

**Date – 1/24/2012**

**Attendees:** CJ Clark, Adam Ley, Bill Tuthill, Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Carol Pyron, Craig Stephan, Dharma Konda, Dave Dubberke, Francisco Russi, Heiko Ehrenberg, Hugh Wallace, Jeff Halnon, John Braden, John Seibold, Josh Ferry, Ken Parker, Peter Elias, Rich Cornejo, Roland Latvala, Roger Sowada, Sankaran Menon, Ted Eaton, Wim Driessen, Bill Eklow,

**Missing with pre-excuse:** Adam Cron,

**Missing:** Bill Bruce, Brian Erickson, Kent NG, Lee Whetsel, Matthias Kamm , Mike Richetti, Neil Jacobson, Ted Cleggett,

**Agenda:**

- 1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
- 2) Carl's Motions:
  - Motion to accept the requirements document as of Friday 1/20 meeting
  - Motion to confirm the decision made in April 2010 to adopt PDL as the language for documenting procedures. The specifics TBD by the WG.
- 3) Review of Annex C/PDL specifics discussion.

**Meeting Called to order at 10:44am EST**

**Minutes:**

Review Patent Slide – Slide Presented to the Group.

Solicited input from anybody who is aware of patents that might read on our standard.

No responses

Review of Working Group Meeting Guidelines

No Objections

Kathryn Bennett from IEEE – is observing today

Carl moves to accept requirements document as posted after Friday meeting on 1/20/2012

Carol – Seconded

Discussion

Ken – are these on the website.

Carl – no not yet

Carl displays the requirements document that was emailed out.

Carl points out that there were minimal emails and comments generated concerning the requirement document.

Wim – INIT SETUP how does the chip designer create the instance for the board

Carl – needs to be done by the board designer and not the chip designer.

Wim – init setup is just a function with parameters and all the parameters need to be setup for the board. It is not something that goes with the component specifications.

CJ – is there a specific sentence that you would like to modify

Wim- not at the moment.

CJ – we are getting off topic. We seem to be moving towards the specifics of PDL

Wim – don't think the requirements should be at the board level but at the chip level.

Roland – use the init setup at the IC level. Need to setup the IOs

CJ – standard isn't addressing the board level but can be used at the board level.

Ted – Init data/init setup should be per instance on the pad.. not “board”

Wording should be more broad. Same concept, but need to have individual control over the pins

Carl – this wording doesn't preclude it

Carol – don't know if the chip provider would provide the ability on a per pin basis. Maybe on a bus wide basis.

John S – agrees with Carol. Having it on a per instance basis is good.

Ted – the word board doesn't belong here.

CJ – suggests that we remove “board” and put “per instance”.

Carl – the point of this as a requirement is because we do not know what the init setup needs to be for a certain instance on a specific board. And there is a requirement to provide init setup and init run for each instance on a board. Where an IC reset or ECIDcode would only be needed once per type. So the intent was to assert the requirement for the board test engineer to create those specific board setup routines

Wim – needs to have parameters

Carl – that is one way

CJ – there is not a requirement to have parameters. But That is one way to do it.

Ted –In Item 3, can we define what “Board Level Testing” is?

CJ – do we need to define that?

Ted – this goes to the scope of our intention. What is the scope of the document?

Carol – intending to support whatever can be done through JTAG

CJ- do you want to add 1149.1 or through the TAP. Would that clarify it?

Ken – has interpreted this to be the requirement for EXTEST.

Ted – want to make sure we understand the intention of the document.

Camp for EXTEST

Camp to run functional test through JTAG using these structures.

Carl – added 1149.1 to help clarify?

Carl – not talking about just interconnect test. Also other standard tests that are performed 1149.1.

Ted – support for PRBS SERDES test. Is that considered?

Carl – that is a design specific test.

John S- 1990 standard supported INTEST. This isn't trying to claim new ground for 1149.1

Ted – just wants to make the scope clear.

CJ – 3 is saying init reset/init setup and IC reset

Ted – wants the document to be specific

Ted – if the document is to guide us developing the language wants it to be specific.

CJ – thinks the document covers the area

Carol – we are building a minimum set of requirement. Once the building blocks are in place you can do whatever you want with them.

Adam L – “The question of scope is at the heart of the matter . The question of scope does not pertain to what is within the purview of the standard but rather what is the scope of the work we are about for this revision within a time certain.”

Ted – makes a motion to table this motion.

No Second for the motion

John B moves to call the question

Carol seconds John B’s motion

Ted is opposed

No others opposed

**Motion - to accept requirements document as posted after Friday meeting on 1/20/2012**

Bill T. – Yes	Craig S. – Yes	John S. – Yes
Brian T. – Yes	Dave D. – Yes	Josh F. – Yes
Carl B. – Yes	Jeff H. – Yes	Roland L. – Yes
Carol P. – Yes	John B. – Yes	

Adam L. – No	Ted E. – No
--------------	-------------

Bill E. – Abstain	Francisco – Abstain	Heiko E. – Abstain
Ken P. – Abstain	Peter E. – Abstain	Wim D. – Abstain

Motion Passes 11 Yes, 2 No, 6 Abstain

Carl – motion to confirm decision made in April 2010 to adopt a version of PDL based on PDL of p1687 as the language for documenting procedures and specific details of the language to be worked out by the Working Group.

Hugh – it would be a good objective to have high degree of compatibility to 1687. Would be bad to frustrate users of the 2 standards.

Seconded – Bill E.

Floor opened for discussion.

Ted – can we have clarification of based on p1687

CJ – have presented needs to 1687 working group to make modifications for compatibility for 1149.1 and was told by 1687 WG that they would not make the modifications.

Ted – what 1149.1 presented were not the same thing as 1687 and why they were not adopted.

CJ – not had that technical discussion yet. This motion is to move forward with PDL in some form. Not going to solve the differences in PDL today.

Ken – based on 1687 clause. Would like to make that “based and aligned with”

Carl – that is a detail that the working group needs to determine. We are simply trying to confirm decision made back in April

Francisco – likes the idea that Ken put out. Don't want to support 2 different pieces of software with different tools for 1687 and 11491.

Carl – that goes beyond reaffirming April 2010 decision. It is a valid discussion for development of PDL. Not appropriate piece of this motion and should be part of the TBD.

Francisco – could add aligned.

Carl – not part of the April 2010 decision that we are trying to reconfirm.

Bill E – if we get bogged down in discussion the scope we won't get a chance to vote.

Hugh – is this a motion to reaffirm a motion.

CJ – this is a motion to reaffirm a decision that was made. So this is to formalize the decision.

Adam L – many of us don't have the context of the original decision made in April 2010. Would like to suggest that the context be provided or that aspect be stricken from the motion.

CJ – that context was sent out by Brian T. in email'

Adam L – can we post that context.

CJ – no. Not able to find

Brian – clarification April 2010

CJ – can you send it to the reflector or send it out.

Ted – use the word PDL does is it your intention to support both level 0 and level 1 constructs. Those are details to be defined by the working group.

CJ – does anyone want to call the question?

Ken – is it April 2011 or 2010.

CJ – 2010.

Ken – we should fix that on the motion.

Carl – agreed. Change it in the motion

Carol – calls the question.

Ted opposed to calling the question.

No others opposed.

**Motion - to confirm decision made in April 2010 to adopt a version of PDL based on PDL of p1687 as the language for documenting procedures and specific details of the language to be worked out by the Working Group.**

Bill T. – Yes      Craig S. – Yes      John S. – Yes

Brian T. – Yes      Heiko E. – Yes      Josh F. – Yes

Carl B. – Yes      Jeff H. – Yes      John B. – Yes

Carol P. – Yes      Wim D. – Yes

Bill E. – Yes      Peter E. – Yes

Adam L. – No      Ted E. – No

Francisco – Abstain      Ken P. – Abstain      Roland L. – Abstain \*

Dave D. – Abstain

Motion Passes 13 Yes, 2 No, 4 Abstain

\*did not answer at time of vote

Ted moves that Any differences between 1687 PDL and 1149.1 PDL will require the WG to use a different keyword.

Carol – not sufficient to have the parser user the pdllevel ?

Ted – from the last 1687 PDL tiger teams it became clear that there were significant differences between commands

John B- seconded.

Hugh – wants compatibility. But if you end up with something with different functionality will lead to confusion. Should pick a different key word to avoid confusion.

Carol – will those differences be highlighted?

CJ – yes.. Differences will be noted when we know what they are.

- Due to time constraints Ted's Motion will continue discussion on the next meeting. The motion will be voted on the next Tuesday meeting.

**Meeting adjourned: 12:00 EST.**

*Summary of Motions Voted on*

**2 Motions voted**

- **to accept requirements document as posted after Friday meeting on 1/20/2012**
  - Passed
- **to confirm decision made in April 2010 to adopt a version of PDL based on PDL of p1687 as the language for documenting procedures and specific details of the language to be worked out by the Working Group.**
  - Passed

**Next Meeting:** 1/31/2012 11:00 AM EST

NOTES:

1149.1 working group website - <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1149/1/>

Now using LiveMeeting as audio/video conference software

**[JOIN the meeting as PRESENTER](#) - this way you will not need to be made a presenter**

Just one person needs to connect VOIP to phone system. It's usually me, but if you connect first, you can connect the VOIP to the dial-in with the sequence below. Within LiveMeeting you must connect the Audio to enable the Conference calls. (Just we don't want to do it more than once).

Voice and Video -> Options -> Connect Telephone and Computer Audio -> Dialing Keys

[ppppp11491p\\*pp03820#](#)

**JOIN the meeting as GUEST** – will have to ask to present

Meeting time: Tuesdays 11:00 AM (EST) (Recurring)

### **AUDIO INFORMATION**

-Computer Audio(Recommended)

To use computer audio, you need speakers and microphone, or a headset.

-Telephone conferencing

Use the information below to connect:

Toll: +1 (218) 862-1526

Participant code: 11491

### **FIRST-TIME USERS**

To save time before the meeting, [check your system](#) to make sure it is ready to use Office Live Meeting.

### **TROUBLESHOOTING**

Unable to join the meeting? Follow these steps:

1. Copy this address and paste it into your web browser:

<https://www.livemeeting.com/cc/intellitech/join>

2. Copy and paste the required information:

Meeting ID: F9R6S6

Entry Code: k/d6<@M6j

Location: <https://www.livemeeting.com/cc/intellitech>

If you still cannot enter the meeting, [contact support](#).

### **NOTICE**

**Microsoft Office Live Meeting can be used to record meetings. By participating in this meeting, you agree that your communications may be monitored or recorded at any time during the meeting.**