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Abstract

• One measure of the quality of a product requirement is that it be verifiable. Verifiability assessment is one of the exit criteria for the Systems Requirements Review and is necessary for requirement validity. Nomination of one or more verification methods (inspection, analysis, modeling and simulation, demonstration or test) is often taken as the sole evidence of verifiability. A completed Verification Cross Reference Matrix is frequently considered as the final verifiability assessment and responsibility for the remainder of the verification effort is transferred to the test and evaluation and other implementing communities for completion.

• Lessons learned from many Programs have shown that a more robust application of systems engineering should include the requirements engineers (with detailed knowledge of product requirement intent) working with the implementing organizations as the best combination to define the verification requirements. Such definition should include statement of the verification objectives, success criteria and environment. Including this information in the “Quality Assurance” section of the requirements document allows for buy-in by the customer well in advance of implementing the verification activities. This information is used by verification personnel to generate one or more verification plans and to develop the detailed verification program. Verification requirements are planned into verification events which are executed using the proper system elements and environments. These verification requirements are key to establishing long lead verification facilities, tools and laboratories. Early definition of these requirements helps prevent facility re-designs and verification re-plans that can cause expensive delays. Finally, verification data analysis is performed, and the information compiled into verification reports certifying system product requirements compliance. This robust verification approach will provide proof of requirements satisfaction, leading to systems that meet the customers' needs at a lower life-cycle cost.

• This paper describes these concepts and steps in detail and provides examples for a set of generic aircraft requirements.
Verification Requirements – What Are They And Why Do We Need Them?

- Verification Requirements Specify the Verification Events Needed to Prove the Satisfaction of the Product Requirements and Help to Define the Verification Process and Environment

- Verification Requirements are Necessary for at Least Two Reasons:
  - Existence of Verification Requirements Demonstrates Verifiability of Product Requirements
  - Agreed-to Verification Requirements Define the Verification Program by Which the Contractor Shows that the Product is What the Customer Needed
Verification in the Product Development Life-Cycle
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A Day in the Life of a Verification Requirement

Verification Events Satisfy the Verification Requirements, **NOT** the Product Requirements.

Product Requirements are **Never** Complete Until The Associated Verification Requirements are Completed

The Culmination of the Verification Activity of the Design Requirements Results in a Verified Product.
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Start with Product Requirements

• The Verification Process Begins With Authenticated Product Requirements

• Examples
  - PR-1: LRU Markings
    • The product line-replaceable units shall be marked in accordance with MIL-STD-130M.
  - PR-2: Operational Availability
    • The product shall have an operational availability \( (A_0) \) of 97.5% at IOC.
  - PR-3: LRU Accessibility
    • Each product line-replaceable unit shall be able to be removed and replaced without removing any other item or displacing any cables.
  - PR-4: Recovery Force Communication - Nominal
    • The product shall provide a communications system capable of communicating with the ground command.
### Recovery Force Communications

The communications system shall provide a communications system capable of communicating with the recovery forces pre- and post-landing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verification Objective</th>
<th>Pass / Fail (Success Criteria)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perform Integrated System Test of the communications system capability to provide a</td>
<td>Testing will show that the communications system can transmit and receive audio at frequencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice communications and beacon with recovery forces pre and post landing within an</td>
<td>and ranges (power) represented by standard ground recovery force communications devices as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrated hardware / software environment</td>
<td>defined in TBD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform a demonstration of the communications systems capability to provide voice</td>
<td>Demonstration will show the ability for the communications systems to verbally communicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and beacon communications with recovery forces pre and post landing within a</td>
<td>with the on board communication production configuration equipment. The demonstration will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative environment and using a production equipment configuration</td>
<td>also show beacon tracking within communication ranges established by TBD.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Verification Cross-Reference Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph #</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Anal</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.15.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2.15.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifying a verification method is necessary, but not sufficient!
Verification Requirement Attributes

Objective
What is the purpose of this verification?

Method
What method do you need performed? What are the verification circumstances (e.g., laboratory, desk-top analysis, flight test)?

Environment
What are the environmental conditions under which the item will be verified?

Special Conditions (if necessary)
Are there any unique conditions (e.g., item configurations) necessary for the execution of the verification?

Success Criteria
What results are to expected?

Verification isn’t ONLY test!
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• VR-1I: Compliance of product markings shall be verified by examination of design drawings at the LRU supplier’s location prior to the LRU CDR. The inspection will show that each marking on the LRU conforms to MIL-STD-130M.

• VR-2A: The product operational availability shall be calculated using the results of the Government-accredited contractor-developed reliability and maintainability analyses performed during the design in conjunction with the Design Reference Missions documented in Report XXXX. The analysis will show that the product, in its operational environment, supported with its support equipment and personnel, across all missions, will have an operational availability of at least 97.5%.
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Sample Verification Requirements - 2

- **VR-3D:** Removal and replacement of all LRUs shall be demonstrated on the aircraft to show that each LRU can be removed and replaced without removing any other items or moving any cables.

- **VR-4D:** Perform demonstration to provide a communications system capable of communicating with the ground command team while in a representative environment and production configuration. Demonstration will show capability to communicate with recovery forces at TBD distances in the TBD terrain environment.
Sample Verification Requirements - 3

• VR-4T: Prove that the product’s communications system is capable of communicating with the ground command team by performing an integrated system test within an integrated hardware/software environment. Testing will show that the product can transmit and receive audio at frequencies represented by standard ground recovery forces communications devices defined in (TBD).

Verification Objective

Verification Method

Environment

Success Criteria

Note – there are no Special Conditions
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Verification Requirements Flow and Traceability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Design Requirements</th>
<th>Verification Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PR-1 PR-2 PR-3 PR-4</td>
<td>VR-1E VR-2A VR-3D VR-4D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VR-4T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verification Requirements Appear in the Same Specification as the Product Requirements to be Verified

Master Verification Plan

Examination VR-1E
Analysis VR-2A
Demonstration VR-3D, VR-4D
Test VR-4T

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product Requirement</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Exam</th>
<th>Anal</th>
<th>Demo</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Verification Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PR-1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VR-1I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VR-2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>VR-3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR-5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>VR-4D VR-4T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Create Detailed Verification Requirements (Verification Events)

Convert Verification Statements into Detailed Verification Requirements (Verification Events) by ----

For each verification activity identified in the verification matrix, a detailed description of the activity including:

- Verification configuration & its relationship to production configuration
- Associated prerequisites
- Constraints
- Objectives
- Procedures
- Relevant environmental conditions
- Pass/fail criteria - and necessary Data Set, Analysis models, if applicable.
- Sequence if applicable
- Verification Environment (i.e.; Lab, Flight, Production)

A One To One Relationship Exists Between the Verification Requirements and the DVRs
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Master Verification Plan

Examination VR-1I
Analysis VR-2A
Demonstration VR-3D, VR-4D
Test VR-4T

Customer Concurrence

Verification Modeling
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Verification Execution Flow

### Method
- **Examination**
  - QA, Manufacturing, Mission Assurance
  - Examination Points Identified
  - Tooling Requirements Identified

### Organization
- **Analysis**
  - Systems Engineering
    - Specialty Engineering
    - Design
  - Define / Build / Buy / Train Analysis Prior to Need Date
  - Accreditation of Analyses Tools Prior to Need Date

### Early Verification Benefits
- **Demonstration**
  - Systems Engineering
    - Specialty Engineering
    - Design, Operational Assessment
  - Define / Build / Buy / Train Demonstration Models and Simulations Prior to Need Date

- **Test**
  - Ground and Flight Test Facilities Development
  - Laboratory and Lab Software Requirements Identified
  - Facilities Requirements Identified
  - Long Lead Test Items Identified

---

**Early Verification Supports Multiple Organizational Functions’ Long Lead Needs and Prevents Costly Late Program Re-Work**

---
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Planning for Verification Execution and Product Verification

Rev 1  Rev 2  Rev 3

Requirements  Design  Build

Verification

Certification

Define Verification Requirements Early and in Detail to Establish the Entire Verification Effort

Long Lead Facilities Laboratory Design

Range Coordination

Design Requirements Software Analysis Tools

Discover the Verification Requirements Late and Have Enormous Rework to Establish the Entire Verification Effort

... and it Costs Relatively little ...

Early Verification Is an Effective Cost Avoidance Approach

... and it Costs a Lot More ...
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Summary and Conclusions

- The Verification Process Begins With Authenticated Product Requirements
- Define Verification Requirements, not Just Methods - The VCRI Is the Last Thing Developed in the Specification
- Verification Requirements Must State the Objective, Method, Environment, and Expected Results. There May Also be Special Conditions.
- The Master Verification Plan is the Guidance for the Verification Program
- Verification is Conducted Against the Product Defined by the Title of the Specification
- Verification Program Benefits are not Limited to Just the Systems Engineering and Test Organizations
- Define the Verification Requirements Early to Reduce the Overall Program Cost
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$A_0$</td>
<td>Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anal</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demo</td>
<td>Demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVR</td>
<td>Detailed Verification Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOC</td>
<td>Initial Operational Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRU</td>
<td>Line Replaceable Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MVP</td>
<td>Master Verification Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Product Requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QA</td>
<td>Quality Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Systems Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRD</td>
<td>Systems Requirements Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To Be Determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCRI</td>
<td>Verification Cross Reference Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCRM</td>
<td>Verification Cross Reference Matrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR</td>
<td>Verification Requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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