

LFR-FSW - Bug #1084

PA\_RPW\_BYTE\_POSITION wrong into a TM\_LFR\_TC\_EXE\_INCONSISTENT on TC\_LFR\_LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS

25/04/2017 06:04 PM - Veronique bouzid

Status:	Closed	Start date:	25/04/2017
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	bruno katra	% Done:	0%
Category:		Estimated time:	0.00 hour
Target version:		Spent time:	0.00 hour
revision:	r0		

**Description**

Cela ressemble à un bug déjà tracé ([#426](#))

Sur TC\_LFR\_LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS, un seul champ genere une TM\_LFR\_TC\_EXE\_INCONSISTENT, c est KCOEFF\_FREQ. Envoi du champ KCOEFF\_FREQ = 36 pour generer l inconsistent

08:31:25.474498, **TC\_LFR\_LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS**, CCSDS\_VERSION\_NUMBER = 0, PACKET\_TYPE: TC\_PACKET = 1, DATA\_FIELD\_HEADER\_FLAG: WITH\_HEADER = 1, PROCESS\_ID: RPW\_PID\_2 = 76, PACKET\_CATEGORY: PRIVATE\_SCIENCE\_OR\_TELECOMMAND = 12, (PACKET\_ID=0x1ccc), SEGMENTATION\_GROUPING\_FLAG: STANDALONE\_PACKET = 3, SEQUENCE\_CNT=7906, (PACKET\_SEQUENCE\_CONTROL=0xdee2), PACKET\_LENGTH=135, CCSDS\_SECONDARY\_HEADER\_FLAG=0, PUS\_VERSION = 1, ACK\_EXECUTION\_COMPLETION=0, ACK\_EXECUTION\_PROGRESS=0, ACK\_EXECUTION\_START=0, ACK\_ACCEPTANCE=0, SERVICE\_TYPE: EQ\_CONFIGURATION = 181, SERVICE\_SUBTYPE: LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS = 93, SOURCE\_ID: MISSION\_TIMELINE = 110, **KCOEFF\_FREQ = 36**, KCOEFF\_1 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_2 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_3 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_4 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_5 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_6 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_7 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_8 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_9 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_10 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_11 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_12 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_13 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_14 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_15 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_16 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_17 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_18 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_19 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_20 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_21 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_22 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_23 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_24 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_25 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_26 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_27 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_28 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_29 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_30 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_31 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_32 = 1065353216,CRC = 0x436f

08:31:25.484079, **TM\_LFR\_TC\_EXE\_INCONSISTENT**, CCSDS\_VERSION\_NUMBER = 0, PACKET\_TYPE: TM\_PACKET = 0, DATA\_FIELD\_HEADER\_FLAG: WITH\_HEADER = 1, PROCESS\_ID: RPW\_PID\_2 = 76, PACKET\_CATEGORY: ACKNOWLEDGE = 1, (PACKET\_ID=0xcc1), SEGMENTATION\_GROUPING\_FLAG: STANDALONE\_PACKET = 3, SEQUENCE\_CNT=89, (PACKET\_SEQUENCE\_CONTROL=0xc059), PACKET\_LENGTH=19, SPARE\_1=0, PUS\_VERSION = 1, SPARE\_2=0, SERVICE\_TYPE: TELECOMMAND\_VERIFICATION = 1, SERVICE\_SUBTYPE: TC\_EXECUTION\_COMPLETION\_FAILURE = 8, DESTINATION\_ID: MISSION\_TIMELINE = 110, TIME=0x8000001fd995, PA\_RPW\_TELECOMMAND\_PKT\_ID=0x1ccc, PA\_RPW\_PKT\_SEQ\_CONTROL=0xdee2, PA\_RPW\_TC\_FAILURE\_CODE: WRONG\_APP\_DATA = 5, PA\_RPW\_TC\_SERVICE=181, PA\_RPW\_TC\_SUBTYPE=93, **PA\_RPW\_BYTE\_POSITION=11, PA\_RPW\_RCV\_VALUE=36**

On devrait avoir PA\_RPW\_BYTE\_POSITION = 10 et non 11

J ai vérifié les autres commande de type LOAD\_xxx\_PAR. On met toujours le BYTE position du parametre et la valeur est l octet LSB du champ.

Paul, peux-tu verifier cela?

Le script utilisé est /opt/VALIDATION\_R3plusplus/lfrverif/LFR\_SVS/SVS-0008/tc\_execution\_failure\_report.py.  
Les fichiers de log (2017\_04\_20-08\_32\_02\*) sont rangés dans /home/validation/data/R3++/3.2.0.15/3.1.91/SVS-0008

Contexte du test

-----

FSW 3.2.0.15  
VHDL 3.1.91  
SocExplorerEngine.getSocExplorer: Version = 0.7.0, Branch = default, Changeset = c459540a6dbdcbb4e17f204685fce02c070ba971+  
EQM sans Timegen  
StarDundee  
-----

Related issues:

## History

### #1 - 25/04/2017 06:05 PM - Veronique bouzid

- Related to Bug #426: R3 \*\*\* TC\_LFR\_LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS: SY\_LFR\_KCOEFF\_FREQUENCY ne doit pas etre superieur à 35 added

### #2 - 26/04/2017 06:31 PM - paul leroy

- Assignee changed from paul leroy to Veronique bouzid

Je confirme, j'ai mis la position du LSB alors qu'il faudrait mettre la position du MSB, la règle étant celle que tu dis, à savoir qu'on indique la position du champ et on met comme valeur le LSB du champ. Correction à venir pour fsw >= 3.2.0.16!

### #3 - 23/08/2017 05:30 PM - bruno katra

Ce comportement non nominal est décrit dans le SUM 1.5 la demande du CNES.  
Correction a valider puis cloturer l'issue QUAND LE SUM AURA ETE MIS A JOUR !

### #4 - 13/07/2018 11:26 AM - Veronique bouzid

- Status changed from New to Closed

Bug corrigé en 3.2.0.18 ( version HK annoncé en 3.2.0.17)

08:45:53.834152, TC\_LFR\_LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS, CCSDS\_VERSION\_NUMBER = 0, PACKET\_TYPE: TC\_PACKET = 1, DATA\_FIELD\_HEADER\_FLAG: WITH\_HEADER = 1, PROCESS\_ID: RPW\_PID\_2 = 76, PACKET\_CATEGORY: PRIVATE\_SCIENCE\_OR\_TELECOMMAND = 12, (PACKET\_ID=0x1ccc), SEGMENTATION\_GROUPING\_FLAG: STANDALONE\_PACKET = 3, SEQUENCE\_CNT=3521, (PACKET\_SEQUENCE\_CONTROL=0xcdc1), PACKET\_LENGTH=135, CCSDS\_SECONDARY\_HEADER\_FLAG=0, PUS\_VERSION = 1, ACK\_EXECUTION\_COMPLETION=0, ACK\_EXECUTION\_PROGRESS=0, ACK\_EXECUTION\_START=0, ACK\_ACCEPTANCE=0, SERVICE\_TYPE: EQ\_CONFIGURATION = 181, SERVICE\_SUBTYPE: LOAD\_KCOEFFICIENTS = 93, SOURCE\_ID: MISSION\_TIMELINE = 110, KCOEFF\_FREQ = 36, KCOEFF\_1 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_2 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_3 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_4 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_5 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_6 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_7 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_8 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_9 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_10 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_11 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_12 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_13 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_14 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_15 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_16 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_17 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_18 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_19 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_20 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_21 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_22 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_23 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_24 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_25 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_26 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_27 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_28 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_29 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_30 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_31 = 1065353216, KCOEFF\_32 = 1065353216, CRC = 0x8600

08:45:53.844346, TM\_LFR\_TC\_EXE\_INCONSISTENT, CCSDS\_VERSION\_NUMBER = 0, PACKET\_TYPE: TM\_PACKET = 0, DATA\_FIELD\_HEADER\_FLAG: WITH\_HEADER = 1, PROCESS\_ID: RPW\_PID\_2 = 76, PACKET\_CATEGORY: ACKNOWLEDGE = 1, (PACKET\_ID=0xcc1), SEGMENTATION\_GROUPING\_FLAG: STANDALONE\_PACKET = 3, SEQUENCE\_CNT=87, (PACKET\_SEQUENCE\_CONTROL=0xc057), PACKET\_LENGTH=19, SPARE\_1=0, PUS\_VERSION = 1, SPARE\_2=0, SERVICE\_TYPE: TELECOMMAND\_VERIFICATION = 1, SERVICE\_SUBTYPE: TC\_EXECUTION\_COMPLETION\_FAILURE = 8, DESTINATION\_ID: MISSION\_TIMELINE = 110, TIME=0x800000188465, PA\_RPW\_TELECOMMAND\_PKT\_ID=0x1ccc, PA\_RPW\_PKT\_SEQ\_CONTROL=0xcdc1, PA\_RPW\_TC\_FAILURE\_CODE: WRONG\_APP\_DATA = 5, PA\_RPW\_TC\_SERVICE=181, PA\_RPW\_TC\_SUBTYPE=93, PA\_RPW\_BYTE\_POSITION=10, PA\_RPW\_RCV\_VALUE=36

Les fichiers (2018\_07\_12-08\_45\_59\*) se trouvent dans /home/validation/data/R3++/3.2.0.18/1.1.91/SVS-0008.

#### Contexte du test

FSW 3.2.0.18

VHDL 1.1.91

SocExplorerEngine.getSocExplorer: Version = 0.7.0, Branch = default, Changeset = c459540a6dbdcb4e17f204685fce02c070ba971+

EM1 sans Timegen

StarDundee

### #5 - 13/07/2018 12:49 PM - Veronique bouzid

- Assignee changed from Veronique bouzid to bruno katra

Attention remettre à jour le SUM version 1.5 puisque le bug est corrigé:

Ce comportement non nominal est décrit dans le SUM 1.5 la demande du CNES.  
Correction a valider puis cloturer l'issue QUAND LE SUM AURA ETE MIS A JOUR !

### #6 - 13/07/2018 03:57 PM - bruno katra

- Status changed from Closed to In Progress

### #7 - 19/10/2018 09:01 AM - Veronique bouzid

- Status changed from In Progress to Closed

**#8 - 13/12/2018 02:20 PM - bruno katra**

SUM 1.6 mis à jour suite à correction du bug