, HealthStatus status)

```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.81 Specification Item SWS_HM_00449

Trace References:

RS_HM_09159, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to report the information collected and determined by one Health Monitoring component, so that they can be forwarded to another Health Monitoring component.

```
1
2 ReportHealthMonitoring(HealthMonitoring monitoringData)
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.82 Specification Item SWS_HM_00450

Trace References:

RS_HM_09159, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to trigger a defined error handler, providing the identifier of this error.

```
1
2 TriggerErrorHandler(ErrorID id)
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.83 Specification Item SWS_HM_00451

Trace References:

RS_HM_09244, RS_HM_09245, RS_HM_09246, RS_HM_09247, RS_HM_09248,
RS_HM_09028, RS_HM_09226, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to control the watchdog drivers.

```
1  
2 ControlWatchdog(ControlData control)
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Au-

tosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.84 Specification Item SWS_HM_00455

Trace References:

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to initialize the service.

```
1
2 Init()
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.85 Specification Item SWS_HM_00456**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09222, RS_HM_09125, RS_HM_09235, RS_HM_09255, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to deinitialize the service.

```
1
2 DeInit ()
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[\ } T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\ } Autosar\ } svn\ } work\ } 26_Standards\ } 00_FO_R1\ } 01_Sources\ } Elaboration\ } SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application

where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:
[⁰⁰_Acronyms.tex]
[⁰⁰_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^{Diff}_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^{Pro}-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.86 Specification Item SWS_HM_00457

Trace References:

RS_HM_09237, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to report the Local Status of a Supervised Entity to the application.

```
1
2 GetLocalStatus(LocalStatusType* LocalStatus)
```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html
https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.87 Specification Item SWS_HM_00458

Trace References:

RS_HM_09237, [RS_HM_09249](#)

Content:

Health Monitoring shall provide a method to report the Global Status to which the specified Supervised Entity belongs to the application.

```

1
2 GetGlobalStatus(GlobalStatusType* GlobalStatus)

```

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-86137: PHM Mismatch between FO and AP

Problem description:

Due to several reasons the changes applied to FO could not be released in R1.5.0, so the contents were taken from R1.4.0. This led to some gaps in the functional description for the AP as the AP documents found on the contents in FO.

Agreed solution:

https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20551/diff_FO.html
https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff_SWS.html

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.88 Specification Item SWS_HM_00460**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09242, RS_HM_09249

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall supervise graphs with checkpoints belonging to the same or different Supervised Entity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{\}Autosar\{\}svn\{\}work\{\}26_Standards\{\}00_FO_R1\{\}01_Sources\{\}Elaboration\{\}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

and

[^Pro-

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.89 Specification Item SWS_HM_00461

Trace References:

RS_HM_09243, RS_HM_09249

Content:

The Health Monitoring shall simultaneously supervise graphs of Supervised Entity preempted by other Supervised Entity.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\Autosar\svn\work\26_Standards\00_FO_R1\01_Sources\Elaboration\SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

- * should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

- * as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

- * The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

- * "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, maybe the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

- * I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

- * here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

- * traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

- * several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommened for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html]

posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

and

[^Pro-

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

19.90 Specification Item SWS_HM_NA**Trace References:**

RS_HM_09240, RS_HM_09241

Content:

These requirements are not applicable because of limitations.

CRs affecting this spec item between releases 1.5.0 and 1.5.1:

- CR AR-878: Document review: SWS_HealthManagement, SVN-Ver.: 284201

Problem description:

+*rake buildpdf*+

[WARN] for details see line 316 -

[]\{}T1/phv/m/n/12 Warning: an de-ac-ti-va-tion of WdgM when it is in states

[WARN] for details see line 520 -

Package autosar Warning: Multiple defined target SPRS_Watchdog_00316 on input line 634.

<use logo.pdf> [41.41]

Output written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.pdf (49 pages, 481104 bytes).

SyncTeX written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.synctex.gz.

Transcript written on AUTOSAR_SWS_HealthMonitoring.log.

logfilter: errors = 0

logfilter: warnings = 2

C:\{}Autosar\{}svn\{}work\{}26_Standards\{}00_FO_R1\{}01_Sources\{}Elaboration\{}SWS_Health

Page 1: "Document History:"

* Description for Release 1.2.0 is missing, not clear for which release this document version is planned to be used

Page 5: "Know Limitations"

* should be filled with content or "none"

Page 5: "1 Introduction and functional overview"

* as this is a foundation document it would be nice to know how this document is related to the still existing "AUTOSAR_SWS_WatchdogManager.pdf" in classic Autosar and how this is related to adaptive Autosar.

* The description in this chapter uses only classic Autosar terminology.

Page 7 "1.4 Watchdog Handling"

* "Watchdog Supervision Protocol controls the hardware watchdog." I understood so far that this document contains a protocol description and NOT a module description. Wouldn't such a sentence more show the reality "The Module/Application where the Watchdog Supervision Protocol is implemented, controls the hardware watchdog." ? This is just an example, may be the document owner should rethink about the general style.

Page 7ff "1.5 Error Handling"

* I have the feeling that a "Watchdog Supervision Protocol" should be described more abstract without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hierarchical structure of classic and adaptive Autosar documents, e.g.

classic Autosar: WdgM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

adaptive Autosar: PHM → references this "Watchdog Supervision Protocol"

This document looks actually like a slightly modified SWS WdgM which I think does not cover the foundation use case of sharing this between classic and adaptive Autosar.

Page 11: "5 Dependencies to other modules"

* here is an open "fixme" which mentioned the first time adaptive Autosar features.

Page 11: "6 Requirements Tracing"

* traceability to the "PRS Watchdog and SPRS Watchdog" and NOT to the "AUTOSAR_RS_HealthMonitoring.pdf"

Chapter 7:

* several missing pictures

review stopped here, rework needed, not recommended for the next release
17/10

Agreed solution:

-see attached files:

[^00_Acronyms.tex]

[^00_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [^Diff_SWS_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [^Pro-
posal_SWS_HealthMonitoring_850.zip]

BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1