

<b>Document Title</b>	SWS_HealthMonitoring: Complete Change Documentation 1.5.0 - 1.5.1
<b>Document Owner</b>	AUTOSAR
<b>Document Responsibility</b>	AUTOSAR
<b>Document Identification No</b>	885

  

<b>Document Status</b>	Final
<b>Part of AUTOSAR Standard</b>	Foundation
<b>Part of Standard Release</b>	1.5.1

## Table of Contents

1	SWS_HealthMonitoring	5
1.1	Specification Item SWS_HM_00050	5
1.2	Specification Item SWS_HM_00051	7
1.3	Specification Item SWS_HM_00052	10
1.4	Specification Item SWS_HM_00053	12
1.5	Specification Item SWS_HM_00054	15
1.6	Specification Item SWS_HM_00055	18
1.7	Specification Item SWS_HM_00056	20
1.8	Specification Item SWS_HM_00057	23
1.9	Specification Item SWS_HM_00058	26
1.10	Specification Item SWS_HM_00059	28
1.11	Specification Item SWS_HM_00060	31
1.12	Specification Item SWS_HM_00062	33
1.13	Specification Item SWS_HM_00063	36
1.14	Specification Item SWS_HM_00064	39
1.15	Specification Item SWS_HM_00065	42
1.16	Specification Item SWS_HM_00066	44
1.17	Specification Item SWS_HM_00067	47
1.18	Specification Item SWS_HM_00068	50
1.19	Specification Item SWS_HM_00069	52
1.20	Specification Item SWS_HM_00070	55
1.21	Specification Item SWS_HM_00071	58
1.22	Specification Item SWS_HM_00072	61
1.23	Specification Item SWS_HM_00073	63
1.24	Specification Item SWS_HM_00074	66
1.25	Specification Item SWS_HM_00075	69
1.26	Specification Item SWS_HM_00076	71
1.27	Specification Item SWS_HM_00077	74
1.28	Specification Item SWS_HM_00078	77
1.29	Specification Item SWS_HM_00079	79
1.30	Specification Item SWS_HM_00080	82
1.31	Specification Item SWS_HM_00083	85
1.32	Specification Item SWS_HM_00098	88
1.33	Specification Item SWS_HM_00115	91
1.34	Specification Item SWS_HM_00117	93
1.35	Specification Item SWS_HM_00139	96
1.36	Specification Item SWS_HM_00182	99
1.37	Specification Item SWS_HM_00200	101
1.38	Specification Item SWS_HM_00201	104
1.39	Specification Item SWS_HM_00202	107

1.40	Specification Item SWS_HM_00203	109
1.41	Specification Item SWS_HM_00204	112
1.42	Specification Item SWS_HM_00205	115
1.43	Specification Item SWS_HM_00206	118
1.44	Specification Item SWS_HM_00207	121
1.45	Specification Item SWS_HM_00208	123
1.46	Specification Item SWS_HM_00209	126
1.47	Specification Item SWS_HM_00213	129
1.48	Specification Item SWS_HM_00214	131
1.49	Specification Item SWS_HM_00215	134
1.50	Specification Item SWS_HM_00216	137
1.51	Specification Item SWS_HM_00217	139
1.52	Specification Item SWS_HM_00218	142
1.53	Specification Item SWS_HM_00219	145
1.54	Specification Item SWS_HM_00220	147
1.55	Specification Item SWS_HM_00221	150
1.56	Specification Item SWS_HM_00228	153
1.57	Specification Item SWS_HM_00229	156
1.58	Specification Item SWS_HM_00252	159
1.59	Specification Item SWS_HM_00268	162
1.60	Specification Item SWS_HM_00269	165
1.61	Specification Item SWS_HM_00271	167
1.62	Specification Item SWS_HM_00273	170
1.63	Specification Item SWS_HM_00285	173
1.64	Specification Item SWS_HM_00286	176
1.65	Specification Item SWS_HM_00291	178
1.66	Specification Item SWS_HM_00294	181
1.67	Specification Item SWS_HM_00295	184
1.68	Specification Item SWS_HM_00296	187
1.69	Specification Item SWS_HM_00297	190
1.70	Specification Item SWS_HM_00299	192
1.71	Specification Item SWS_HM_00300	195
1.72	Specification Item SWS_HM_00315	198
1.73	Specification Item SWS_HM_00316	201
1.74	Specification Item SWS_HM_00331	203
1.75	Specification Item SWS_HM_00354	206
1.76	Specification Item SWS_HM_00387	209
1.77	Specification Item SWS_HM_00440	212
1.78	Specification Item SWS_HM_00441	215
1.79	Specification Item SWS_HM_00447	217
1.80	Specification Item SWS_HM_00448	220
1.81	Specification Item SWS_HM_00449	223
1.82	Specification Item SWS_HM_00450	225

1.83	Specification Item SWS_HM_00451	228
1.84	Specification Item SWS_HM_00455	231
1.85	Specification Item SWS_HM_00456	233
1.86	Specification Item SWS_HM_00457	236
1.87	Specification Item SWS_HM_00458	239
1.88	Specification Item SWS_HM_00460	242
1.89	Specification Item SWS_HM_00461	245
1.90	Specification Item SWS_HM_NA	247

# 1 SWS\_HealthMonitoring

## 1.1 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, 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

## 1.2 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, 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

## 1.3 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 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

posar\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

[^Pro-

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.4 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 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

## 1.5 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 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

## 1.6 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, 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.7 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 recommended for the next release  
17/10

**Agreed solution:**

-see attached files:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.8 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]

and

[^Pro-

posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.9 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, 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

## 1.10 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, 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

## 1.11 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

## 1.12 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

## 1.13 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 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

## 1.14 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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 [^Proposal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### **BW-C-Level:**

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.15 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 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

## 1.16 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 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

## 1.17 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 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

## 1.18 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, 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

## 1.19 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, 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

## 1.20 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.21 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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 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 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

## 1.22 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, 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

## 1.23 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 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.24 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, 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

## 1.25 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, 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

## 1.26 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, 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

## 1.27 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

## 1.28 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, 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

## 1.29 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

### 1.30 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 1.1: 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, 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

## 1.31 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, 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

## 1.32 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, 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

### 1.33 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 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

## 1.34 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, 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.35 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 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

## 1.36 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 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

## 1.37 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, 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

## 1.38 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, 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

## 1.39 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, 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

## 1.40 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, 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

## 1.41 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 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

## 1.42 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, 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

### 1.43 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 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



## 1.44 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, 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

## 1.45 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, 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

## 1.46 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, 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



## 1.47 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, 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.48 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, 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

## 1.49 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, 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



## 1.50 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 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

## 1.51 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 LOCAL\_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, 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.52 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, 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

## 1.53 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 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

## 1.54 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, 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

## 1.55 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 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]

[^Pro-



**BW-C-Level:**

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

**1.56 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

[^Proposal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

**BW-C-Level:**

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

**1.57 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/20551/diff_FO.html)[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.58 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 reported 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.59 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, 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

## 1.60 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, 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

## 1.61 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, may be the docuemnet 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 abstarct without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hirachical 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.62 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.63 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, 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

## 1.64 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, 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

## 1.65 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, 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

## 1.66 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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 docuemnet 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 abstarct without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hirachical 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

## 1.67 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):  
See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.68 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 -

[<sup>\}</sup>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

## 1.69 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 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

## 1.70 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/20551/diff_FO.html)

[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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 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

## 1.71 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 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

## 1.72 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]

[^Pro-



#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.73 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 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

## 1.74 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.75 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.76 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, 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

## 1.77 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 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

**1.78 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\_LocalSupervisionStatus [LOCAL\\_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] and [^Pro-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.79 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-

posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.80 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, 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

## 1.81 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] and [^Pro-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.82 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

## 1.83 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, 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

## 1.84 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 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 [\[^Proposals\\_SWS\\_HealthMonitoring\\_850.zip\]](#)

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.85 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:  
[<sup>00</sup>\_Acronyms.tex]  
[<sup>00</sup>\_FunctionalSpecification.tex]

See also SVN commit 349170.-

New proposal (2019-02-08):

See [<sup>Diff</sup>\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring01.html] and [<sup>Pro</sup>-  
posal\_SWS\_HealthMonitoring\_850.zip]

#### BW-C-Level:

Application	Specification	Bus
1	1	1

## 1.86 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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 docuemnet 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 abstarct without the usage of classic Autosar terms.

In general I would expect a hirachical 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

## 1.87 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/20551/diff_FO.html)  
[https://jira.autosar.org/secure/attachment/20552/diff\\_SWS.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

## 1.88 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, 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

## 1.89 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

**1.90 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