

>Is it the viewpoint presented few days ago during a webinar?

No, there were no webinar on these viewpoints.

>Do you (or plan to) use formal methods for requirements consistency checks (based on formal semantics)?

No, it is not planned.

> How automated is the transition from Capella model to TASTE model?

Same question than a previous one.

>Do you actually have a Capella sub-model that specifies Mil-1553?

Yes, but actually, it is not a sub-model, it is a viewpoint which is activated on the diagrams to add the parameters linked to the protocol.

There is one viewpoint by protocol.

>How is the "Model-based FDIR activity" linked with the SAVOIR FDIR Working Group?

It is linked to the SAVOIR FDIR Working Group in the sense that same engineers involved in the study are consulted and follow the Working Group.

For the moment, the Working Group is starting again. For the last 2 years after the release of the FDIR handbook, the Working Group was not so active.

In TAS, in the Model-based FDIR activity, engineers have produced guidelines for modelling activities and specifically linked to the FDIR domain.

As far as TAS has understood the new starting point of the SAVOIR FDIR Working Group, the objective is to propose a FDIR process and not only FDIR principles as it was the fact in the FDIR Handbook.

> How automated is the transition from Capella model to MOST model?

The Capella model generates exactly the files for the simulation input. It is only done with a click. But after, to run the simulation, for the moment, we need to copy and paste the documents automatically generated in a corresponding folder for launching the simulation.