Date – 1/31/2012

Attendees: CJ Clark, Bill Tuthill, Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Carol Pyron, Roland Latvala, Ken Parker, John Braden, Rich Cornejo, Ted Eaton, Jeff Halnon, Hugh Wallace, Adam Ley, Dave Dubberke, Josh Ferry, Dharma Konda, Peter Elias, Bill Eklow, Sankaran Menon,

Missing with pre-excuse: Heiko Ehrenberg.

Missing: Bill Bruce, Brian Erickson, Kent NG, Lee Whetsel, Matthias Kamm, Mike Richetti, Neil Jacobson, Ted Cleggett, Adam Cron, Francisco Russi, John Seibold, Roger Sowada, Wim Driessen,

Agenda:

1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
2) Motion: Any differences between 1687 PDL and 1149.1 PDL will require the WG to use a different keyword.
   a. Discussion: Are there currently differences in PDL commands? Which ones
   b. What is a difference?
   c. Are –options consider differences? There seemed to be some convergence that – options are allowed

3) Editor’s motions for draft on iRead/iWrite
4) Educational material for discussion (we probably will not get to this once again, given the time for other motions)

Meeting Called to order at 10:44am EST

Minutes:
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

Ted’s Motion – Con’t from last Tuesday WG meeting
Any differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL will require the WG (1149.1) to use a different keyword
Ted – Goal is to work as best we can to align the concepts of PDL. If we are going to change the meaning or instruction of a keyword, we should have a different keyword than one used in 1687.
-options are ok as long as they aren’t creating the same behaviors as another command that already exists in the 1687 PDL
   CJ – Answered one of the 3 question
   Ted – -direct is not part of the motion.
   CJ – Friday’s meeting discussed iCALL
   CJ – are there any differences in commands in Annex C
   Ted – Annex C changes. Not sure which rev of Annex C you are referring to.
   Ted – This is an overall goal. Not saying anything is bad. We should make an effort to consolidate the languages.
   And be open for discussion on the commands
   Carl – Differences would be on a command by command basis?
   Ted – the quickest way to get this done is to show what 1687 PLD is and look at any short comings. And then decide what should be done
   A lot of the changes to the PDL were based on a lack of documentation of 1687 PDL.
   Behaviors of some commands were not fully understood. We should discuss as a group to decide if it can be used or not
   Carl – this motion doesn’t have enough definition for me to make decisions on my own. Any discussion of differences will have to be done on a command by command basis
   Wim – is there a iPDLLevel command?
   Ted – there is an iPDLLevel. But intention would be to get it close as possible to make it portable between tools.
   Wim – agrees we should be as close to 1687 PDL as possible.
   Ted – if the option is changing the behavior we should discuss it.
   Josh – as a PDL developer, I don’t see why iPDLLevel is enough
   Ted – adding PDL that can talk to any TDR register will give us a lot of power.
   The PDL provider would need to make different PDL so it works right in the 1149.1 vs 1687 solutions
   Josh –I know exactly how the code works. Why would I put in different functions.
   Ted –then there would be a .1 name.
   Josh – the hassle is that I would have to look up a different option.
   Roland – For item 2a (agenda) is there an itemized list? Can we stick to the obvious commands and decide if those should be –options or a different name
   Ted – items a,b,c are not part of any motion. These are CJ’s comments.
   There are only a few commands currently defined. We should go through each command and examine each one.
   Francisco – in support in what Ted is talking about.
   Convergence helps with designing tools.
   It is a must that the 2 working groups agree to not create anything to keep from convergence.
   Ted – part c (referring to agenda) is not accurate to my motion. It has nothing to do anything with the motion. Never indicated that something isn’t allowed, I just said we should discuss it. Not part of the motion.
   CJ – it is a clarification. Would icall- direct be allowed?
Ted- not sure. This needs to discuss it. It needs to be brought to the group and discussed openly.

Ken – are there differences between the two languages that entertain deliberately using the same command differently?

CJ- differences in the architecture of the 2 standards. What are the differences?
  iApply 1149.1 only allows 1 instruction to be loaded
  iApply 1687 you could have multiple instructions loaded.

Hugh – concurs with CJ.

CJ – iReset also has a difference.

Do we need to change iAPPLY for this subtle difference? Can we have – options?

Ken – wants to understand what we mean by difference. Any difference is very broad and general.

Ted – iApply, someone took the concept from 1687 wrote it down and put it in the draft. Limiting iApply to having only one register may be ok, but we should discuss it as a group.

CJ – iApply was modified based on papers, and reflector discussions.

Hugh – if you copy the syntax and make the same and reword it, will try and create the same function. You will have 2 standards with similar commands but not the same. Would be very upset if a command that was supposed to be the same but had subtle differences. As for the options as long as they are clear would be good.

Roland – the –options, is that part of Ted’s motion.

CJ – is Roland suggesting a friendly amendment to Ted’s motion

**Roland – major differences would require a new keyword. Minor differences would require a –option**

Jeff H – different standards have different use cases so commands will be different. If we require them to be the same then they won’t be doing what they should be doing.

Hugh – Ken Posse (1687) asked Hugh to be moderator and normalizer for the two languages.

CJ – Concern is that we are going to get into a bunch of legal ease to work out the differences. We already know there are behavioral differences iapply and ireset as example. We want to converge on one language. Not in favor of coming up with new commands just for some minor differences.

We talk about 1687 as a known standard, but it might be possible that 1687 hasn’t got everything correct. If we require that we follow everything 1687 does and they get it wrong than we will also have it wrong.

With the addendum to this motion it makes it more palatable.

If we add any new commands we will make sure those are not the same as 1687 commands.

Ted – please define major and minor. Who makes that decision?

1687 has had some slack, but the concepts have been hard and clear.

1 PDL hasn’t been in existence for 5 years either so an open discussion would be healthy

**John B – still seconds amended motion**

Brian – motion to end discussion
Call the question.
No one objects

**Original - Any differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL will require the WG (1149.1) to use a different keyword**

**Amended Motion - (A major differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL would require a new keyword. A Minor differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL would require a –option)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam L</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Carl B.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Francisco R.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Josh F.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill E</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Carol P.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Jeff H.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ken P.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill T.</td>
<td>Abstain</td>
<td>Craig S.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>John B.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Peter E.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian T.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dave D.</td>
<td>–Yes</td>
<td>John S.</td>
<td>–Yes</td>
<td>Roland L.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted E.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Wim D.</td>
<td>–Yes</td>
<td>Darmha K</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 Yes / 3 No / 2 Abstain

Motion passes

Carl – No problem discussed with commands and syntax sent out.
   Iwrite/iread/iapply are proper subsets of the same command as in 1687
   iTRST added this command

Carl – motion **that Clause C3.9.1 be adopted subject to further refinement**

Brian Seconds
   Hugh – the whole document or just highlighted commands.
   Carl – what we are voting on is the clause 3.9.1
   CJ – this is the 5 commands and description.
   Ted – questions about iwrite. What do the JTAG tools do with the
   compliance enable pins? Are we open for that discussion later on?
   Carl – if any working group member makes a proposal it is an item for
   discussion yes.

Adam l- it doesn’t seem that these are ready for adoption.
   The text of the table with respect to the reset command is not
   consistent with the main body.
   Carl – You may be right. But we are voting on the clause and not the
   table. The table will be updated
   Wim – what is Unit under test?
   Carl – could be IP, could be a board.
   Ted – are we only talking about IP verification at the chip level or at the ip
   level. Having a hard time following how moving tap state machine to reset having to do
   with IP?

   CJ – talking about the IP having a tap controller
   Ted – how does the IP developer know what the implementation of the tap
   controller is. How does he know if there is clamp – hold?
   Carl – what is in the verification test bench that the ip provider is going to
   use? That is his choice. We are not specifying that. He has a reset signal coming into
   his IP. All of that are details outside of the standard.
   CJ – the issue of clamp – hold we have register fields and package files
   that the ic provider will provide. E
Ted – should make it clear that the reset is different than 1687
Call the question?
Brian calls the question
Chair calls if anyone objects.
No one objects

**Clause C3.9.1 be adopted subject to further refinement**
Adam L  - No    Carl B. - Yes      Francisco R. – Abstain    Josh F. - Yes
Bill E  - Yes    Carol P. - Yes    Jeff H. - Yes   Ken P. - Abstain
Bill T.  - Yes    Craig S. - Yes    John B. - Yes
Brian T. –Yes    Dave D. – Abstain    John S. -Abstain    Roland L - Yes
Ted E.   -No    Wim D. – Abstain    Darma K - Yes
11 Yes / 2 No / 5 Abstain

Francisco would like an official motion as a go between for 1687 and 1149.1
(This will need to be brought in the next meeting as the time has run out)

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

**Summary of Motions Voted on**

2 Motions voted on

- A major differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL would require a new
keyword.  A Minor differences between 1687 and 1149.1 PDL would require
a –option
  - 14 Yes / 3 No / 2 Abstain
  - Passes

- Clause 3.9.1 to be adopted subject to further refinement
  - 11 Yes / 2 No / 5 Abstain
  - Passes

**Next Meeting:** 2/7/2012 11:00 AM EST

**NOTES:**

1149.1 working group website - [http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1149/1/](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
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.