



Collaborative Large-scale Integrating Project

# OPENCROSS

**Open Platform for Evolutionary Certification Of  
Safety-critical Systems**

## Test results and recommendations D3.4



<b>Work Package:</b>	WP3: Platform Integration and Validation
<b>Dissemination level:</b>	PU
<b>Status:</b>	Final
<b>Date:</b>	29 March 2015
<b>Responsible partner:</b>	ALTREONIC
<b>Contact information:</b>	eric.verhulst@altreonic.com

### PROPRIETARY RIGHTS STATEMENT

This document contains information, which is proprietary to the OPENCROSS Consortium. Neither this document nor the information contained herein shall be used, duplicated or communicated by any means to any third party, in whole or in parts, except with prior written consent of the OPENCROSS consortium.

---

## Contributors

Names	Organisation
Andrea Critelli, Giorgio Tagliaferri	RINA Services SpA
Jérôme Lambourg	AdaCore
Adrian Larkham	ATEGO UK
Jan Mauersberger	ikv++ technologies ag
Jean-Pierre Guichenez	Inspearit (before DNV ITGS)
Leonel Braga, Eric Verhulst	ALTREONIC

## Document History

Version	Date	Remarks
V.0.1	2014-10-16	ToC
V.0.2	2014-10-16	First draft version
V.0.3	2014-12-08	Update
V.0.4	2014-12-08	Update
V.0.9	2014-12-15	Release for review
V.1.0	2014-12-16	Final release
V1.1	2015-03-18	Update in the context of campaign 3
V1.2	2015-03-29	Release for review PB
V2.0	2015-03-29	Final

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abbreviations</b> .....		<b>5</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>7</b>
	2.1 Scope and Purpose .....	7
	2.2 Relationship with other Deliverables: .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Test results</b> .....	<b>8</b>
	3.1 OPENCROSS Platform Test Results .....	8
	3.2 Evidence API Test Results .....	9
	3.3 Process API Test Results .....	9
	3.3.1 Integration testing results with Process Director.....	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis of the results</b> .....	<b>10</b>
	4.1 OPENCROSS Platform .....	10
	4.2 Evidence API .....	10
	4.3 Process API.....	11
<b>5</b>	<b>Recommendations</b> .....	<b>12</b>
	5.1 OPENCROSS Platform .....	12
	5.2 Evidence API .....	12
	5.3 Process API.....	13
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>References</b> .....	<b>15</b>
	<b>Appendix A. Tests results list</b> .....	<b>16</b>
	7.1 Campaign 1 .....	16
	7.2 Campaign 2 .....	47
	7.3 Campaign 3 .....	56
	7.3.1 Opencoss Platform.....	56
	7.3.2 Evidence API .....	107
	7.3.3 Process API.....	109

## List of Tables

Table 1 Test campaigns on the OPENCROSS prototypes .....	8
Table 2 Results of the test campaigns.....	8
Table 3 Campaign 3 test results acc. to test origin.....	9

## Abbreviations

API	Application programming interface
ATC	Acceptance Test Case
CCL	Common Certification Language
CRUD	Create/Read/Update/Delete
DAO	Data Access Object
DX.Y	OPENCROSS deliverable X.Y
DoW	Description of Work
EMF	Eclipse Modeling Framework
FMEA	Failure Mode and Effects Analysis
FTA	Fault tree analysis
GUI	Graphical User Interface
HTTP	Hypertext Transfer Protocol
JSON	JavaScript Object Notation
OC	OPENCROSS
OSLC	Open Services for Lifecycle Collaboration
PHA	Process_Hazard_Analysis
QM	The Qualifying Machine
REST	Representational State Transfer
SVN	Subversion
TX.Y	OPENCROSS task X.Y
V&V	Verification and Validation
WP	OPENCROSS Work Package

## **1 Executive Summary**

This document (D3.4) is the fourth deliverable of WP3. This WP aims to integrate the platform building blocks developed in WP4, 5, 6, and 7, and to validate the developed concepts and technologies in test conditions. The goal of D3.4 is to present the results of the tests that were defined and executed in D3.3.

This deliverable summarizes the results of the test campaigns that were executed. An analysis of the results is provided, together with some recommendations concerning the implementation state of the OPENCROSS platform.

This document concerns the OPENCROSS prototype version 1, 2, and 3.

## **2 Introduction**

### **2.1 Scope and Purpose**

see D3.3

### **2.2 Relationship with other Deliverables:**

see D3.3

### 3 Test results

#### 3.1 OPENCROSS Platform Test Results

Three test campaigns were executed on the OPENCROSS prototypes:

Table 1 Test campaigns on the OPENCROSS prototypes

Campaign	Release	Objective
Campaign 1	Proto 2.0	To check implementation vs User Manual & CCL coverage
Campaign 2	Proto 2.1	To check 2.0 tickets corrections + applicable tests derived from D3.2
Campaign 3	Proto 3	To do some regression tests on 2.0 & check new 3.0 functionalities

Tests results for these campaigns are:

Table 2 Results of the test campaigns

Test results	Campaign 1	Campaign 2	Campaign 3
passed	93	22	239
passed with...	33	8	33
failed	99	21	63
inconclusive	9	2	11
total	234	53	346
tickets	112	22	90
CCL update requests	4		4

Status “passed with”: functionality that works but could be enhanced

Status “inconclusive”: not able to completely run the test

For each “passed with...” or “failed” status a ticket or “CCL updt request” is generated:

- A ticket corresponds to a problem identified in the software (component = GUI-EMF) or in the user manual (component = UserManual).
- A “CCL updt request” corresponds to a question / problem arising into the CCL model.

In case of discrepancy between the software and the CCL model as defined into D4.4, a ticket is generated (component = GUI-EMF), meaning that we make the assumption that D4.4 is the right reference. Afterwards it may lead to the creation of a “CCL updt request” if the software was more up to date than the reference document.

We have the following relationship:

$$\text{nb of "tickets"} + \text{nb of "CCL updt request"} \leq \text{nb of "passed with..."} + \text{nb of "failed"} \text{ tests}$$

This is because 2 “failed” or 2 “passed with...” tests may lead to the same ticket / CCL updt request.

Several tests were not reproducible, and disappeared when re-initializing the database.

The results of tests run in Campaign 2, depending on the test origin, are the following:

Table 3 Campaign 2 test results acc. to test origin

Campaign2 tests source	Results
2 passed in Camp1	2 failed
32 failed in Camp1 & corrected	12 failed + 7 passed with... + 1 inconcl + 12 passed
3 passed with... in Camp1 & corrected	2 failed + 1 passed with...
16 new	5 failed + 10 passed + 1 inconcl



The results of tests run in Campaign 3, depending on the test origin, are the following:

Table 3 Campaign 3 test results acc. to test origin

Campaign3 tests source	Nb of tests	Results
Non Regression tests	151	105 passed + 14 passed with + 26 failed + 6 inconcl
New functionalities tests	195	134 passed + 19 passed with + 37 failed + 5 inconcl

### 3.2 Evidence API Test Results

Three kinds of test cases were defined and executed against the evidence test API. The first (and for this kind of implementation most important) consist of a set of automated Junit based integration tests. The tests are based on mockups for the server side to concentrate on the pure API and management part with consistent, reliable, and repeatable test environment. The third prototype passed all tests after a second and third iteration.

A second set of manual tests were defined and executed against a real (or a vanilla) server using a simple browser based test infrastructure to simulate single API calls. Due to the complexity of REST APIs and the need for multiple – if not hundreds of calls – a real life scenario these test cases are limited in expressing robustness but very useful to test the API itself with different parameters (e.g. Request content type, method, unexpected body content etc.) The initial test execution revealed a few problems and unexpected results (see D3.3). All major issues were fixed and passed the second iteration.

At last the proof of concept integration with medina analyse was tested as the proof for a real tool integration. Simple test scenarios as “first time artefact export”, “update export” as well as single vs. multiple artefacts export were tested.

See page 107 for the complete list of results regarding the tests to the evidence API.

### 3.3 Process API Test Results

The Process API test campaign only concerned prototype 3. Two test suite have been implemented : the functional test suite is a semi-manual test suite, expecting manual verifications, while the robustness test suite is an automated test suite checking automatically the output of the OPENCROSS platform according to some inputs.

**proc-api-functional:** 9/9 PASSED

**proc-api-robustness:** 28/28 PASSED

#### 3.3.1 Integration testing results with Process Director

1. **importProcessDefinition :**
  - EN 50126-1 : PASSED
  - EN 50128 : PASSED
  - Railway GATC France : PASSED
2. **importProjectDefinition :**
  - Railway GATC France : PASSED
3. **importProjectExecution :**
  - Railway GATC France : PASSED

## 4 Analysis of the results

### 4.1 OPENCROSS Platform

From these results, we have the following findings:

1. Difficulty to have a consistent and up to date reference to base the tests on (specially for campaigns 1 & 2)

When we found discrepancies between the CCL conceptual model (D4.4) and the software, it appeared that in several cases the D4.4 was not as up to date as the software.

Also D3.2 (integration requirements and test plan) which is the main input document for the tests is based on requirements that are no more up to date, making it difficult to exploit.

2. Some regression from prototype 2.1 vs 2.0

Several tickets found in prototype 2.0 and corrected in prototype 2.1 lead to new tickets. In some cases tests passed in 2.0 failed in 2.1.

3. Few regression from prototype 3 vs 2.1

There was globally few regression between versions 2.1 and 3. Nevertheless we didn't re-run tests that were failed in version 2.0 & 2.1 when the tickets were not corrected, so we were not able to do a complete check.

4. Some required features not completely implemented in prototype 3

The platform, in the final stage of development, does not implement some features that are required in some tests defined in D3.2 (integration requirements and test plan). In some cases the requirements of the test are not met because the relative feature is simply not implemented, in other cases the requirements are met but not with the method defined in the test, determining a difference between the test definition and actual implementation.

Observations on the testing carried out on the argumentation, contracts and vocabulary tooling developed in WP5 are as follows:

- The data provided by the case studies made it very difficult to develop a fully convincing compositional argument, since the case study providers in general provided data relating to a particular component or functionality in isolation, with information about the higher-level integration redacted. Although the tool functionality is adequately demonstrated, it has not been possible to validate certain aspects of the approach convincingly. In particular, this is true of the compositional argument patterns developed in WP5 (D5.3), which are not carried through into the case study argumentation.
- Although WP5 has developed tooling for the automated instantiation of argument patterns from CCL models (see D5.6), it has not been decided to carry this functionality forward into the final Platform. This is partly because – as discussed above – the patterns have not been validated, and also because the assumptions relating to the use of CCL models which were the foundation of this work do not fully reflect recognized usage of the CCL.
- Although the vocabulary support functionality (requirements 01\_01 – 01\_05) has been implemented and validated, the tooling is not fully integrated with the third prototype of the OPENCROSS Platform. Specifically, the support for structured expressions and user support for the instantiation of claim types was only implemented for a file-based system. As such, it has been validated only in a standalone context, although the vocabulary editor has been validated in a CDO-based vocabulary project.

### 4.2 Evidence API

The automated and manual API tests revealed some problems with the API which could be fixed in a second and third iteration. The tool integration tests showed that the API needs some future extensions to support more scenarios and cases (as other type of query interfaces) but also revealed that some management API calls were required to address the technical infrastructure of the OC server (e.g. the hierarchical organization of projects and resources). Since these

management interfaces are rather generic they are probably not best situated in the evidence API and may migrated to other general OC API in the future.

### **4.3 Process API**

The Process API looks fully implemented. No known bugs to report.

## 5 Recommendations

### 5.1 OPENCROSS Platform

Following these first results and findings, we would make the following recommendations:

1. Correct bugs in priority with respect to new developments.

This is because, the cost of a bug correction and tests increases with time. Also to correct a bug may help to avoid a similar one in a new development.

2. Secure input fields in the interface.

Several input fields are not restricted for validity: for example time field, Boolean fields (true, false entered as string), nor checked for validity / coherency: for example in an Artefact OwnedRel, the source can be any Artefact. More generally all constraints should be implemented in order to avoid erroneous input data.

3. Improve the support for the exchange of information in an assessment process between the manufacturer and one or different assessors.

One of main objective of the platform is to give support to the main actors during the assessment process. As output of the present testing activities, some required functionalities are correctly implemented but it would be worthwhile to improve some other features:

- History traceability, in order to facilitate the visualisation and the storage of the exchange of information between different actors (e.g. the manufacturers and different assessors). This is normally a complex process which extends along the time and which has to be well managed during the assessment phase.
- Accounts management, in order to allow different users to log in before doing any action in the OPENCROSS platform. This could be useful to trace every action performed during the exchange of information.

4. Implement a Glossary in the interface.

In addition to the User Manual (referenced to or included in) it would also be very helpful to have a glossary, listing the CCL entities and other important information useful to understand and use the tool.

5. Define a “How to use” guide for OPENCROSS.

In complement to the existing User Manual that is mandatory, it would be very useful to have a guide to explain how to use OPENCROSS. This guide would typically inherit from the 3 use cases, and give a global and concrete view of use of the tool.

6. Incorporate full vocabulary support and evidence assessment in the OPENCROSS Platform

As discussed in Section 4.1 above, time and political constraints on the project have led to the creation of some tooling which complements the OPENCROSS Platform – and is fully in keeping with the approach - but which is not fully integrated with it. In any future attempt to productize the OPENCROSS tooling, these functionalities should be fully integrated in the OPENCROSS tooling.

### 5.2 Evidence API

The evidence API is sufficient for proof of concept integrations but lacks a number of improvements and management parts for a full-fledged tool integration scenario. The evidence API is rather close to the OSLC Assets API specification any may be further “trimmed” towards that standard in the future, befitting from management, authentication and authorization stuff already covered by OSLC and not yet considered at all in OC APIs.

### **5.3 Process API**

N/a

## **6 Conclusions**

This report reflects the results of testing and validation on the OPENCROSS prototype 3. Several issues were detected and reported as well as recommendations given for improvement.

## 7 References

- [1] Book: “Better Embedded System Software”, P. Koopman, Carnegie Melon University.

## Appendix A. Tests results list

Note: when the test status is “passed with...” or “failed”, the Ticket column contains either

- a ticket Id, with the link to the wiki tickets repository
- a CCL updt request id, with the link to the file CCL\_METAMODEL\_UPDATE\_REQUESTS AND COMMENTS.xlsx in the wiki repository

### 7.1 Campaign 1

Ref doc	Functionality	Chapter / Req	Test name	Execution results1	Status1	Ticket id1
				No glossary inside the User Manual.	Passed with...	<a href="#">53</a>
User Manual	Installation	3.1.1	Instal PostgreSQL DB on Windows	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Installation	3.1.1	Instal PostgreSQL DB on Linux	No chapter available	Failed	<a href="#">31</a>
User Manual	Installation	3.1.2	Create Opencoss DB	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Installation	3.1.3	Instal OPENCROSS server distribution	The server page is empty unlike fig 2 => need to load the DB used for the user manual.	Passed	
User Manual	Installation	3.2	Instal OPENCROSS platform client	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Installation	3.3	Configure connection settings with CDO repository	The view is not the same as in fig 7. Cf test 4.	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.1	Create a Reference Framework model	OK	Failed	<a href="#">34</a>
User Manual			Delete the Folder	After right click on the folder and selection of “Remove” Eclipse doesn’t answer any more : I have to kill the Eclipse process and restart it	Failed	<a href="#">32</a>



User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.1	Add a valid concept to the diagram	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">33</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.1	Add an invalid concept to the diagram	Need to change modelling rule : this can't be made by the user but only by the developer (cf mail AL 11/9/14)	Inconclusive	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.2	Add a valid link between concepts	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.2	Add an invalid link between concepts	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3	Edit properties without object selected	Properties are set with then name "Undefined", and 3 titles: Base, Rulers & Grid, Appearance	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3	Edit properties with an object selected	Properties are set with the name of the object selected and associated titles.	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Edit "To be xxx" properties	For the "To be xxx" properties like "To be instantiated", "To be supported"... the choice being false/true, using an enumerate would be more user friendly than editing a text.	Passed with...	<a href="#">46</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3	Edit properties with a connection selected	Properties are set with the name "Undefined" and only 1 title : appearance.	Passed with...	<a href="#">35</a>

User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete a link within properties	The diagram is not refreshed. To see the result on the diagram it has to be saved, closed and re-open. The behavior is not the same if we change name property for example : in that case the refreshing of the diagram is done.	Failed	<a href="#">36</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.4	Create multi-diagrams from a Reference Framework model	The choice "Delete from Diagram" doesn't exist for the object "Ref Activity". For the "Ref Role" and "Ref Artefact" the choice exists but is unselectable. For a connection the choice exists and is selectable.	Failed	<a href="#">37</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.4	Create multi-diagrams from a Reference Framework model	Act 1 and Art 1 remain on diag 2 as not deleted. If we save sometimes the Eclipse craches sometimes the Act 1 and Art 1 are deleted from diag 1 but not from diag 2.	Failed	<a href="#">60</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a diagram	In several cases (not reproducible) Eclipse doesn't answer anymore. We have to kill the application.	Failed	<a href="#">38</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a folder	In several cases (not reproducible) Eclipse doesn't answer anymore. We have to kill the application.	Failed	<a href="#">39</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Editing a refframework	An error is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">59</a>

User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Opening a refframework	Sometimes it works, sometimes : "Resource Set > CDResource[TRANSIENT]" is displayed instead.	Failed	<a href="#">63</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.5	Use of a non graphical editor	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.3.1	Create an Equivalence Map using the editor	The result is not as described in the User Manual as the "RefFramework.mapping" is missing : we have to create it before.	Failed	<a href="#">34</a>
User Manual		4.3.1	Create an Equivalence Map using the editor	The left zone is empty.	Failed	<a href="#">40</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.3.2	Create an Equivalence Map using a tailored functionality	There is nothing in the Equivalence Map to select.	Inconclusive	
User Manual			Adding an Equivalence Map into an activity	A map line is created with nothing except "]" inside Activities column.	Failed	<a href="#">61</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.4	Create an applicability table	Applicability not displayed in the properties view.	Failed	<a href="#">62</a>

User Manual	Assurance Project Management	5.1	Create an Assurance Project and Baseline	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Assurance Project Management	5.2	Create a new Project Baseline	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Assurance Project Management	5.3	Edit a Project Baseline	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Assurance Project Management	5.4.1	Edit a Compliance Map using the editor	Example given in the User Manual (or equivalent) not available (nothing selectable in the "To" list).	Inconclusive	
User Manual	Assurance Project Management	5.4.2	Edit a Compliance Map using a tailored functionality	Example given in the User Manual (or equivalent) not available (nothing selectable in the "To" list).	Inconclusive	
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.2.1	Creating a New Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.2.2	Opening a Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1	Editing a Diagram	The diagram is not refreshed. Furthermore if you save the diagram, close it and try to re-open it, an error message appears.	Failed	<a href="#">41</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1	Editing an Argumentation	You can put any string in this field. As it is supposed to be the place where is stored the argumentation diagram file, I suggest to use a browser to locate the file.	Passed with...	<a href="#">42</a>

User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1	Editing an argumentation diagram : deleting from diagram	The choice "Delete from Diagram" exist for all objects(as well as connections) but is unselectable.	Failed	<a href="#">43</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1.1	Copying and Pasting an Element	Copy is not selectable	Failed	<a href="#">45</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1.2	Deleting a Node or a Link	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">44</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.2	Create multi-diagrams from an Argumentation model	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.1	Creating a New Pattern Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.2	Editing a Pattern Diagram	The user manual mention the fact that only Patterns arg diagram allow this. This is not the case as Modules arg diagram allow also the Multiextension.	Failed	<a href="#">47</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.3	Adding Elements from Patterns to a Diagram (instantiating a Pattern)	When we select the pattern diagram from the Template view the drag & drop doesn't work.	Failed	<a href="#">48</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.4	Creating a New Module Diagram	The user manual talks about pattern diagram instead of module diagram	Failed	<a href="#">49</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.6	Adding Elements from Modules to a Diagram (instantiating a Module)	It is possible to instantiate the argumentation module in an argumentation diagram. But double clicking on the argumentation module doesn't open another diagram.	Failed	<a href="#">50</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.4	Connecting a Diagram to Artefacts	No Artefact available when pressing "+" in the Artefact field of the Base property of an InformationElementCitation	Failed	<a href="#">65</a>

User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.4	Printing a Diagram	OK	Passed
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.5.1	Creating a contract	OK	Passed with... <a href="#">51</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.5.1	Creating a contract	When double clicking on the upper tab of the Agreement figure, the content of the agreements is not shown	Failed <a href="#">52</a>
User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.5.2	Editing a contract		Inconclusive
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.1	Define Artefact Repository Preferences	Under Windows->Preferences->Opencross->Artefact Repository Preferences : 1) Checkbox "use local repository" should trigger the edition of the fields (SVN local... / SVN remote... : editable / not editable). 2) "SVN local ..." has not the foreseen effect : When you edit a resource, click on location : it doesn't open the SVN repos browser but the window explorer 3) "SVN remote..." does the same	Failed <a href="#">57</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.2.1	Add an artefact definition	OK	Passed
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.2.2	Delete Artefact Definition	OK	Passed
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.3.1	Add an artefact	OK	Passed
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.3.2	Delete Artefact	OK	Passed
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.4.1	Add an artefact resource to an artefact	See test with same ticket	Failed <a href="#">57</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.4.2	Delete an artefact resource	OK	Passed
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.5	Artefact Property Value	It is not possible to add a property : the "Finish" button is not clickable and an error is displayed : see attached file.	Failed <a href="#">58</a>

User Manual	Evidence Management	7.5.1	Add an artefact property value to an artefact	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.5.2	Delete an artefact property value	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.6.1	Add an artefact assurance asset evaluation to an artefact	If you create an Assurance Asset Evaluation as a child of an Artefact you don't have access to it from the property menu.	Passed with...	<a href="#">54</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.6.2	Delete an artefact assurance asset evaluation	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.7.1	Add an artefact assurance asset event to an artefact	Same remark as for Assurance Asset Evaluation	Passed with...	<a href="#">54</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.7.2	Delete an artefact assurance asset event	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management		Creation of Artefact models	When you double click on essai : essai is displayed. Double click on essai3 : essai3 is displayed. But if you double click on essai2 : essai & essai2 are displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">56</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management		Artefact model update	When doing a "Save all" a Java error message is displayed : see associated screen copy.	Failed	<a href="#">55</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.8	Impact analysis	In the AssuranceAssetEvent editing window, the field "Description" doesn't allow to see the whole message (line is cut).	Failed	<a href="#">64</a>
User Manual	Process Assurance Management	8	Process Assurance Management	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Process Assurance Management	8.1	Creating Process Assurance data	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Process Assurance Management	8.2	Deleting Process Assurance Objects	OK	Passed	

User Manual	Properties Management	9	Properties Management	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Properties Management	9.1.1	Add a property	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Properties Management	9.1.2	Delete a property	OK	Passed	
User Manual	OPENCROSS server web interface	10.2	Gap Analysis report - Compliance Assessment and Evidence Evaluation	OK	Passed	
N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Concurrent update of a refframework and a refframework_diagram	Message "Your Resource is in conflict and cannot be committed" is displayed but the (*) has disappeared from the refframework_diagram as if it were saved. Re-doing "Save all" generates the same message again, and the refframework remains with (*). So this is not coherent, as the (*) should stay on the 2 figures : the diagram should not have been saved.	Failed	<a href="#">66</a>
N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Display a diagram containing activities with sub-activities and zoom inside one to see the relationships and linked objects.	There is no possibility to link the "Child" diagram to its "Father" : e.g. by use of "Navigate" or another item to be defined in the contextual menu.	Passed with...	<a href="#">70</a>



N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	Mapping set display	Several GUI enhancements could be provided : - the type field is not fully visible - when you click on "New map" a popup should be open the same way as when you click on "New group". Furthermore if you select a "To" refframework and click on an activity an error message is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">67</a>
N/A	Assurance Project Management	New map in Compliance Map edition	When creating a new map, Eclipse is no more responding.	Failed	<a href="#">68</a>
N/A	Assurance Project Management	Selection of the active baseline for Compliance Map edition	In the case where the 2 refframeworks are in the same resource window, selecting 1 refframework generates the message "Selected baseline not active for the project" even on the active one.	Failed	<a href="#">69</a>
N/A	Evidence Management	Edition of an artefact	"Errors" is displayed in red when we enter any value in the properties of the Artefact.	Failed	<a href="#">71</a>
N/A	Process Assurance Management	Undo command when editing a process.	The "Undo Do Command" has no effect.	Failed	<a href="#">72</a>

N/A	Process Assurance Management		Opening a process model with Process model editor	An error is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">73</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Edition	The "Issued" attribute is not saved. Furthermore if you update only this attribute the "*" doesn't appear and "Save All" is not available as if you didn't do any update.	Failed	<a href="#">104</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Edition (2)	The "Annotations" attribute is not saved. In that case the "*" appears and "Save All" is available as for any update, but the attribute is not restored.	Failed	<a href="#">105</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Edition (3)	If you chose "Cancel", the map is however open.	Failed	<a href="#">106</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : : Edition (4)	Eclipse doesn't launch the popup to ask if you want to save or no before exiting. Re-opening Eclipse, we can see that the attribute has not been saved.	Failed	<a href="#">107</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Ref Activity edition	The popup window list all available techniques from the model and others models loaded as resource. The presentation is not the same than for the other relationships like Role or Produced Artefact where the popup has 2 sheets : one for "model resource" and one for "all resources".	Passed with...	<a href="#">108</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Ref Activity edition (2)	There is no mean to enter any requirement. Nevertheless the table displaying the Applicabilities has a column named "Requirements".	Passed with...	<a href="#">109</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Export	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Rename	The OK button is not selectable after entering a name. The same problem occurs with another resource.	Failed	<a href="#">111</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Delete	Delete generates an error. Furthermore the "Save all" is not available and exiting Eclipse doesn't ask if we want to save. This means that it is not possible to undo a delete as any other update. Afterwards, if we try an import of the file saved before to restore the model, Eclipse doesn't answer anymore.	Failed	<a href="#">112</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Save	No file is created. After exiting from Eclipse and re-open it, the model has disappeared.	Failed	<a href="#">103</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.2	RefActivity : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.2	RefActivity : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.3	RefActivityRel : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.3	RefActivityRel : Edition	In the OwnedRel of a RefActivity A, you can select as source and target any activity : source can be different from A, and target can be outside the current model.	Failed	<a href="#">114</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.4	RefRole : Edition	It is possible to map a role A to itself. Same thing for an Activity, Artefact or Technique.	Failed	<a href="#">115</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.5	RefArtefact : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.5	RefArtefact : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.6	RefArtefactRel : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.6	RefArtefactRel : Edition	OK. Nevertheless it is possible to create a Max multiplicity < Min multiplicity for the Source as well as the Target. An error could be generated in that case.	Passed with...	<a href="#">113</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.7	Property : Structure	1) Manageable Assurance Asset is a SuperClass : not implemented 2) Attributes : attribute not implemented ; dataType, Unit implemented and not described 3) The property class applies only to an Artefact. 2 points : - why not to other elements... - if only Artefact is concerned, it would clarify to call it "ArtefactProperty"	Failed	<a href="#">74</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.7	Property : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.8	RefTechnique : Structure	None in the document / Critic Applic in the tool. Furthermore if we click on "Add" any resource is proposed : there is no filter.	Failed	<a href="#">75</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.8	RefTechnique : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.9	RefRequirement : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.9	RefRequirement : Edition	OK except Annotations of previous test	Failed <a href="#">105</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.10	RefRequirementRel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.10	RefRequirementRel : Edition	You can set source and target as any requirement including outside the current model.	Failed <a href="#">114</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.11	RefCriticalityLevel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.11	RefCriticalityLevel : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.12	RefApplicabilityLevel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.12	RefApplicabilityLevel : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.13	RefCriticalityApplicability : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.13	RefCriticalityApplicability : Edition	OK	Passed

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.14	RefApplicability : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.14	RefApplicability : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.15	RefApplicabilityRel : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.15	RefApplicabilityRel : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.17	RefEquivalenceMap : Structure	The tool has attributes not mentioned in the doc : MapGoup, Type, Justification	Failed	<a href="#">76</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.17	RefEquivalenceMap : Edition	Not possible to do the test (see ticket 40).	Inconclusive	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Structure	Several differences between tool implementation and doc : attributes (created by, responsible, date, version), relationships SubProject, PermissionConfigurations not in the document.	Failed	<a href="#">77</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Base Edition	The "Date" attribute is lost. Furthermore it is possible to select as SubProject the project itself.	Failed	<a href="#">116</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Base Edition (2)	OK (except "Date" see before)	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : ProjectBaselines Edition	OK (except same pb than in "Assurance Project : Baseline Edition" test)	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : PermissionConfigurations Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : AssuranceAssets Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Asset Package Edition	1) You can select Argumentation models that where created with Model object = "Case", but not Argumentation models that were created with Model object = "Assurance Case". 2) D4.4 doesn' t distinguish "Case" and "Assurance case" 3) You can select Artefact model outside the project (provided resource has been loaded). Idem for an Argumentation model and a process model	Failed <a href="#">118</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : PermissionConfiguration Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Baseline Edition	<p>1) You can select several Ref Frameworks : but when you create an Assurance Project from the menu (File-&gt;New-&gt;...) you can only select 1 RefFramework</p> <p>2) When you select a RefFramework, the tool list proposals as Baselines not RefFrameworks (loaded as resources)</p> <p>3) The second column of the table listing the baselines should be called "Is Active", not "Last version"</p>	Failed	<a href="#">117</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		Baseline : Structure	D4.4 doesn't describe a Baseline as different from a Ref Framework, whereas the prototype makes a true difference : a Baseline is not equal to a Ref Framework : a comment in the dedicated Excel Spreadsheet has been put.	Failed	<a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 40)</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseActivity : Base Edition	You can put as Preceding Activity the current one, and in OwnedRel as source activity a different activity than the current one.	Passed with...	<a href="#">131</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseActivity : BaseActivitySelection Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseActivity : BaseActivityRequirement Edition	OK	Passed	



D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivityApplicability Edition	1) The "Requirements" column has not a corresponding field in the popup 2) The OwnedRel->Source can be different from the current Applicability : is it normal ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">132</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivityEquivalenceMap Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivityComplianceMap Edition	One can put any entity : Arterfact, Person, Tool, Technique... as Target in compliance map. Only Activities should be allowed ?	Failed	<a href="#">133</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseArtefact : Base Edition	An error occurs when we want to add a property (without any property defined). Also, if we define a property in the same project, it is not available and we get the same error message.	Failed	<a href="#">134</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseArtefact : BaseArtefactSelection Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseArtefact : BaseArtefactEquivalenceMap Edition	It is possible to put as a target an Activity. Shouldn't be restricted only to Artefacts ? Also in that case the column "Artefacts" contains "]"	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseArtefact : BaseArtefactComplianceMap Edition	It is possible to put as a target any entity : Tool, Participant... Shouldn't be restricted only to Artefacts ? Also in that case the column "Artefacts" contains "]"	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: Base Edition	OK	Passed	

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementSelection Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementApplicability Edition	OK, with already done remark for Applic Target and OwnedRel	Failed	<a href="#">114</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementEquivalenceMap Edition	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementComplianceMap Edition	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementComplianceMap Edition (2)	The columns are not the same as usually : "Label" and "" instead of "Map", "Map Group", "Requirements"	Failed	<a href="#">136</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseAppicabilityLevel: Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseIndependencyLevel: Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRecommandationLevel: Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseControlCategory: Edition	OK	Passed	

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseCriticalityLevel: Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRole: Base Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRole: BaseRoleSelection Edition	Wording : "BaseRolSelection" instead of "BaseRoleSelection"	Failed	<a href="#">137</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRole: BaseRoleEquivalenceMap Edition	Wording : "BaseRoleEquivelanceMap"	Failed	<a href="#">137</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRole: BaseRoleEquivalenceMap Edition (2)	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRole: BaseRoleComplianceMap Edition	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseTechnique: Base Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseTechnique: BaseTechniqueEquivalenceMap Edition	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseTechnique: BaseTechniqueComplianceMap Edition	Same pb than for BaseArtefact	Failed	<a href="#">135</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseTechnique: BaseTechniqueSelection Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.6.2	Assurance Asset Evaluation		Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.6.2	Assurance Asset Event	Difference between tool implementation and doc : relationship "Triggered by Participant" not implemented.	Failed	<a href="#">78</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Model	Not specified in the document.	Inconclusive	
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Definition	Not specified in the document.	Inconclusive	
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact : Structure	"refers to Artefact Property ", "stored in" not implemented. "ArtefactPart", "Precedent Version" implemented and not in doc "Owned by Participant", "results from technique" are implemented in the related item properties but not in the Artefact properties : in that case it should'nt be mentioned it the same way in the doc ?	Failed	<a href="#">79</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact : Base Edition	<p>1) Precedent Version : it is possible to select an Artefact outside from the model. Is it normal ? Furthermore why another version may imply another artefact ?</p> <p>2) Owned Rel : allows to use as source &amp; target any Artefact : source shouldn't be the current Artefact ? Target shouldn't be in the same evidence model ?</p>	Passed with...	<a href="#">119</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact PropertyValue : Edition	If you change the name of a property when adding an ArtefactProperty Value, the name is updated in the table, but when you open edit it again we see the previous property name : this name should not be editable.	Failed	<a href="#">129</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact PropertyValue : Edition (2)	In several cases (not reproducible) when we click on "Add" in the ArtefactProperty no popup appears but an "empty" value is created as we can see in the attached file.	Failed	<a href="#">123</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Relationship : Structure	"Recordable Assurance Asset", "Manageable Assurance Asset" inheritance not implemented. "source" not mentioned here in the doc (cf remark in ticket 79)	Failed	<a href="#">80</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Relationship : Structure (2)	Why should ArtefactRel, ArtefactProperty inherit from Assurance Asset ? Question put in the XLS Spreadsheet dedicated to CCL updt & requests.	Passed with...	<a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 39)</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Version : Structure	<p>"Is last version", "Is Template", "Is Configurable" implemented but not in the doc. Same for "Resource" : is it corresponding to the "stored in" relationship described in the Artefact class ?</p> <p>The notion of Version is applicable only to an Artefact : it should be named "Artefact Version".</p> <p>Furthermore the word "version" is also used for a "Tool" and "Refframework" but is only a string, so not the same entity.</p>	Failed	<a href="#">81</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Version : Edition	The "Date" attribute is lost when you select another sheet and come back to ArtefactVersion	Failed	<a href="#">120</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Evaluation : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Asset Event : Edition	An error is displayed when entering Time in a wrong format. It should help to display or force entering the right format.	Passed with...	<a href="#">121</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Asset Event : Edition (2)	It some case (not reproducible) is not possible to edit the "Resulting evaluation"	Failed	<a href="#">122</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact : all properties Edition	OK	Passed	

D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Resource : Structure	Entity implemented and not described in D4.4 : a comment has been written into the Excel spreadsheet dedicated to D4.4 update.	Failed	<a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 42)</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Resource : Edition	<p>Edit the Location attribute :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- if you type any string (invalid) then save, open Eclipse : you got an error (see attached file)</li> <li>- if you enter a correct value by browsing the file dir, this value is not saved (when you open Eclipse, it has been lost).</li> </ul> <p>Other points : if you select by browsing a file (local SVN repository) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Assign doesn't do anything</li> <li>- Delete doesn't delete the file</li> <li>- Open open another directory</li> </ul>	Failed	<a href="#">130</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	File : Structure	Seems to correspond to the "Resource" implemented : doc to be updated or the opposite ? In fact "File" seems more precise and corresponds to what is expected.	Failed	<a href="#">82</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Technique : Structure	<p>"Assurance Asset" (supposed to be inherited) : not defined in the doc.</p> <p>"Recordable Assurance Asset" : inheritance not implemented.</p> <p>"Aim" attribute not implemented. Also relationship "created Artefact" not mentioned in the same place in the doc (see remark in ticket 79)</p>	Failed	<a href="#">83</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Activity : Structure	"Activity Evaluation" and "Activity Events" are not displayed the same way (table) then inside an Artefact properties. "Recordable Assurance Asset" not inherited. "SubActivity", "Preceding Activity", "OwnedRel", "Technique" : implemented and not in the doc. "Participant" implemented and not at the same place in the doc. "Creates" not implemented. "Activity Assurance Asset" is made by a list of Events like "Activity Events" ?	Failed	<a href="#">84</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Activity relationship : Structure	"Source" and "Target" should be noted as attributes in the doc.	Failed	<a href="#">85</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Activity : Base Edition	<p>1) Time is not memorized if entered in the wrong format, but no error is displayed and nothing to help entering the right format. Also no coherency check (start can be after end).</p> <p>2) In some cases (not reproducible) it was not possible to add a Preceding activity</p> <p>3) You can choose as preceding activity :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the current activity</li> <li>- an activity outside the current model (if resource loaded)</li> </ul> <p>4) When you try to add an OwnedRel, in some cases (not reproducible) nothing happens when you click on "..." for Source or Target. You can choose as source and target any activity including :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- as source an activity different from the current one</li> <li>- as source or target an activity outside the current model (if resource loaded)</li> </ul>	Failed	<a href="#">124</a>



					I attached a backup of the database where the non reproducible pb was found : the problem appear with this database but not with another		
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Participant : Edition	OK. Nevertheless it is possible to choose as an Owned Artefact, an Artefact outside the current Assurance Project : is it normal ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">128</a>	
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Person : Structure	"Participant" is inherited but as "Participant" is also an entity edited inside the Process model, why not implement it through a link to a Participant id ? This would allow to have several Persons corresponding to the same Participant without copying the information.	Passed with...	<a href="#">87</a>	
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Person : Edition	OK, with same remark than for Participant : Edition	Passed with...	<a href="#">128</a>	
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Tool : Structure	Same remarks than for the Person with regard to the inheritance of "Participant". The attribute "Version" appears after the relationships whereas usually attributes are displayed first in the properties.	Passed with...	<a href="#">88</a>	
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Tool : Structure (2)	From preceding test a remark has been put in the XLS Spreadsheet dedicated to CCL updt & requests.	Passed with...	<a href="#">CCL updt requests XLS (ID 41)</a>	

D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Tool : Edition	OK, with same remark than for Participant : Edition	Passed with...	<a href="#">128</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Organization : Structure	Same remarks than for the Person with regard to the inheritance of "Participant". The attribute "Address" appears after several relationships whereas usually attributes are displayed first in the properties. "SubOrganization" used instead of "part of Organization" in the doc.	Passed with...	<a href="#">89</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Organization : Edition	OK, with same remark than for Participant : Edition	Passed with...	<a href="#">128</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Vocabulary metamodel	5.9	Organization	Not implemented yet	Inconclusive	
D4.4 (CCL)	Mapping metamodel	5.10.2	Map	"Explanation" attribute not implemented (this is not the same than Justification written as a relationship). "MapGroup" implemented and not in the doc. "RequirementComplianceMap" has not the same display than others compliance maps in properties.	Failed	<a href="#">92</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase : Structure	"ModelElement" superclass is not defined in the doc. Relationships implemented are not corresponding to the doc.	Failed	<a href="#">93</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase : Edition	"HasArgument" doesn't allow to add an Agreement. Nevertheless if we add an Agreement by right click on the AssuranceCase - Child, it is added in the list below "HasArgument". Suggestion : either make 2 different inputs : one for adding Argumentation, one for adding Agreement or allow to choose between the 2 inside "HasArgument".	Passed with...	<a href="#">125</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase : Edition (2)	"HasEvidence" opens a window to create an Artefact ,even if with have loaded as resource the evidence model : why not to allow to add Artefacts from an evidence model ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">127</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase : Edition (3)	It is possible to put as "Composed of" the current argument case. Also with the database attached to ticket 124 it was not possible to add "Composed of"	Passed with...	<a href="#">138</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase - Argumentation Edition	In some cases (not reproducible) nothing was listed in the "Consist of" popup window even if we load an argumentation model. Also it was not possible to add "Argumentation" and "Consist of" with the database attached to ticket 124	Passed with...	<a href="#">139</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase - Agreement Edition	OK but is it normal that we can select the agreement itself in the "Between" relationship ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">141</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase - Artefact Edition	In several case, the properties are not editable (see example attached).	Failed	<a href="#">126</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.2	Case - Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.2	Case - Edition (2)	When you right click on a Case model, you have among others "Argumentation Agreement" and "Agreement Agreement" that are in fact the same thing. Idem for : - ArgumentElementCitation and Cited ArgumentElementCitation - Argument InformationElementCitation and InformationElementCitation	Passed with...	<a href="#">144</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.8	Case - InformationElementCitation Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.8	Case - InformationElementCitation Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.9	Case - ArgumentElementCitation Structure	Relationship "citesElement" not implemented. "Argumentation reference" implemented and not in D4.4	Failed	<a href="#">96</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.9	Case - ArgumentElementCitation Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.12	Case - ArgumentReasoning Structure	Relationship "hasStructure" is said [0..1] in D4.4, but implementation is [0..n]	Failed	<a href="#">99</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.12	Case - ArgumentReasoning Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.10	Case - Claim Structure	"choice" relationship not implemented.	Failed	<a href="#">97</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.10	Case - Claim Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.15	Case - Choice Structure	Implementation differs from doc : "hasSource", "hasTarget", "multiplicity" not implemented. "Optionality" implemented and not in D4.4	Failed	<a href="#">100</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.15	Case - Choice Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.14	Case - AssertedInference Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.14	Case - AssertedInference Edition	You can select anything as Source or Target including the edited AssertedInference itself. Also you can put characters in the Cardinality field.	Failed	<a href="#">142</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.16	Case - AssertedEvidence Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.16	Case - AssertedEvidence Edition	Same pb than for the AssertedInference	Failed	<a href="#">142</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.17	Case - AssertedContext Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.17	Case - AssertedContext Edition	Same pb than for the AssertedInference	Failed	<a href="#">142</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.18	Case - AssertedChallenge Structure	1) Graphical notation implementation is different from D4.4. 2) in D4.4 fig20 the relationships Source and Target are said with Claim and [0..1]. This is not what is implemented : [0..n] and Target not only with Claim	Failed	<a href="#">101</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.18	Case - AssertedChallenge Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.19	Case - AssertedCounterEvidence Structure	1) Graphical notation implementation is different from D4.4. 2) in D4.4 fig20 the relationships Source and Target are said with Claim and [0..1]. This is not what is implemented : [0..n] and Target not only with Claim	Failed	<a href="#">102</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.19	Case - AssertedCounterEvidence Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.4	Case - Argumentation Structure	Evaluation, LifeCycleEvent : implemented and not in the doc. Relationship "Contains" is named "Argumentation".	Failed	<a href="#">95</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.4	Case - Argumentation Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.2	Case - Agreement Structure	Implementation differs from doc : element of AssuranceCase superclass not implemented : Argument, Agreement, Cited, Information. Elements implemented and not in doc: consist of, Evaluation, Life Cycle event	Failed	<a href="#">94</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.2	Case - Agreement Edition	OK except that it is possible to put the Agreement itself as part of the Between relationship member.	Failed	<a href="#">143</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.11	EvidenceUseAssertion	This notion is not mentioned in the implementation.	Passed with...	<a href="#">98</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	General metamodel	5.13.2	Fig 31 : general metamodel	OK	Passed	

## 7.2 Campaign 2

Ref doc	Functionality	Chapter / Req	Test name	Execution result2	Status2	Ticket id2
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.1	Create a Reference Framework model	OK	Passed	
User Manual			Delete the Folder	If you create an arg diagram with associated model into a folder, and try to delete the folder, a message appears and the folder is not deleted.	Failed	<a href="#">158</a>

User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a diagram	OK (not able to reproduce the pb).	Passed	
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a folder	There is no more crash but if you create a folder with at least 2 models and try to delete it, it works but you get an error message (see attached file).	Failed	<a href="#">147</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Editing a refframework	OK : menu allow only "delete" now, and it works.	Passed	
User Manual		4.3.1	Create an Equivalence Map using the editor	OK	Passed	
User Manual			Adding an Equivalence Map into an activity	OK but remains the pb already mentioned in ticket 151 : an empty line is created.	Passed with...	<a href="#">151</a>
User Manual	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.4	Create an applicability table	Several things are remaining : - you can select as Applic Level a Recommendation Level : is it normal ? - the Applic / Recom Level is not displayed in the properties table (CL1 :) - what about "Requirements" : not used ?	Failed	<a href="#">154</a>



User Manual	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.4	Connecting a Diagram to Artefacts	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.5	Artefact Property Value	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.6.1	Add an artefact assurance asset evaluation to an artefact	The property menu is not available. This is covered by ticket 23	Failed	<a href="#">23</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management	7.7.1	Add an artefact assurance asset event to an artefact	The property menu is not available. This is covered by ticket 23	Failed	<a href="#">23</a>
User Manual	Evidence Management		Creation of Artefact models	OK	Passed	
User Manual	Evidence Management		Artefact model update	OK	Passed	
N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Concurrent update of a refframework and a refframework_diagram	Now the "Save all" works... but when opening the refframework we have an error. Even if it's not "normal use" this should be either prevented or something coherent done but it should not be possible to generate such an error.	Failed	<a href="#">153</a>

N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	Mapping set display	Bug corrected, but the ergonomic pb remains : the type of mapping (full, partial, no map) is not visible.	Passed with...	<a href="#">145</a>
N/A	Assurance Project Management	New map in Compliance Map edition	There is no more the pb of Eclipse not responding, but now we have the following behavior : - the first time the popup for "Mapping set" is open, it is not possible to select a "to" target model, as well as a source node - then if we change "Filter map element" to Artefact, it becomes possible and also if we select back "Activity" : now it works.	Failed	<a href="#">148</a>
N/A	Assurance Project Management	Selection of the active baseline for Compliance Map edition	OK (unable to reproduce the same pb)	Passed	
N/A	Outline view	Deletion of an item in the Outline view	The item remains displayed in the outline view. Note : this pb was not reproducible after I re-initialize the database.	Failed	<a href="#">160</a>
N/A	Outline view	Cutting an item in the Outline view	Item disappears but an error message is displayed. Note : this pb was not reproducible after I re-initialize the database.		<a href="#">161</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Edition	OK, but the ergonomics should help.	Passed with...	<a href="#">151</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Edition (3)	I disagree with the explanation, I reopened the ticket.	Failed	<a href="#">106</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : : Edition (4)	The pb remains.	Failed	<a href="#">107</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Rename	OK as "rename" is no more available.	Passed	
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Delete	OK but remains the pb that when you create or delete a resource, there is no "Save all" available.	Passed with...	<a href="#">146</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Save	The resource is created but inside the cdo repository and not as a file into the WS folder chosen when asked for in the "Save as" popup window.	Failed	<a href="#">152</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.7	Property : Structure	D4.4 says that Property inherit from Manageable Assurance Asset so from the 2 relationships - evaluated in Assurance Asset Evaluation [0..*] - has lifecycle Assurance Asset Event [0..*] This is not the case. Ticket is reopened.	Failed	<a href="#">74</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.8	RefTechnique : Structure	Waiting for the update of the User Manual to be able to check.	Inconclusive	
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : ProjectBaselines Edition	When clicking on BaseActivityEquivalenceMap => Add or BaseActivityComplianceMap => Add : 1) no popup is displayed 2) a line is created with "]" in Activities column 3) the Outline view is fulfilled. Furthermore Delete has no effect.	Failed	<a href="#">157</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : AssuranceAssets Edition	After creating an Assurance Project, initializing Base properties, when clicking on Assets Package : an error message is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">163</a>

D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Asset Package Edition	Similar pb than for the Activity edition in a Process Model : no popup window when adding a Model to an Assets Package (same ticket is referenced).		<a href="#">156</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2	Assurance Project : Baseline Edition	Similar pb than for the Activity edition in a Process Model : no popup window when adding a Refframework to a Baseline config (same ticket is referenced).		<a href="#">156</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseArtefact : Base Edition	Now we don't have the previous error, but another one : at the time we do a "Save all" an error message is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">149</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact PropertyValue : Edition	OK	Passed	

D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact PropertyValue : Edition (2)	OK, but now when you edit an ArtefactProperty without entering anything, and click on "Finish", an empty line is added in the Properties table and an empty value is created : note that this is general: it applies also for ArtefactEvaluation, ArtefactEvent...	Passed with...	<a href="#">151</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5.7	Artefact Version : Edition	OK, but the ergonomics should help.	Passed with...	<a href="#">151</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2	Activity : Base Edition	OK, but remains the pb mentioned in a previous ticket	Passed with...	<a href="#">114</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase : Edition (2)	OK but why to allow "Assurance Case" creation if we should not use it ? For what purpose is it ? It would clarify to remove it or explain when to use it.	Passed with...	<a href="#">150</a>
D4.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1	AssuranceCase - Artefact Edition	OK, with the remark done in ticket 150	Passed	
		WP4_ATC_002	Machine readability of the CCL conceptual model - Arg Case	OK	Passed	

WP4_ATC_00 2	Machine readability of the CCL conceptual model - Arg Diagram	OK	Passed
WP4_ATC_00 2	Machine readability of the CCL conceptual model - Evidence Model	OK	Passed
WP4_ATC_00 2	Machine readability of the CCL conceptual model - Property Model	OK	Passed
WP4_ATC_00 2	Machine readability of the CCL conceptual model - Assurance Asset Model	OK	Passed
WP6_ATC_00 3	Modification of the Body of Evidence - 1	OK	Passed
WP6_ATC_00 3	Modification of the Body of Evidence - 2	OK	Passed

D3.2 (Test plan)	WP5&6 integration Acceptance Tests	WP5&6_ATC_001	Importability of Component Evidence in a new system assurance case	OK	Passed	
D3.2 (Test plan)	WP6&7 integration Acceptance Tests	WP6&7_ATC_001	Artefacts and evidence view	Clicking on Base.Preceding Activity, Activity Artefacts.Required / Produced Artefacts; Activity Participants.Participant, Activity Techniques.Technique, Activity AssuranceAsset.Asset Event has the effect of adding resources into the Outline view.	Failed	<a href="#">156</a>
N/A		N/A	Ticket 27 correction verification	OK	Passed	
N/A		N/A	Ticket 22 correction verification	Same pb than in ticket 149	Failed	<a href="#">149</a>
N/A		N/A	Ticket 25 correction verification	Add 2 Artefacts to a Participant in a Process model. Then delete the Artefact definition containing 1 of the 2 Artefacts (Artefact CCC). The deleted Artefact is always in the list of Owned Artefacts of the Participant and an error is displayed when double clicking on the Artefact that was deleted.	Failed	<a href="#">155</a>
N/A		N/A	Ticket 19 correction verification	OK	Passed	
N/A		N/A	Ticket 21 correction verification	I don't see any change between 2.0 and 2.1 on this point.	Inconclusive	

### 7.3 Campaign 3

#### 7.3.1 Opencoss Platform



Ref doc	Functionality	Chapter / Req	Test name	Execution result3	Status3	Ticket id3
				No glossary inside the User Manual.	Passed with...	<a href="#">53</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.1.1/ 3.1.1	Instal PostgreSQL DB on Windows	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.1.1/ 3.1.1	Instal PostgreSQL DB on Linux	No chapter available	Failed	<a href="#">31</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.1.2/ 3.1.2	Create Opencoss DB	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.1.3/ 3.1.3	Instal OPENCROSS server distribution	The server page is empty unlike fig 2 => need to load the DB used for the user manual.	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.2/ 3.2	Instal OPENCROSS platform client	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Installation	3.3/ 3.2.2	Configure connection settings with CDO repository	The view is not the same as in fig 7.	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.1/ 4.1	Create a Reference Framework model	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.1/ 4.2.1	Add a valid concept to the diagram	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">33</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.1/ 4.2.1	Add an invalid concept to the diagram	Need to change modelling rule : this can't be made by the user but only by the developer (cf mail AL 11/9/14)	Inconclusive	<a href="#">193</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.2/ 4.2.2	Add a valid link between concepts	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.2/ 4.2.2	Add an invalid link between concepts	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.2/ 4.2.2	Maintain the left mouse clicked	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3/ 4.2.3	Edit properties without object selected	Properties are set with then name "Undefined", and 3 titles: Base, Rulers & Grid, Appearance	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3/ 4.2.3	Edit properties with an object selected	Properties are set with the name of the object selected and associated titles.	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3/ 4.2.3	Edit "To be xxx" properties	For the "To be xxx" properties like "To be instantiated", "To be supported"... the choice being false/true, using an enumerate would be more user friendly than editing a text.	Passed with...	<a href="#">46</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3/ 4.2.3	Edit properties with a connection selected	Properties are set with the name "Undefined" and only 1 title : appearance.	Passed with...	<a href="#">35</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.3/ 4.2.3	Delete a link within properties	The diagram is not refreshed. To see the result on the diagram it has to be saved, closed and re-open. The behavior is not the same if we change name property for example : in that case the refreshing of the diagram is done.	Failed	<a href="#">36</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.4/ 4.2.4	Create multi-diagrams from a Reference Framework model	The choice "Delete from Diagram" doesn't exist for the object "Ref Activity". For the "Ref Role" and "Ref Artefact" the choice exists but is unselectable. For a connection the choice exists and is selectable.	Failed	<a href="#">37</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.4/ 4.2.4	Create multi-diagrams from a Reference Framework model	Ref Act1-1 appears as a default "RefActivity" object inside the associated diagram. When saving the associated diagram, this default "RefActivity" object disappear.	Failed	<a href="#">195</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Use the "Delete" menu in the "Repository Explorer" view	"DELETE Model" menu is displayed when clicking right on a diagram type item.	Passed with...	<a href="#">194</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a diagram/ Delete of a diagram from the "Outline" view	OK (ticket 38 solved).	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a refframework diagram from the "Repository Explorer" view	After approval of the "Delete Model Confirmation" window, the "Problem deleting the model" window appears. In addition, the "Problem deleting the model" message is not consistent with the refframework diagram deletion action.	Failed	<a href="#">198</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Delete of a folder	In several cases (not reproducible) Eclipse doesn't answer anymore. We have to kill the application.	Failed	<a href="#">39</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Editing a refframework	OK : menu allow only "delete" now, and it works.	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management		Opening a refframework	"toto.refframework" is displayed in the workinf window	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.2.5/ 4.2.5	Use of a non graphical editor	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.3.1/ 4.3.1	Create an Equivalence Map using the editor	The result is not as described in the User Manual as the "RefFramework.mapping" is missing : we have to create it before.	Failed	<a href="#">34</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)		4.3.1/ 4.3.1	Create an Equivalence Map using the editor	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.3.2/ 4.3.2	Create an Equivalence Map using a tailored functionality	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.3.2/ 4.3.2	Create an Equivalence Map using a tailored functionality	Ergonomics problem: The mapping type selection is not visible inside the "Equivalence Map" window.	Passed with...	<a href="#">201</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)			Adding an Equivalence Map into an activity	OK but remains the pb already mentioned in ticket 151 : an empty line is created.	Passed with...	<a href="#">151</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	4.4/ 4.4	Create an applicability table	Several things are remaining : - you can select as Applic Level a Recommendation Level : is it normal ? - the Applic / Recom Level is not displayed in the properties table (CL1 :) - what about "Requirements" : not used ?	Failed	<a href="#">154</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Assurance Project Management	5.1/ 5.1	Create an Assurance Project and Baseline	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Assurance Project Management	5.2/ 5.2	Create a new Project Baseline	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Assurance Project Management	5.3/ 5.3	Edit a Project Baseline	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Assurance Project Management	5.4.1/ 5.4.1	Edit a Compliance Map using the editor	Example given in the User Manual (or equivalent) not available (nothing selectable in the "To" list).	Inconclusive	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Assurance Project Management	5.4.2/ 5.4.2	Edit a Compliance Map using a tailored functionality	Example given in the User Manual (or equivalent) not available (nothing selectable in the "To" list).	Inconclusive	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.2.1/ 6.2.1	Creating a New Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.2.2/ 6.2.2	Opening a Diagram	There is an error in the user manual in the chapter "6.2.2 Opening a Diagram/In File Format", the sentence "Double click on the project folder on the <u>Package Explorer</u> tab in order to expand the folder" should be replaced by "Double click on the project folder on the <u>Project Explorer</u> tab in order to expand the folder". In addition, the default editor is "Dawn Arg Diagram" instead of "Arg Diagram Editing".	Failed	<a href="#">216</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1/ 6.3.1	Editing a Diagram	The diagram is not refreshed. Furthermore if you save the diagram, close it and try to re-open it, an error message appears.	Failed	<a href="#">41</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1/ 6.3.1	Editing an Argumentation	You can put any string in this field. As it is supposed to be the place where is stored the argumentation diagram file, I suggest to use a browser to locate the file.	Passed with...	<a href="#">42</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1/ 6.3.1	Editing an argumentation diagram : deleting from diagram	The choice "Delete from Diagram" exist for all objects(as well as connections) but is unselectable.	Failed	<a href="#">43</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1.1/ 6.3.1.1	Copying and Pasting an Element	Copy is not selectable	Failed	<a href="#">45</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.1.2/ 6.3.1.2	Deleting a Node or a Link	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">44</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.2/ 6.3.2	Create multi-diagrams from an Argumentation model	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.1/ 6.3.3.1	Creating a New Pattern Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.2/ 6.3.3.2	Editing a Pattern Diagram	The user manual mention the fact that only Patterns arg diagram allow this. This is not the case as Modules arg diagram allow also the Multiextension.	Failed	<a href="#">47</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.3/ 6.3.3.3	Adding Elements from Patterns to a Diagram (instantiating a Pattern)	When we select the pattern diagram from the Template view the drag & drop doesn't work.	Failed	<a href="#">48</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.4/ 6.3.3.4	Creating a New Module Diagram	The user manual talks about pattern diagram instead of module diagram	Failed	<a href="#">49</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.3.5/ 6.3.3.5	Editing a Module Diagram	When the attribute "Public" of a claim is set to "true", the public activation is noticed on the graphic notation only when clicking in the edition window. In addition, the figure 89 should be updated to reflect the tool version (i.e., order of the fields to be updated). When the properties attribute "cited type" of an ArgumentElementCitation is updated, the graphic notation is updated accordingly only when clicking in the edition window.	Failed	<a href="#">217</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.3.4/ 6.3.4	Connecting a Diagram to Artefacts	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.4/ 6.4	Printing a Diagram	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.5.1/ 6.5.1	Creating a contract	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">51</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Safety Argumentation Management	6.5.2/ 6.5.2	Editing a contract		Inconclusive	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.1/ 7.1	Define Artefact Repository Preferences	Under Windows->Preferences->Opencross->Artefact Repository Preferences : 1) Checkbox "use local repository" should trigger the edition of the fields (SVN local... / SVN remote... : editable / not editable). 2) "SVN local ..." has not the foreseen effect : When you edit a resource, click on location : it doesn't open the	Failed	<a href="#">57</a>



					SVN repos browser but the window explorer 3) "SVN remote..." does the same	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.1/ 7.1	Copy Artefact Repository Preferences	OK but the confirmation message contains a spelling error	Passed with...	<a href="#">202</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.2.1/ 7.2.1	Add an artefact definition	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.2.2/ 7.2.2	Delete Artefact Definition	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.3.1/ 7.3.1	Add an artefact	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.3.2/ 7.3.2	Delete Artefact	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.4.1/ 7.4.1	Add an artefact resource to an artefact	See test with same ticket	Failed	<a href="#">57</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.4.2/ 7.4.2	Delete an artefact resource	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual	Evidence Management	7.5/ 7.5	Artefact Property Value	OK	Passed	

(proto3)						
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.5.1/ 7.5.1	Add an artefact property value to an artefact	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.5.2/ 7.5.2	Delete an artefact property value	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.6.1/ 7.6.1	Add an artefact assurance asset evaluation to an artefact	The property menu is not available. This is covered by ticket 23	Failed	<a href="#">23</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.6.2/ 7.6.2	Delete an artefact assurance asset evaluation	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.7.1/ 7.7.1	Add an artefact assurance asset event to an artefact	The property menu is not available. This is covered by ticket 23	Failed	<a href="#">23</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.7.2/ 7.7.2	Delete an artefact assurance asset event	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management		Creation of Artefact models	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management		Artefact model update	When doing a "Save all" a Java error message is displayed : see associated screen copy.	Failed	<a href="#">203</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	In case of creation of an artefact without entering any data no event is generated : should be "creation' event ? In case of creation of an artefact with entering data an event of "modification" type is generated : shouldn't it be "creation" ?	Failed	<a href="#">225</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK, but the time field is empty	Failed	<a href="#">226</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK but timestamp is not updated.	Passed with...	<a href="#">226</a>
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	No event is generated into Art1	Failed	<a href="#">227</a>

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed

User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Evidence Management	7.8/ 7.8	Impact analysis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Process Assurance Management	8/ 8	Process Assurance Management	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Process Assurance Management	8.1/ 8.1	Creating Process Assurance data	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Process Assurance Management	8.2/ 8.2	Deleting Process Assurance Objects	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Properties Management	9/ 9	Properties Management	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Properties Management	9.1.1/ 9.1.1	Add a property	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	Properties Management	9.1.2/ 9.1.2	Delete a property	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto2)/ User Manual (proto3)	OPENCROSS server web interface	10.2/ 11.5	Gap Analysis report - Compliance Assessment and Evidence Evaluation	OK	Passed

N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	Concurrent update of a refframework and a refframework_diagram	When updating the refframework ("name" of an activity is updated) and the refframework_diagram ("identifier" of an activity is updated) concurrently, the first "Save all" generate the message "Your Resource is in conflict and cannot be committed". After the second "Save All", the message is not displayed anymore. When reopening the refframework and the refframework_diagram, only the name is filled and the identifier is not filled for this specific activity.	Failed	<a href="#">236</a>
N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	Display a diagram containing activities with sub-activities and zoom inside one to see the relationships and linked objects.	There is no possibility to link the "Child" diagram to its "Father" : e.g. by use of "Navigate" or another item to be defined in the contextual menu.	Passed with...	<a href="#">70</a>
N/A	Prescriptive Knowledge Management	Mapping set display	Bug corrected, but the ergonomic pb remains : the type of mapping (full, partial, no map) is not visible.	Passed with...	<a href="#">145</a>
N/A	Assurance Project Management	Selection of the active baseline for Compliance Map edition	OK	Passed	
N/A	Evidence Management	Edition of an artefact	"Errors" is displayed in red when we enter any value in the properties of the Artefact.	Failed	<a href="#">71</a>

N/A	Process Assurance Management		Undo command when editing a process.	The "Undo Do Command" has no effect.	Failed	<a href="#">72</a>
N/A	Process Assurance Management		Opening a process model with Process model editor	An error is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">73</a>
N/A	Outline view		Deletion of an item in the Outline view	OK (unable to reproduce the same pb)	Passed	
N/A	Outline view		Cutting an item in the Outline view	OK (unable to reproduce the same pb)	Passed	
N/A	Exiting Eclipse		Exiting Eclipse	Sometimes a popup is displayed (several times) when exiting Eclipse.	Failed	<a href="#">166</a>
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1/ 5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.1/ 5.4.2.1	RefFramework : Rename	OK as "rename" is no more available.	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.2/ 5.4.2.2	RefActivity : Structure	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.2/ 5.4.2.2	RefActivity : Edition	OK	Passed	

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.3/ 5.4.2.3	RefActivityRel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.5/ 5.4.2.5	RefArtefact : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.5/ 5.4.2.5	RefArtefact : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.6/ 5.4.2.6	RefArtefactRel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.7/ 5.13.2.2	Property : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.8/ 5.4.2.7	RefTechnique : Structure	Waiting for the update of the CCL update to be able to check.	Inconclusive
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.8/ 5.4.2.7	RefTechnique : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.9/ 5.4.2.8	RefRequirement : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.10/ 5.4.2.9	RefRequirementRel : Structure	OK	Passed



(CCL)						
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.11/ 5.4.2.10	RefCriticalityLevel : Structure	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.11/ 5.4.2.10	RefCriticalityLevel : Edition	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.12/ 5.4.2.11	RefApplicabilityLevel : Structure	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.12/ 5.4.2.11	RefApplicabilityLevel : Edition	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.13/ 5.4.2.15	RefCriticalityApplicability : Structure	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.13/ 5.4.2.15	RefCriticalityApplicability : Edition	OK		Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.14/ 5.4.2.16	RefApplicability : Structure	The "OwnedRel" relationship is missing in the "RefApplicability" description (chapter 5.4.2.16 of the D4.4_V1.4_FINAL.doc).	Failed	<a href="#">230</a>
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.14/ 5.4.2.16	RefApplicability : Edition	OK but the "OwnedRel" is not presented with the source and the target in the "RefApplicability" window.	Passed with...	<a href="#">230</a>

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.15/ 5.4.2.17	RefApplicabilityRel : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.15/ 5.4.2.17	RefApplicabilityRel : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	RefFramework metamodel	5.4.2.17/ 5.4.2.19	RefEquivalenceMap : Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2/ 5.5.2	Assurance Project : Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2/ 5.5.2	Assurance Project : PermissionConfigurations Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	5.5.2/ 5.5.2	Assurance Project : PermissionConfiguration Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		Baseline : Structure	D4.4 doesn't describe a Baseline as different from a Ref Framework, whereas the prototype makes a true difference : a Baseline is not equal to a Ref Framework : a comment in the dedicated Excel Spreadsheet has been put.	Failed <a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 40)</a>

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivitySelection Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivityRequirement Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseActivity : BaseActivityEquivalenceMap Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseArtefact : BaseArtefactSelection Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: Base Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseRequirement: BaseRequirementSelection Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel	BaseAppicabilityLevel: Edition	OK	Passed

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseIndependencyLevel: Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseRecommandationLevel: Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseControlCategory: Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseCriticalityLevel: Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseRole: Base Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseTechnique: Base Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Assurance Project metamodel		BaseTechnique: BaseTechniqueSelection Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4	Assurance Project metamodel	5.6.2/ 5.7.2	Assurance Asset Evaluation	OK	Passed

(CCL)						
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact Model	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact Definition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact PropertyValue : Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact Relationship : Structure (2)	Why should ArtefactRel, ArtefactProperty inherit from Assurance Asset ? Question put in the XLS Spreadsheet dedicated to CCL updt & requests.	Passed with...	<a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 39)</a>
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact Evaluation : Edition	OK	Passed with...	<a href="#">233</a>
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Artefact : all properties Edition	OK	Passed	
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Artefact metamodel	5,7/ 5.8	Resource : Structure	Entity implemented and not described in D4.4 : a comment has been written into the Excel spreadsheet dedicated to D4.4 update.	Failed	<a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 42)</a>

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2/ 5.9.2.2	Activity : other Properties (Artefacts, Participants, ...) Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Process metamodel	5.8.2/ 5.9.2.6	Tool : Structure (2)		Passed with... <a href="#">CCL upt requests XLS (ID 41)</a>
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Vocabulary metamodel	5,9/ 5.10	Organization		Inconclusive
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.1/ 5.12.2	AssuranceCase - Artefact Edition	OK, with the remark done in ticket 150	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.2/ 5.12.2	Case - Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.8/ 5.12.2	Case - InformationElementCitation Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.8/ 5.12.2.8	Case - InformationElementCitation Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.9/ 5.12.2.9	Case - ArgumentElementCitation Edition	OK	Passed

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.12/ 5.12.2.12	Case - ArgumentReasoning Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.10/ 5.12.2.10	Case - Claim Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.15/ 5.12.2.15	Case - Choice Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.14/ 5.12.2.14	Case - AssertedInference Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.16/ 5.12.2.16	Case - AssertedEvidence Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.17/ 5.12.2.17	Case - AssertedContext Structure	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.18/ 5.12.2.18	Case - AssertedChallenge Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.19/ 5.12.2.19	Case - AssertedCounterEvidence Edition	OK	Passed

D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	Argumentation metamodel	5.11.2.4/ 5.12.2.4	Case - Argumentation Edition	OK	Passed
D4.4 v1.2 (CCL)/ D4.4 v1.4 (CCL)	General metamodel	5.13.2/ 5.14.2	Fig 31 : general metamodel/ Fig 35 : general metamodel	OK	Passed
		WP4_ATC_00 4	Qualitative Reuse Indication	Reuse of artefacts between two different projects. Qualitative indication (green color) if they are equivalent	Passed
		WP4_ATC_00 5	Quantitative Reuse Indication	No percentage indication about the extend to which the artefact can be reused	Failed <a href="#">207</a>



D3.2 (Test plan)	WP5 Acceptance Tests	WP5_ATC_00 1	Argument Creation		Passed	
		WP5_ATC_00 2	Assurance Assets Composition		Not run	
		WP7_ATC_00 2	Assessment Report	No possibility to select the information of which the report will consist	Passed with...	<a href="#">208</a>
		WP7_ATC_00 3	Process Management and Monitoring	The aim of the test is fulfilled, with some annotations: No possibility to select new metrics. No possibility to insert data No availability of a metric completeness report The end user has no possibility to specify new metrics for his project and target values against which to evaluate	Failed	<a href="#">209</a>

the progress.

D3.2 (Test plan)	WP4&5 integration Acceptance Tests	WP4&5_ATC_ Contract Specification 001	<p>1.The platform provides the user with a guided procedure to establish relationships/dependencies between components' contracts. PASSED</p> <p>2.3.4.The others expected features are not yet implemented.</p> <p>The two requirements of this test,WP4&amp;5_001, WP4&amp;5_002, are not met , but the user can achieve the same result with different method.</p>	Failed <a href="#">237</a>
------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---	----------------------------

WP4&5_ATC_002	Reuse of Assets in Compositional Certification	There is not a specific wizard to characterise an evidence in a structured language that would permit an automatic comparison between evidences and consequently an evaluation of their possible re-use.	Failed	<a href="#">234</a>
WP4&5_ATC_003	Information Exchanged between Safety Assessors and Manufacturers	The platform provide some tools to facilitate the exchange of information between Safety Assessors and Manufacturers, but lacks of the concept of history tracing and logging	Passed with...	<a href="#">235</a>
WP4&5_ATC_004	Extension of Safety Standard Model	The only functionality implemented is the extension of the Reference Framework model	Failed	<a href="#">231</a>

		WP4&5_ATC_005	Safety Case Module Specification	1. Lack of EN50129 reference framework which defines the structure of the Safety Case in the Railway Domain. 2. Lack of access privileges (read/write) within a company 3. No possibility to assign to each document a progress status that could be used by the platform to automatically alert users in charge of tasks requiring them	Failed	<a href="#">181</a>
D3.2 (Test plan)	WP4&6 integration Acceptance Tests	WP4&6_ATC_001	CCL-Based Evidence Management	1.Applicability level not available in the Artefact definition	Failed	<a href="#">232</a>
		WP4&7_ATC_002	Process inspection and execution	How to produce a real assessment report, tracing the time/date and person who performs it? Only Compliance report on Webserver, not enough to capture the complexity of the exchange between Assessor and manufacturer	Failed	<a href="#">224</a>
		WP4&7_ATC_004	Metrics Estimation and Collection		Passed	
		WP5&6_ATC_002	Coherence and traceability of arguments, claims and evidence in a component assurance case		Passed	

D3.2 (Test plan)	WP5&7 integration Acceptance Tests	WP5&7_ATC_001	Impact of a certification process modification to arguments	The Compliance Report takes into account the artefacts without any assessments of the completeness of the activities (uploading all the evidences for the input and output artefacts, the relative activity status is not assessed for completeness). In the light of this, what the platform allows to do is to verify the presence/absence of an evidence associated to the artefact independently from the ones associated to the relative activity	Failed	<a href="#">191</a> <a href="#">WP5&amp;7_A</a> <a href="#">TC_001</a>
		WP5&7_ATC_002	Compliance of a project structure with the managed standards	The platform does not make a check of the structure of an existing project, but a new project is in line with the RefFramework the end user selects	Passed	
		WP6&7_ATC_003	Metrics Inspection and Reporting	No possibility to perform metrics on singular artefact or piece of evidence through OPENCROSS Webservice	Passed	
N/A		N/A	Performance test	The creation time for this Assurance Project is around 30 minutes which seems not acceptable in the context of a demo.	Failed	<a href="#">218</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Deleting repository content	3.2.3	Delete a folder (1)	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Deleting repository content	3.2.3	Delete a folder(2)	OK	Passed	-

User Manual (proto3)	Deleting repository content	3.2.3	Delete a model (1)	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Deleting repository content	3.2.3	Delete a model (2)	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create 2 ref fmk and equivalence map	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create post-conditions	<p>1) In the ActivityEquivalenceMap, the way to know that a target is a post-condition is by the fact that it is taken from Source Ref Fmk : it would be more user friendly to make explicit the distinction between target and post-conditions (as in the mapping set)</p> <p>2) From the mapping set interface, one can select any entity type (activity, artefact, role, technique...) whereas from the ActivityEquivalenceMap interface one can select only entities of the same type than the source (so even for the post-conditions) : this is not coherent.</p> <p>3) It would be useful to allow to add (not only modify) an entity inside the post-conditions panel as by definition</p>	Passed with...	<a href="#">196</a>

					the post-conditions are known at the time the mapping is done.		
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create a new mapping set	1) OK 2) OK for the "To" panel. The post-conditions are not re-initialized	Failed	<a href="#">197</a>	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Mapping set switch	1) The post-conditions include previous entities set 2) idem Note that this appear only in the "Mapping set" window, not in the ActivityEquivalenceMap of the selected Ref activity	Failed	<a href="#">197</a>	

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Mapping group	The mapping model is not including the 2 equivalence maps that have been created.	Failed	<a href="#">199</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create an Assurance Project starting from the previous Ref Fmk	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Update the created Baseline	OK but the new entities created are marked with a red cross as for the entities not inherited from the Ref Fmk. It would be more appropriate to mark them with e.g. a "+" to show that they have been added with regard to the initial ref framework.	Failed	<a href="#">200</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Edit the "Mapping set " of the Baseline	It is not possible to edit post-conditions	Passed with...	<a href="#">210</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create an Assurance Project bis starting from Ref Fmk bis	OK	Passed	



User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on activity	Msg : "The Assurance Pject" doesn't have an Equivalence Map" is displayed while it's not the case.	Failed	<a href="#">211</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create assurance project 1 for cross domain reuse	OK with a trivial pb	Failed	<a href="#">204</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Select base activity from target project	An error message is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">205</a>

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Select base artefact with equivalence map from target project	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Select base artefact without equivalence map from target project	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	From Cross Domain window, create a new CM	1) OK 2) KO : the target artefacts in green are all the artefacts corresponding to all the CM, not only the one selected. 3) There is no way to select a specific CM (the last seems to be used systematically).	Failed	<a href="#">206</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Add post-conditions inside eq map for Base Ref art 1	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Reuse an artefact		Passed	

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Reuse an artefact (2)	OK, but what is the purpose of having "No" and "Cancel" ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">212</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Reuse an artefact (3)	Nothing appears, the source artefact is not copied into the selected target. This is due to the fact that no resource is attached to the source artefact.	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Update of the Ref Fmk bis	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Update of the Ref Fmk	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create Assurance Pject 2	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Add compliance maps into Baseline Pject 2	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Create Assurance Pject 2 bis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Add compliance maps into Baseline Pject 2 bis	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2	OK	Passed

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (2)	1) & 2) : OK 3) error	Failed	<a href="#">214</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (3)	1) OK 2) OK 3) OK but the selection mechanism is not the same for target artefact (line filled in gray) than for source artefact (check button). The select on the source artefact making the line filled in gray has in fact not a selection effect as for the target).	Passed with...	<a href="#">219</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (4)	1) OK 2) OK 3) OK but nothing happens. This is in fact due to the fact that no resource is attached to art2 bis. Nevertheless a warning msg should be displayed in that case.	Passed with...	<a href="#">220</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (5)	Copy is done. Nevertheless : - we don't have a feedback showing that the cpy took place - why is the copy done in a directory pject2/null/null/ ? - the version ID of the art2 artefact should be incremented	Passed with...	<a href="#">221</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (6)	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Cross domain on Assurance Pject 2 (7)	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Avionic Assurance Pject : add an equivalence map	No popup is displayed when clicking on "Add' and a "J' is added in the "Artefacts" column	Failed <a href="#">215</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	RailwaysTASPlatform Assurance Pject : display eq maps	1) & 2) OK 3) Display pb : sometimes the green color doesn't cover the whole line	Failed <a href="#">222</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	RailwaysTASPlatform Assurance Pject : mapping for cross domain	1) OK 2) No popup is displayed when clicking on "Add' and a "Base compliance map" msg is added in the "Label" column	Failed <a href="#">223</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Creation of a mapping set	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Creation of an assurance project	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Cross domain reuse	5.5	Apply cross domain on JP-Assurance Pject 3	They are 2 sources resources : 1 associated to Artefact_Thales_SRD, 1 associated to Artefact_PSAC_Thales : only 1 is copied in the target and with an error.	Failed <a href="#">228</a>

User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of a mapping model	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of a map group	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Deletion of a map group	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Deletion of several map groups	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of a map	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of a map & deletion of the associated group	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Deletion of a map	OK	Passed	-
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of an equivalence map	OK, but you can't create it through the "+" button inside the Map model properties.	Passed with...	<a href="#">165</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Deletion of an equivalence map	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Creation of an compliance map	OK, but you can't create it through the "+" button inside the Map model properties.	Passed with...	<a href="#">165</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Mapping Management	10	Deletion of an compliance map	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)				OK	Passed	
	Compliance report	11.2.2	Selection of a project			

User Manual (proto3)			Change compliance to "full"	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.2			
User Manual (proto3)			2 compliances to "full"	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.2			
User Manual (proto3)			1 compliance "full" & 1 compliance "partial"	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.2			
User Manual (proto3)			1 compliance "full" & 1 compliance "nomap"	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.2			
User Manual (proto3)			Remove compliances	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.2			
User Manual (proto3)			Add a compliance evidence through Web I/F	OK	Passed
	Compliance report	11.2.3			
User Manual (proto3)			Generation of textual report	OK	Passed with...
	Compliance report	11.2.4			<a href="#">172</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Compliance estimation report		Add a connector	OK	Passed
		11.3			
User Manual (proto3)	Compliance estimation report	11.3	Execute a connector	OK	Passed



User Manual (proto3)	Compliance estimation report	11.3	Change the connector	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Define inconstent relationships between Baseline and Evidence models.	Source and Target can be set with anything. 1) why not limiting e.g. source as himself ? 2) why not limiting target as B1 ?	Passed with... <a href="#">174</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Modify a target artefact from a OwnedRel of an artefact compliant with the baseline.	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Following previous test: Modify the impacted source from web I/F.	OK on the web I/F.If we go back inside EMF,we can see that the event created by IA has it's time for modification updated.	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Following previous test: Modify the impacted source from EMF.	OK	Passed

User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Modify a target artefact from a OwnedRel of an artefact compliant with the baseline. (2)	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Following previous test: Validate the impacted source from web I/F.	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Change impact analysis	11.4	Modify a target artefact from a OwnedRel of an artefact compliant with the baseline. (3)	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Gap Analysis Report	11.5	Display of Compliance details	OK. Nevertheless the eval1 is not expanded into eval11 : is it normal ?	Passed with...	<a href="#">176</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Baseline metrics : nb of applicability & criticality levels	OK, but shouldn't we see the list of criticality & applicability levels ?	Inconclusive	
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Baseline metrics : nb of applicability & criticality levels (2)	OK	Passed	

User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Baseline metrics : Base assets types	OK, but is it normal that the sub-activities are not counted (only high level activities are counted) ?	Inconclusive
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Mapping metrics : Compliance map	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Assurance Asset Metrics : Weekly Assurance Assets Metrics - Evidence	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Assurance Asset Metrics : Histogram Assurance Asset Metrics	OK	Passed
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Assurance Asset Metrics : Weekly Assurance Assets Metrics - Process	Doesn't work : it is implemented ?	Inconclusive
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Assurance Asset Metrics : Histogram Assurance Assets Metrics - Process	Doesn't work : it is implemented ?	Inconclusive

User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	RefFramework Metrics : RefFramework coverage	Suggestion : invert Color red / green for coherency with EMF display. If you add a technique for ex in the baseline, it has been made unavailable but web I/F is considering as coming from the refFramework.	Failed	<a href="#">178</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Process Metrics / all	Web I/F should reflect EMF data.	Failed	<a href="#">179</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Metric Estimation Report	11.6.1	Argumentation Metrics	Result = - nb of claims = 4 => OK - nb of public = 2 => OK - nb of uninstanciated... = 5 => KO - nb of undev = 2 => OK - nb of uninst & undev = 0 => KO	Failed	<a href="#">180</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Equivalence Map Report	11.6.2	DO-178 vs EN 50128	RefArt : 3 full, 4 partial ReqReq : 0	Failed	<a href="#">182</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Equivalence Map Report	11.6.2	DO-178 vs EN 50128 - MS Word report	Word report : System requirements : full map Name: EN50128 - SyRS (2 times) EMF : System requ : full map to EN50128 Syst req spec + Sys safety req spec In Word, we have the name of the Eq map, that is the same if they are several target mapped. It would be better to have the name of the eq refframework entity	Passed with...	<a href="#">183</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Equivalence Map Report	11.6.2	DO-178 vs EN 50128 - EMF I/F	There is no automatic filling of an eq map from target ref model to source : e.g. you have DO178 ref art Hw I/F with eq map to EN50128 Ext I/F spec. On the other side, into EN50128 Ext I/F spec has no Eq map to DO178. It would be nice to have something (either automatic or a posteriori check	Passed with...	<a href="#">184</a>

to show the inverse link).						
User Manual (proto3)	Argumentation		Select JP-AssPject2	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Argumentation		Select AutUseCase	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Argumentation		Select AvionicsAssurancePject	OK except the "number of claims with no evidence associated" not conform to EMF	Failed	<a href="#">185</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Evidence		Select AvionicsAssurancePject	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Evidence		Select AutUseCase	The artefact "GuidanceForOPENCOSSToolsUsers.doc" inserted through web I/F is not visible under EMF.	Failed	<a href="#">186</a>
User Manual (proto3)	Evidence		Select JP-AssPject2	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Evidence		Select AvionicsAssurancePject	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Process		Select JP-AssPject	There is nothing in the Web I/F whereas they are data in the Process folder of the project under EMF.	Failed	
User Manual (proto3)	Project administration	11.7.1	Select JP-AssPject	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Create sample data	11.7.2	Select JP-AssPject	In BaslineConfig the new created fmk is added with art, act. But how do I see it in a baseline fmk ? What about "range of..." ?	Inconclusive	

User Manual (proto3)	Config settings	11.7.3	Config settings	OK	Passed	
User Manual (proto3)	Compliance report	11.2.2	Activity compliance	OK	Passed	
WP6_ImplementationPlan	Evidence Management	01_10	Copy Artefact from one Evidence to another	OK	Passed	
WP6_ImplementationPlan	Evidence Management	01_10	Copy Artefact from one Evidence to another	OK	Passed	
WP6_ImplementationPlan	Evidence Management	01_11	Drop an Evidence model	You can't drop an evidence model: an error msg is displayed.	Failed	<a href="#">229</a>
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Claims	01_01	Manual creation of claim		Passed	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Claims	01_01	Generation of a claim in argument patterns		Passed	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Contracts	01_02	Manual creation of a contract between two argument modules		Passed	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Contracts	01_02	Semi-automattic creation of a contract between two argument modules		Passed	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Contracts	01_02	Supporting an undeveloped goal with public goals from another module		Passed	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Contracts	01_02	Supporting an undeveloped goal with a reference to evidence in another module		Passed	

WP5_ImplementationPlan	Safety Argument Contracts	01_02	Supporting an undeveloped goal with undeveloped goals and evidence from diverse modules		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Automated compliance claims		Instantiation of a claim pattern from vocabulary	NB: user input required, and the success depends on the specification of categories in the vocabulary and claim type	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Automated compliance claims		Instantiation of baseline argument structure for compliance with information from project models		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting no change		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting change in a goal in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting removal of a goal in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting change in the context-goal associations in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting removal of context-goal associations in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting addition of a context-goal association in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting change in a solution in a module which is referred to in a contract		Passed

WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting removal of a solution in a module which is referred to in a contract	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting change in the context-solution associations in a module which is referred to in a contract	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting addition of a context-solution association in a module which is referred to in a contract	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Managing change within a modularised argument	01_06	Detecting removal of context-solution associations in a module which is referred to in a contract	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Pattern Instantiation Support	01_05	Semi-automatic creation of a contract see line 502	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Pattern Instantiation Support	01_05	Semi-automatic instantiation of system integration pattern	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Pattern Instantiation Support	01_05	Creating an integration pattern from modules when some of the modules only provide support (i.e. they themselves have no inter-module dependencies)	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan			Creating an integration pattern from modules when all of the modules have no inter-module dependencies	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Creation of a vocabulary	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary Support	01_01-01_05	Creation of category structure within vocabulary	Passed



WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary Support	01_01-01_05	Creation of terms		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary Support	01_01-01_05	Assignment of term single category		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary Support	01_01-01_05	Assignment of term to multiple categories		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Representation of meronym relationship between terms		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Representation of metonym relationship between terms		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Creation of claim type model	passed, but only in file-based tooling. Claim types tooling not fully implemented in prototype 3, but in standalone tooling	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Display of candidate terms from categories to instantiate claim types	passed, but only in file-based tooling	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	Instantiation of claim types from user selection	passed, but only in file-based tooling	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	user modification of claim structure (i.e. partial instantiation)	passed, but only in file-based tooling	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Vocabulary support	01_01-01_05	instantiation of a goal from a claim type in argument editor	passed, but only in file-based tooling	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Support for Contract Validation		All undeveloped goals are referenced in contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan			Some undeveloped goals are referenced in contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of Contextual Information in Safety Arguments	01_03	Contextual information can be recorded manually using argument editor		Passed

WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of Contextual Information in Safety Arguments	01_03	generation of context associations for goals as input to argument contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of Contextual Information in Safety Arguments		generation of context associations for solutions as input to argument contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of assumptions in safety arguments	01_04	Assumptions can be recorded manually in argument structures		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of assumptions in safety arguments	01_04	generation of assumptions for goals as input to argument contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Use of assumptions in safety arguments	01_04	generation of assumptions for solutions as input to argument contracts		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Libraries of reusable pattern-based structural templates for modular arguments		Patterns implemented in tool		Passed
				Patterns from D5.3	
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Support for Public Goals	02_01	Goals can be designated public within modules		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Support for Away Goals	02_02	Public goals can be referred to from parallel modules		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Validation on case study	04_03	Creation of vocabulary for automotive case study		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Validation on case study	04_03	Creation of modular argument for automotive case study		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	Validation on case study	04_03	Creation of claim types for automotive case study		Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	User Guidance	01_01	Display of definitions of reserved terminology to user	The intention is to regularise usage	Passed

WP5_ImplementationPlan	User Guidance	01_01	Display of context associations for selected claims input to a contract	The intention is to provide guidance to support the user in assessing the suitability of goals to support their argument	Passed
WP5_ImplementationPlan	User Guidance	01_01	Display of context associations for selected solutions input to a contract	The intention is to provide guidance to support the user in assessing the suitability of solutions/evidence items to support their argument	Passed

## 7.3.2 Evidence API

ID	Name	Steps	Expected	Actual	X	Comment	2. X	2. Comment
	General Use Case	Setup and start server	Server starts up and reports success	success	X			
		Ping the service with text/html (default)	Reply with 200 and info data	success	X			
		Ping the service with text/plain	Reply with 200 and info data	success	X			
		Ping the service with application/json	Reply with 200 and info data	success	X			
		Send a POST request to the ping	Reply with 405 - method not allowed	success	X			
		Send an OPTIONS request to the ping	Reply with 200 and allowed methods	failed	O	not implemented yet	X	works fine now (GET, OPTIONS) returned
WP6_ATC_009	Evidence Import	List all artefacts						
		List all artefacts with text/plain	Reply with 405 - method not allowed	406 Not Acceptable	X	this is okay, maybe even more correct?		
		List all artefacts in unknown path	Reply with 200 and empty result	success	X			
		List all artefacts in known path	Reply with 200 and list of evidences (JSON)	success	X	sometimes the first call produces an error (50X)		
		Get a single artefact	Reply with 200 and	failed	O	404 Not Found when		

			JSON result			used with path argument		
		Get a single artefact with invalid GUID	Reply with 404 - not found	success	X	404 Not Found		
		List artefact definitions	Reply with 200 and list of definitions (JSON)	success	X			
		List artefact definitions in unknown path	Reply with 200 and empty result	failed	O	path is ignored	X	works fine now
		Get a single artefact definition	Reply with 200 and JSON result	success	X			
		Get a single artefact definition with invalid GUID	Reply with 404 - not found	success	X	404 Not Found		
		Send an OPTIONS request to the evidences	Reply with 200 and allowed methods	failed	O	not implemented yet	X	works fine now (OPTIONS, GET, POST, PUT) returned
WP6_ATC_010	Evidence Export	Create new artefacts (POST) with empty body	Reply with 40X	success	X	415 if content type is not correct, 400 otherwise		
		Create new artefacts (PUT) with empty body	Reply with 40X	success	X	405 Method Not Allowed		
		Create new artefact (POST) with body	Reply with 200	success	X	a GUID can be passed but is ignored and overwritten, okay?		
		Create new artefact definition without a body	Reply with 40X	success	X	400 Bad Request		
		Create new artefact definition	Reply with 200	success	X	JSON of newly created definition was returned (with GUID)		
WP6_ATC_011	Evidence Synchronisation	Delete an existing artefact with valid GUID	Reply with 200	success	X	does not work with path attribute		
		Delete an existing artefact with invalid GUID	Reply with 404 - not found	success	X			

		Delete artefact definition	Reply with 200	failed	O	404 not found (??) but definition was removed correctly	X	seems to work now
		Delete artefact definition with invalid GUID	Reply with 404 - not found	success	X	404 not found		
		Update an artefact (POST) without body	Reply with 40X	failed	O	this is interpreted as create because GUID is ignored, okay?		
		Update an artefact (PUT) with body and wrong GUID	Reply with 40X	success	X	405 Method Not Allowed		

### 7.3.3 Process API

See section 3.3