To: GLAST LAT FSW EM-2 Design Peer Review Committee Members

Reference: LAT FSW EM-2 Design Peer Review Charge

In order to assure that the GLAST-LAT FSW Engineering Model #2 design and development is progressing satisfactorily, the GLAST-LAT Project Management is holding a FSW Peer Review. We request your participation in this Peer Review scheduled for January 29th.

The Committee Chairs and Membership are listed below. The Chairmen will be responsible for coordinating Request For Actions (RFAs) that are proposed during the review and producing a summary consensus report. The chair should submit the report to Lowell Klaisner within ten business days of the conclusion of the respective Subsystem Peer Design Review. RFAs will be tracked and reported at subsequent Monthly reviews.

A website with the review materials is being constructed at this time. Review material will be posted on or around January 26th. The URL for the website is:

http://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/flight/web/FSW_review_em2.shtml

The website provides links to a range of FSW documentation. To start at the top of the FSW web, go to:

http://www.slac.stanford.edu/ exp/glast/flight/web/FSW_home.shtml

The review team is strongly encouraged to review the design details in advance, since the presentation materials will be by necessity at a summary level.

EM 2 is an Engineering development effort targeted towards the LAT DAQ/FSW Test Bed and the Instrument Simulator provided to the Spacecraft Contractor. While no formal validation of requirements is intended with this development, EM2 does lay a foundation for the Flight Unit Software to be developed later this year. For this reason the review team is asked to ensure that the FSW team has a clear understanding of functionality to be provided, baseline control and verification approach.

The Committee is requested to evaluate and address the following questions:

- Is the subsystem design maturity, test and verification planning sufficient to meet the EM 2 objectives?
- Has the subsystem identified open design issues and established appropriate resolution plans to ensure closure?
- Is the subsystem near readiness for implementation and build/release testing?
- Has the subsystem identified open design or implementation issues and established appropriate resolution plans?
- Are there other issues the committee feels should be addressed?