

*HMA Follow On. Task 2: Feasibility Analysis Service
(Sensor Planning Service)*

**HMA-FO Feasibility Analysis Service
SOFTWARE SYSTEM SPECIFICATION**

Code : HMA-FO-DMS-TEC-
 SSS01-E-R
Issue : 1.1
Date : 07/04/2010

	Name	Function	Signature
Prepared by	Reuben Wright	DEIMOS Project Manager	
	Manuel Casado	DEIMOS Project Engineer	
	Corentin Guillo	Astrium Ltd Project Manager	
Reviewed by	Ángel Monge	DEIMOS Head of Section	
Approved by	Reuben Wright	Project Manager	
Signatures and approvals on original			

DEIMOS Space S.L.U.
Ronda de Poniente, 19, Edificio Fiteni VI, 2-2ª
28760 Tres Cantos (Madrid), SPAIN
Tel.: +34 91 806 34 50 / Fax: +34 91 806 34 51
E-mail: deimos@deimos-space.com



HMA-FO Feasibility Analysis Service
Software System Specification

Code : HMA-FO-DMS-TEC-SSS01-E-R
Issue : 1.1
Date : 07/04/2010
Page : 2 of 22

This page intentionally left blank

Document Information

Contract Data	
Contract Number:	22506/09/I-LG
Contract Issuer:	ESA

Internal Distribution		
Name	Unit	Copies
Reuben Wright	MOS	1
Ángel Monge	MOS	1
Manuel Casado	MOS	1
Teresa García	MOS	1
Internal Confidentiality Level (DMS-COV-POL05)		
Unclassified <input type="checkbox"/>	Restricted <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Confidential <input type="checkbox"/>

External Distribution		
Name	Organisation	Copies
Yves Coene	Spacebel	1
Pier Giorgio Marchetti	ESA	1
Corentin Guillo	Astrium Ltd	1

Archiving	
Word Processor:	MS Word 2007 (Compatible with MS Word 97-2003)
File Name:	HMA-FO-DMS-TEC-SSS01-11-E-R.doc

Formatted: Spanish (Spain-Traditional Sort)
Formatted: Spanish (Spain-Traditional Sort)

Document Status Log

Issue	Change description	Date	Approved
1.0	First release	26/01/2010	
1.1	All PR RIDs addressed (MOM-1, YC- , including reorganisation to match latest ECSS-E-ST-40C Section 5.1: Clarified that "the agreed HMA standards" are SPS 2.0 and EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS 2.0	07/04/2010	

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1. Purpose	7
1.2. Scope	7
2. Applicable and reference documents	8
2.1. Applicable Documents	8
2.2. Reference Documents	8
3. TERMS, DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATED TERMS	10
3.1. Acronyms and Abbreviations	10
4. GENERAL DESCRIPTION	12
4.1. Product perspective	12
4.1.1. HMA Project Background and Perspectives	12
4.1.2. OGC Specification Background and Perspectives	12
4.2. General capabilities	13
4.2.1. SFRE Function and Purpose	13
4.2.2. EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS Interface Operations	13
4.3. General Constraints	16
5. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS	17
5.1. Capabilities requirements	18
5.2. Performance requirements	21
5.3. System interface requirements	21
5.4. Computer resource requirements	21
6. VERIFICATION, VALIDATION AND SYSTEM INTEGRATION	22
6.1. Verification and validation process requirements	22
6.2. Validation requirements	22



List of Figures

Figure 4-1: SPS interface use case diagram 14

List of Tables

Table 1: Applicable documents 8
Table 2: Reference documents 8

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose

This is the Software System Specification (SSS), forming a part of the Requirements Baseline Document (RBD) for the HMA-FO project **Task 2: Feasibility Analysis Service (Sensor Planning Service)**.

The requirements cover the work corresponding to an open source Sensor Feasibility Reference Environment (SFRE) that will be used by ESA for the testing and demonstration of the Earth Observation Satellite Tasking Extension for OGC® Sensor Planning Service 2.0 (EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS) OGC 07-018 [RD 1]. There are requirements applicable to SF Client and Server systems which send and receive programming requests for EO products to support access to data from heterogeneous systems dealing with derived data products from satellite based measurements of the earth's surface and environment. Requirements have been sourced from Operational Scenarios Technical Note [RD 8], and the HMA-FO Statement of Work [AD 1] and the consortium's proposal [RD 7].

The document contains:

- Capabilities requirements for the SF client and server systems
- System interface requirements
- Verification and validation process requirements
- Validation requirements

1.2. Scope

This document is produced as part of the Requirements Baseline that shall be subject to review at PM1. Therefore, it is applicable to the project from PM1 onwards. Following this there will be a Software Requirements Specification (SRS) produced which will contain a functional decomposition, and software requirements. The SRS will also have forward and backward traceability matrices between the requirements listed in this document and its software requirements.

2. APPLICABLE AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

2.1. Applicable Documents

The following table specifies the applicable documents that shall be complied with during project development.

Table 1: Applicable documents

Reference	Code	Title	Issue
[AD 1]	SGSE-DFPR-EOPG-SW-08-0001	Statement of Work – HMA Follow on activities	1.2
[AD 2]	Appendix 3 to ESRIN/AO/1-5949/09/I-LG	Special Conditions Of Tender	-
[AD 3]	RES-POE/2009/34/LG/cb	Letter with the Invitation to Tender AO/1-5949/09/I-LG – HMA Follow On	-
[AD 4]	Appendix 2 to ESRIN/AO/1-5949/09/I-LG	Contract – HMA Follow on activities	-
[AD 5]	ECSS-E-ST-40C	Software general requirements standard ECSS-E-ST-40C tailored to small software projects	-
[AD 6]	HMAFO-MOM-0001-SPB	Minutes of the negotiation meeting held at ESRIN on 24 June, 2009	-
[AD 7]	HMA-FO-DMS-PMD-PMP01-E-R	Project Management Plan	1.0

2.2. Reference Documents

The following table specifies the reference documents that shall be taken into account during project development.

Table 2: Reference documents

Reference	Code	Title	Issue
[RD 1]	OGC 07-018	Earth Observation Satellite Tasking Extension for OGC® Sensor Planning Service 2.0	2.0
[RD 2]	OGC 09-000	OpenGIS® Sensor Planning Service Implementation Standard	2.0
[RD 3]	OGC 06-126r2	Compliance Test Language (CTL), Best Practices Paper	0.6
[RD 4]	WS-BaseNotification	Web Services Base Notification OASIS Standard	1.3



HMA-FO Feasibility Analysis Service
Software System Specification

Code : HMA-FO-DMS-TEC-SSS01-E-R
Issue : 1.1
Date : 07/04/2010
Page : 9 of 22

Reference	Code	Title	Issue
[RD 5]	OGC 06-121r3	OpenGIS® Web Services Common Specification	1.2
[RD 6]	HMAT-TN-0001-IGN	HMA-T Phase 2 Testing Policy	1.1
[RD 7]	HMA-FO-DMS-LTR-001	DEIMOS' proposal for HMA-FO Feasibility Analysis Service	13/03/2009
[RD 8]	HMA-TN-ASU-EN-0001	Operational Scenarios Technical Note	1.8

3. TERMS, DEFINITIONS AND ABBREVIATED TERMS

3.1. Acronyms and Abbreviations

The acronyms and abbreviations used in this document are the following ones:

Acronym	Description
AD	Architectural Design
AR	Acceptance Review
ATS	Abstract Test Suite
CCN	Contract Change Notice
CDR	Critical Design Review
CFI	Customer Furnished Item
CITE	Compliance & Interoperability Testing & Evaluation Initiative
CM	Configuration Management
COTS	Commercial Off-The-Shelf
CPU	Central Processing Unit
CR	Change Record
CTL	Compliance Testing Language
CVS	Concurrent Versions System
DB	Data Base
DDD	Detailed Design Document
DDF	Design Definition File
DJF	Design Justification File
DMS	DEIMOS Space
ECSS	European Cooperation on Space Standardization
EO	Earth Observation
EO-DAIL	EO Data Access Integration Layer
EOEP	Earth Observation Envelope Programme
ESA	European Space Agency
ETS	Executable Test Suite
FP	Final Presentation
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
GMES	Global Monitoring for Environment and Security
GUI	Graphical User Interface
HMA	Heterogeneous Missions Accessibility
HMA-I	HMA Interoperability
HMA-T	HMA Testbed
HMI	Human Machine Interface

Acronym	Description
HW	Hardware
ICD	Interface Control Document
IDE	Integrated Development Environment
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
ITT	Invitation to Tender
KOM	Kick-Off Meeting
N/A	Not Applicable
NCR	Non Conformance Report
OGC	Open Geospatial Consortium Inc.
OO	Object Oriented
PA	Product Assurance
PAP	Product Assurance Plan
PDR	Preliminary Design Review
PMAC	Payment Milestone Achievement Certificate
R&D	Research and Development
RB	Requirements Baseline
RID	Review Item Discrepancy
SFRE	Sensor Feasibility Reference Environment
SOA	Service Oriented Architecture
SOAP	Simple Object Access Protocol
SOW	Statement of Work
SPR	Software Problem Report
SR	Software Requirement(s)
SRS	Software Requirements Specification
SSS	Software System Specification
SVV	Software Verification and Validation
SW	Software
TBC	To Be Confirmed
TBD	To Be Defined
TS	Technical Specification
UML	Unified Modelling Language
WBS	Work Breakdown Structure
WP	Work Package
WPD	Work Package Description
XML	Extensible Markup Language
XSD	XML Schema Definition

4. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

4.1. Product perspective

The following sections describe the product in perspective with HMA project and OGC specification.

4.1.1. HMA Project Background and Perspectives

In 2005 the Agency launched the Heterogeneous Missions Accessibility (HMA) project. The aim of the HMA project was to involve the stakeholders, namely national space agencies, satellite or mission owners and operators, in a harmonization and standardization process of their ground segment services and related interfaces.

HMA Follow On Activities cover 4 tasks related to completing specifications and creating implementations.

Task 2: Feasibility Analysis Service (Sensor Planning Service) includes the design, development, testing and documentation of an open source Sensor Feasibility Reference Environment (SFRE) that shall be used by ESA for the testing and demonstration of the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS (OGC 07-018) [RD 1] specification. To support uptake, demonstration and testing of the profile an open source implementation of both sides (ie client and server) is to be developed.

4.1.2. OGC Specification Background and Perspectives

The functionality that OGC has targeted within a sensor web includes:

- Discovery of sensor systems, observations, and observation processes that meet our immediate needs
- Determination of a sensor's capabilities and quality of measurements
- Access to sensor parameters that automatically allow software to process and geolocate observations
- Retrieval of real-time or time-series observations and coverages in standard encodings
- Tasking of sensors to acquire observations of interest
- Subscription to and publishing of alerts to be issued by sensors or sensor services based upon certain criteria

Within the SWE group, the enablement of such sensor web service is pursued through the establishment of several standard interface definitions. The services are the following:

1. **Observations & Measurements (O&M)** – The general models and XML encodings for observations and measurements made using sensors.
2. **Sensor Model Language (SensorML)** – standard models and XML Schema for describing the processes within sensor and observation processing systems; provides information needed for discovery, georeferencing, and processing of observations, as well as tasking sensors and simulations.
3. **Sensor Observation Service (SOS)** – An open interface for a service by which a client can obtain observations and sensor and platform descriptions from one or more sensors.

4. **Sensor Planning Service (SPS)** – An open interface for a service by which a client can
 - determine the feasibility of collecting data from one or more sensors or models
 - submit collection requests to these sensors and configurable processes.
5. **Sensor Alert Service (SAS)** – An open interface for a web service for publishing of and subscribing to deliverable alerts from sensor or simulation systems.

The EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS in particular is concerned with:

1. Getting the list of parameters that can be specified for programming a specific sensor;
2. Verify the feasibility of the request that is going to be submitted;
3. Submit the request and then check its progress;
4. If necessary to cancel the submitted request;
5. Retrieve the sensor's acquired data.

This document, along with the updated EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS [RD 1] specification, constitutes the Requirements Baseline for this Sensor Feasibility Reference Environment (SFRE). The version of this extension specification we shall implement is 2.0.

The OASIS standard Web Services Base Notification [RD 4] is used for allowing client systems to Subscribe to notification topics and receive Notification messages when various state changes are made.

4.2. General capabilities

The following sections describe the main capabilities to be supported by the software.

4.2.1. SFRE Function and Purpose

The main purpose of the SFRE is the implementation and testing of the interfaces to Sensor Planning Services dedicated to the EO Sensor domain complying with specification OGC 07-018.

The implementation of two different systems shall be carried out:

- Sensor Feasibility Client (SF Client)
- Sensor Feasibility Server (SF Server)

They will both support the full range of operations described in the specification. Note that user management/authorisation/authentication is not considered in scope for these systems. Requirements for the Sensor Feasibility Interface are relevant to both SF Client and Server.

4.2.2. EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS Interface Operations

The operations belonging to this interface are aimed at determining the feasibility of an intended sensor planning request, for submitting such a request, for inquiring about the status of such a request, for updating or cancelling such a request, and for requesting information about further OGC Web services that provide access to the data collected by the requested task.

Figure 4-1 shows the UML context diagram including all operations of the interfaces. The entities “SF Client” and “SF Server” refer to any software component that can invoke/be invoked to carry out an SPS operation. In particular the systems built in this project will support the full set of operations.




Figure 4-1: SPS interface use case diagram

The Use Cases above correspond to the Operations specified in the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS which can be requested by a client and performed by SF server. In addition, the triggering of notifications based on certain internal state changes of the SF Server are indicated.

The EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS specifies 13 operations that can be requested by a SF Client and performed by a SF Server. Those operations are:

1. GetCapabilities – This operation allows a client to request and receive service metadata (or Capabilities) documents that describe the abilities of the specific server implementation. This operation also supports negotiation of the specification version being used for client-server interactions. Moreover, the content section of this operation contains the list of sensorID provided by the service.

2. DescribeSensor – This operation allows the client to obtain a description of the sensors supported by the current SPS. The mission can decide on the amount of details provided in such a description (The use of hyperlinks can help keep the initial document size small and simple while still allowing the client to go fetch more detailed information).
3. GetSensorAvailability (optional) – This operation provides information on the availability of the sensor.
4. Validate (optional) – Several acquisition attempts are sometimes necessary to obtain a satisfying result (case of optical satellites on zones with cloudy tendency for example). The Validate operation can be used by the customer to indicate to the server that an acquisition is satisfactory and thus to stop collecting new images for this area.
5. DescribeTasking – This operation allows a client to request the information that is needed in order to send GetFeasibility (for a feasibility study), Submit, Update and Reserve (for tasking the asset) requests. The response contains a description of the input (tasking parameters) and optionally the output parameters included in status reports.
6. GetFeasibility – This operation is to provide feedback to a client about the feasibility of a programming request. Depending on the sensor type offered by the SPS, the SPS server action may be as simple as checking that the request parameters are valid, and are consistent with certain business rules, or it may be a complex operation that calculates the usability of the sensor to perform a specific task at the defined location, time, orientation, calibration etc.
7. Submit – This operation submits the programming request. Dependent on the selected sensor, it may perform a simple modification of the sensor or start a complex mission.
8. GetStatus – This operation allows a client to receive information about the current status of the requested task. The response contains a progress report which content is defined by each service instance in the DescribeTasking response.
9. Cancel – This operation allows a client to request cancellation of a previously submitted task.
10. Update – This operation allows a client to update a previously submitted task.
11. DescribeResultAccess – This operation allows a client to retrieve information how and where data that was produced by the sensor can be accessed. The server response may contain links to any kind of data and not necessary through an OGC Web services nevertheless OGC Web services such as SOS, WMS, WFS or WCS are desirable.
12. Reserve – This operation reserves a task. A reservation lasts for a certain amount of time and can be committed during this timeframe.
13. Confirm – This operation is used to commit a reserved task. By committing a reserved task the SPS starts execution of the task.

The last two operations enable clients to first reserve a task (instead of directly submitting it) and then confirm it later. These operations have many similarities to other OGC® Web Services, including the WMS, WFS, and WCS. Many of these interface aspects that are common with other OWSs are thus specified in the OpenGIS® Web Services Common Implementation Specification [OGC 05-008] [RD 5].

The encoding of operation requests shall use HTTP GET with KVP encoding and HTTP POST with XML, SOAP, and/or KVP encoding as specified in [RD 5]. Some operations will need to support both methods, as detailed in the finalised SPS specifications ([RD 2] and [RD 1]).

The SFRE will support all the operations, and all methods for the operations.

4.3. General Constraints

For the **SF Server development** the following environment shall be used:

Operating system: Linux.

Development language: Java using the JNI library for the interaction with the Earth Explorer CFI (written in C), or a native Java implementation of Earth Explorer CFI.

Essential libraries/software for the software development will be:

- Apache Tomcat webserver
- Axis2 SOAP framework
- XML libraries for reading/writing XML files

For the **SF Client development** the following environment shall be used:

- Operating System: Linux (Fedora 9)

Essential libraries / software for the SF Client development are:

- Apache Tomcat 6 webserver
- Axis2 SOAP framework
- XMLBeans for databinding
- Development language: Java 6.
- WorldWind Java library
- Google Web Toolkit

For Configuration Management the following software shall be used:

- CVS
- SubVersion

For **Project Management** the following software shall be used:

- Microsoft Project for planning and reporting of Project Management tasks.
- Microsoft Excel 2007 (Compatible with MS Excel 97-2003) for managing data such as RIDs

For **Documentation** the following software shall be used:

- Microsoft Word 2007 (Compatible with MS Word 97-2003) to generate the documentation.
- Adobe Acrobat (v7) to generate the PDF format to deliver the documentation via electronic media.

5. SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS

The following conventions will be used for the derived system requirement naming:

All system requirements will be named as

REQ-XXX-NNNN/VER

where:

XXX represents the type of requirement, which for this document, are the following:

FUN – Functional

INT – Interfaces

PER – Performance

RES – Resource

VER – Verification

VAL – Validation

NNNN Is a number providing an ordering within each requirement type. It starts at 0010 and two consecutive requirements are increased in 10 to allow the introduction of additional requirements in later versions of the document.

VER Is the issue of this document where the requirement was introduced or last changed.

Each requirement is presented in a tabular form constituted by four fields:

1. System requirement identifier
2. Requirement title
3. Validation method for the requirement:
 - **Test (T)** – Execution of the element under certain conditions to check the outputs corresponding to particular inputs;
 - **Inspection (I)** – Exhaustive evaluation of the code by manual reading;
 - **Analysis (A)** – Deduction method applied to documentation, code, test results, etc; it is partially or totally automated;
 - **Review (R)** – Review of project documentation.
4. Requirement text. Where the requirement has been sourced from the Operational Scenarios Technical Note [RD 8] then the identifier is indicated in brackets and the text of the requirement repeated. Where there are any additional comments these are added as a "note" after the unchanged requirement text. The terminology of the requirements has been updated in order to avoid ambiguous term *Order* and make clear that the requirements cover Feasibility Analysis rather than Product/Coverage Ordering. For example, the term "HM Ordering Function" has been replaced with "SF Client" (Sensor Feasibility) and "the mission GS" with "SF Server".



REQ-FUN-0040/1.0 Feasibility Analysis assessment T

(sourced from US3_1_GS_2421/Online Ordering)

The interface between the SF Client and the SF Server should provide a function to allow a user to assess an order prior to submitting it (ie a Feasibility Analysis). In case of failure of the assessment, the SF Server should provide a clear explanation of the rejection.

REQ-FUN-0050/1.0 SF Client repository of mission Feasibility Analysis options T

(sourced from US3_1_HM_2430/HM Ordering)

The SF Client shall keep a repository of mission GS's Feasibility Analysis options up-to-date by collecting the regular updates provided by the mission GS's. This repository shall be used to answer user requests for HM Feasibility Analysis options (US3_1_1, option 1).

Note: The options will be part of SF Client configuration and not dynamic or automatically updating.

REQ-FUN-0060/1.0 SF Client to request multiple missions feasibility analysis T

(sourced from US3_1_HM_2431/HM Ordering)

The SF Client shall split a user request for Feasibility Analysis options into mission specific requests, send them to the respective mission GS's and display the responses to answer the user request (US3_1_1, option 2).

Note: SF Client will not split the request automatically, it will allow the operator to choose which mission(s)/sensor(s) to task individually. The SF Client will not aggregate the different responses from a multi mission request.

REQ-FUN-0070/1.0 Feasibility Analysis assessment prior to submission T

(sourced from US3_1_HM_2432/HM Ordering)

The SF Client shall provide a function to allow a user to assess a Feasibility Analysis prior to submitting it. In case of failure or part failure of the assessment, the SF Server should provide a clear explanation for the rejected parts.

REQ-FUN-0080/1.0 Feasibility Analysis using EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS specification T

(sourced from US3_1_HM_2433/HM Ordering)

The SF Client shall allow users to place mission-specific Feasibility Analysis on the respective mission GS's (eg SF Server).

(sourced from US4_1_GS_2445/Online Ordering)

The SF Server shall offer an interface compliant with the agreed HMA standard - the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS [RD 1].



REQ-FUN-0090/1.0 SF Client Feasibility Analysis monitoring/search T

(sourced from US3_1_HM_2435/HM Ordering)

The SF Client shall manage the Feasibility Analyses and provide Feasibility Analysis monitoring resources to the user through blind polling GetStatus operation (based on the Estimated Time of Completion) or WS addressing operation and/or WS Notifications

REQ-FUN-0100/1.0 Loosely defined Feasibility Analysis T

The SF Client shall be capable of sending loosely defined Feasibility Analysis requests, e.g. ROI, time span.

(sourced from US4_1_GS_2440/Order Handling)

The SF Server shall be capable of managing loosely defined Feasibility Analysis requests, e.g. ROI, time span.

(sourced from US4_1_GS_2443/Online Ordering)

The interface between the SF Client and the SF Server shall accept loosely defined Feasibility Analysis requests, e.g. ROI, time span.

(US4_1_GS_2444/Online Ordering)

The interface between the SF Client and the SF Server shall use the agreed HMA standard - the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS [RD 1] - definitions of the loosely defined options such as ROI, time span.

REQ-FUN-0110/1.0 Feasibility Analysis Statuses using EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS specification T

(sourced from US13_1_GS_2670/Online Ordering)

The SF Server shall use the statuses defined in the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS [RD 1] to respond to Feasibility Analysis status requests coming from the SF Client.

(sourced from US13_1_GS_2671/Online Ordering)

The SF Server shall put all non standard statuses in the text field specially allocated in the SPS Extension for EO Sensors specification. It states: "the StatusReport provides an extension point that allows adding domain specific properties (extension)."

REQ-FUN-0120/1.0 SF Server Configuration for simulation scenarios T

SF Server configuration shall include the modelling of:

- Sensor unavailability: periods where the sensor is identified as unavailable.
- Weather conditions: a simple weather forecast, based on the data typically extracted from a Weather Research and Forecasting (WRF) model
- Station unavailability: periods where the relevant ground stations are identified as unavailable.

REQ-FUN-0130/1.0 Web Service Notifications T

Some SF server configurations shall allow subscription to get notifications about the progress of certain SF Server operations.

5.2. Performance requirements

REQ-PER-0010/1.0 SF Server response times R

The SF Server shall respond rapidly enough to all message receptions that sensible time-out parameters can be set for any client software. 60 seconds is the anticipated value, although this may be changed during testing if necessary.

This is the benchmark when a single message is being processed at once. In case of multiple clients connecting at the same moment it is permissible (though not expected) that one should be given a time out by the SF Server in the understanding that the client shall retry later.

5.3. System interface requirements

REQ-INT-0010/1.0 EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS R

The SF Client and the SF Server shall communicate following the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS (OGC 07-018) [RD 1] specification which forms the ICD for the SFRE.

REQ-INT-0020/1.0 Operation encodings R

The encoding of operation requests shall use HTTP GET with KVP encoding and HTTP POST with XML, SOAP, and/or KVP encoding as specified in [RD 5]. Some operations will need to support both methods, as detailed in the finalised SPS specifications ([RD 1] and [RD 2])

5.4. Computer resource requirements

REQ-RES-0010/1.0 Installation on Linux OS R

The SF Server shall be installed on a single server using a Linux OS within ESA for demonstration purposes.

6. VERIFICATION, VALIDATION AND SYSTEM INTEGRATION

6.1. Verification and validation process requirements

REQ-VER-0010/1.0 SFRE Testing R

A complete set of verification activities shall be performed upon the interfaces development.

Unit tests shall be designed, implemented and executed to test each individual software component composing the SPS and OP interfaces. Stubs shall be used in case of component interactions.

Integration tests shall be designed, implemented and executed to mainly verify the interfaces between software components.

Finally, **system tests** shall be designed, implemented and executed to validate the whole software.

REQ-VER-0020/1.0 Abstract Test Suite creation R

Many of the system tests for the SF Server will be encapsulated in the Abstract Test Suite written for the EO Satellite Tasking Extension for SPS (OGC 07-018) [RD 1]. They will be carried out in an automated fashion using the associated Executable Test Suite.

6.2. Validation requirements

REQ-VAL-0010/1.0 Validation process R

For each of the identified requirements in sections 5 and 6, a validation method shall be included