

Date – 07/31/2012

Attendees: CJ Clark, Adam Cron , Adam Ley, Bill Bruce, Bill Eklow, Bill Tuthill, Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Craig Stephan, Dharma Konda, Dave Dubberke, Francisco Russi, Heiko Ehrenberg, Hugh Wallace, John Braden, Josh Ferry, Rich Cornejo, Wim Driessen,

Missing with pre-excuse: Roger Sowada, Ken Parker,

Missing: Lee Whetsel, Matthias Kamm , Mike Richetti, Neil Jacobson, Ted Cleggett, Brian Erickson, Scott Wilkinson, Jason Chodora , Sam McMillan
Kent NG, Sankaran Menon, Ted Eaton,
Carol Pyron, Jeff Halnon, John Seibold, Roland Latvala, Peter Elias,

Agenda:

- 1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
- 2) Use LiveMeeting “Raised Hand” to be recognized and take the floor
- 3) Motion to accept B.8.20.1. This is the R_A section with the changes for SELECTVALUES, SELECTFIELD, BROADCASTVALUES and BROADCASTFIELD. This was sent on 7/22 and the final version is included in the 7/25 draft.
- 4) Motion to accept B.11.4. This is the wrapper serial port examples delivered on 7/24 using the new syntax. It’s included in the 7/25 draft. Some syntax errors were submitted 7/30 and it is assumed the fixes will be incorporated by the editor prior to ballot.
- 5) Motion to submit draft for balloting when editor is ready. It’s getting ‘time’ to move forward. Reflector traffic is light on updates/fixes. Is there a reason that the group would not be ready by next week to make a motion and vote?

Meeting Called to order at 10:40 am 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 Response

Review of Working Group Meeting Guidelines

No Objections

Item #3

Carl makes motion to accept changes made in B.8.20.1 subject to editorial changes

Brian Seconds motion

Carl – is the Parsing working?

CJ – yes.

Carl – wanted to verify there were no BNF issues

CJ – one issue. Mnemonic group name can't be identified in position. It is a vhdl identifier. Either you have a register name with no brackets so it is a generic register name or you are going to find a left bracket after you find the name and it will indicate you have a mnemonic name. so you need to understand that it is a mnemonic and not a register name

Carl – that is not a part of 8.20.1

CJ – Fair enough.

Carl – so everything is resolved for 8.20.1

Francisco – can we have a check list to say we are ready?

CJ – no checklist. Motion on the floor to accept the section B8.20.1

Francisco – though we were on section 5

Carl – Wrong Section number. Carl amends motion to reference B.8.21

CJ – what is this TBD ???

Carl – text that needs to be written. Descriptive only

No discussion

Vote called.

Yes

Bill T. Craig S. Wim D.

Brian T. Hugh W.

Carl B. Josh F.

No

Adam L.

Abstain

Adam C. Dave D.

Bill B. Franciso R.

Bill E. Heiko E

7yes/1no/6abstain

Motion passes

Item #4

Carl – moves to accept B.11.4 subject to editorial changes.

Brian seconds the motion

Carl – as editor at this point Carl does not intend to include Ken's structure. So B.11.4 is the only extensive example of selectable register. Has nesting and register constraints.

Yes

Adam C. Brian T. Francisco R

Bill B Carl B Josh F..

Bill T. Craig S. Wim D

No

Adam L

Abstain

Bill E. Hugh W.

Dave D. Rich C

Heiko E.

Vote passes.

9yes/1no/5abstain

Bill B- There should be some PDL with the example to show uses how to use it.

CJ – that is good feedback.

CJ – will create an iProc group.

Bill B- Also a good opportunity to show how to create instance names from 1500

In the case of the 1500, there is no problem with someone trying to figure out how the circuit works.. just maybe a problem with the PDI

The broadcast one might need some description as to what you are trying to do.

Bill B – will volunteer to review the dickens out of it.

CJ – are there anything else that we need to enhance or improve before going to ballot.

Bill B – little information about formal association of mnemonic names and register fields in the standard.

Carl – will work with Bill B in getting this information in there.

Bill B- Can you use a different mnemonic ID with CAPTURES, DEFAULT, SAFE,RESETVAL

CJ – yes

Carl – different group names.

Bill B -

CJ – group restriction is there because values in registers allows you to have mnemonics of TDI and mnemonics of TDO

A reset value needs to be one of the mnemonics.

Values you load into the register through shifting or reset vs values you are observing

Carl – no rules on this.. Will work with you on this one too.

Bill B – Error checking for mnemonics ID for read/write is very detailed

CJ – well known that it has to be part of the database.

Carl – that is a verification question. And a good one

Bill B – have to capture the group ID. A big hole.

Carl – which field key words are used you need to verify the mnemonic name needs to be the same.

Hugh – is this semantic or use case issue.

Carl – semantic.

Bill B – mnemonic ID needs to be handed in the semantic checking. User would have to know that too .

Big problem with this is wondering how many rules that are not in the book.

CJ – please don't direct that these are the chairs rules.

Bill B – not implying that you are playing an autocrat. Just implying what you know hasn't gotten into the draft.

CJ – not just what I know.. also what the group knows. Also clear to the editor. He wrote the section.

Hugh – CJ is write.. need due diligence by the whole group for inconsistencies.

CJ – Not broken. Might be details where a novice might not understand but feels tool vendors on the call understand the problem.

Hugh – doesn't hold water.

CJ – am saying there is some exception for the reader to have some knowledge in the field.

Hugh – doesn't feel that Bill B is a novice and respects his knowledge.

Bill B – if it isn't in the draft than can't understand it.

CJ – point taken and will update the draft.

Carl – will work with Bill on his input.

CJ – senses a little nervousness about going to ballot.

Bill B – nervousness is stopping putting new stuff in draft. Have we finished?

Carl – yes.

CJ – that is understood. Have fulfilled vote to add support for 1500.

Bill B – no more new stuff?

CJ / Carl – Correct

Bill B – need to work towards a preballot version of the draft.

Carl – exception with question on INIT table that may not be in.

But if examples and everything that needs to be done there should be a Monday publishing of preballot draft.

CJ – Is there a reason the group would not be ready for motion to accept draft for ballot

Need more detail on mnemonic ID

Need INIT Table. (Carl – if we want it included)

Need time to review draft

CJ – anything else?

Bill B – review of PreDraft Draft.

Understanding instance path and that segments don't count. Needs some words in the draft. This is still missing.

Hugh – will provide updated railroad diagrams.

Carl – BNF should be stable now.

Bill B- how long do we get to read the Draft?

Carl – matter of people being comfortable to vote to go to ballot.

CJ – have been reading the increment to help speed up review time.

Want to read through the incremental changes as a group.

Need to do a full read is not there.

CJ – a week to read draft should be all that is necessary.

Carl – if someone needs a dealt document (diff) from a given point to the current, send the request with some justification.

Bill B – biggest problem is finding out what is missing.

CJ – think it is possible that something that is omitted. Request for clarification from the working group could come up

Carl – balloting process could bring up some questions too

CJ – understand the need to be cautious, but at some point we need to pull the trigger. Could hem and haw over it for some time, but at some point we need to go forward and submit the draft

Bill B – in the front of PDL, the use model should be current and complete so it matches what we know today.

CJ - did slides before that show mechanism on how database works.

Carl – wanted to stay away from tools

Bill B – material in there is the biggest hint that is given to the implementer

Carl – not going to do tool level descriptions.

Introduction sections could be out of date if it hasn't been touched for 6 months.

Bill B – use model is what is mostly concerned about. And wants to make sure it reflects what is there today

Hugh – could you write your concerns in an email?

CJ – anyone else have similar concerns as Bill.

Is the standard unclear?

Heiko – hasn't followed anything in the last 2 weeks.

CJ – the question was more overall encompassing

Heiko – it will take a while to get it all out.

Wim – complained a lot about PLD in the past. Will probably complain about PDL again.

PDL isn't good for automatic test generation

CJ – there are areas of the PDL that you are not comfortable with or needs to be approved?

Wim – the whole concept. That PDL is just a description of capabilities of a chip..

Have concerns how to create it and how to take PDL from an outside vendor and automatically create a test procedure.

Not the moment to talk in detail now

CJ – will always have concerns. Whether they are going to rise to a level to say it's broken

Need to see examples of where you think it doesn't work. So that we can understand what the objections are

Wim – need to wait till Peter comes back from Holiday and review

Will provide more feedback at a later time.

CJ – will work on 1500 examples and create some PDL for it.

CJ – only way to see if we are ready as group will be to get a vote on the floor and see what the group feels.

Meeting adjourned: 11:54 pm EST.

Summary of Motions Voted on

2 Motions voted on

- 1. Motion to accept changes made in B.8.20.1 subject to editorial changes**
 - a. Motion passes 7/1/6**
- 2. Motion to accept section B.11.4; subject to editorial changes.**
 - a. Motion passes 9/1/5**

Next Meeting: 8/7/2012 10:30 AM EST

NOTES:

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

To Join the meeting

<https://www.livemeeting.com/cc/intellitech/join?id=2CQ2PQ&role=attend&pw=n%26d%5DNqX%284>

Meeting time: Tuesdays 10:30 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.