

**Date – 11/27/2012**

**Attendees:** CJ Clark, Adam Ley, Bill Bruce, Bill Tuthill, Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Carol Pyron, Craig Stephan, Dave Duberke Dharma Konda, Francisco Russi, Heiko Ehrenberg, Hugh Wallace, Jeff Halnon, John Braden, Josh Ferry, Ken Parker, Li Hui, Peter Elias, Roland Latvala, Wim Driessen,

**Missing with pre-excuse:**

**Missing:** Lee Whetsel, Matthias Kamm , Mike Richetti, Neil Jacobson, Ted Cleggett, Brian Erickson, Scott Wilkinson, Jason Chodora , Roger Sowada, Kent NG, Sam McMillan, Sankaran Menon, Ted Eaton, Rich Cornejo, Adam Cron , Bill Eklow, John Seibold,

**Agenda:**

- 1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
- 2) Use LiveMeeting “Raised Hand” to be recognized and take the floor
- 3) Discussion of ballot re-circ and deadlines.

**Meeting Called to order at 10:30 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

Discussion of ballot re-circ and deadlines

We are getting some push back from the chair of RevCom and best to withdraw from the Dec 5th RevCom.

The Standard will be dated end up being dated 2013. CJ tried to keep it 2012 but was not able to do so.

IEEE will go through draft and update any references to 2012 to 2013

CJ will update examples on website to reflect the 2013 date.

We can make the Jan 23<sup>rd</sup> RevCom.

CJ found issue in the 1500 section. Due to the nature of the change needed CJ feels that it would be best to withdraw the re-circ and re-circ again by Friday after the change has been made. This has also been suggested by Kathryn from IEEE.

Most of the changes have been editorial (syntax, grammar, etc) so far.

CJ would like support from group to remove re-circ and then re-circ later this week.

CJ would like to incorporate Bill Bruce’s editorial comments as well

Carol – CJ what is a non-editorial change you want to make?

CJ – it is editorial in my view and maybe Carl’s but potentially non editorial.

Ken – can we see the timeline laid out for going to RevCom and the re-re-circ.

CJ – need a new ballot draft by Friday is the date.

Ken – the one we see now is obsolete?

Carl – yes

CJ sent out email about DelayPO and shows the issue he would like to bring up.

CJ – Says that the issue is that we would be asking for something additional to what is already being done as it is written with the current wording.

Carl – this is an editorial change because the intent was for the rule to require the DelayPO because without the delay, there is a possibility of a race condition. In 1500 there isn’t a possibility of the race condition. The intent to prevent that race condition is met better by the additional wording to be added. It is doing what it is intended.

CJ – would anyone in the WG change their vote because of this? Because this wording is included?

Adam L – wouldn’t change vote for this but we can’t presume that out of a pool out of 85 that there wouldn’t be someone that changed their vote.

Carl – well it was what we intended

Adam L – no one really knows what you intended when you wrote. It should be clear.

CJ – that is why we are rescinding the re-circ. This is the change that needs us to restart the re-circ.

Carol – if there is a January time line we can work to that would be nice.

Ken – so for us that have started the re-circ how do we deal with the comments that we have.

CJ – it would be good to see what your comments are. We are looking to material comments. It would be good to understand what the comments are.

Carl – would like to see the comments. What I am able to accept as a change is narrowing. Technical change will stop everything but editorial changes will be limited.

CJ – should only be commenting on the changes that have occurred. We should be reviewing the changes.

Carl – finished with changes that were on reflector. Can generate PDFs

Ken shows his comments

Ken – modifications of system pin in lines 1161-1162 is too extreme.

CJ – sees this comment as editorial and not technical.

Ken – we can decide as a group that this is editorial.

Carl – response to the point that you are making is that the original standard system pins were only linkage. This is a clarification to the standard.

Ken – system pin is different now. Digital notion that we had in the past is going away.

Carol – making sure that old clauses that system pins must do this is referring to digital pins. Have clauses that have system pins and linkage VREFs can do this.

Ken – seems we have a new category.

Carl – not new just haven’t defined it. And didn’t do it in the past.

CJ – seems to be a nitpick.

Carl – understands what Ken is saying.. Reality in today world with mixed signal chips. Most designers would include digital, analog pins etc for system pins. Our definition is

out of date to industry usage. In order to avoid changing old text modified text to say that system pin was being used in digital sense.

CJ – rules of the standard is how you manage the pins. Designers wouldn't make decisions on based definitions.

Carl – not defining things for the industry. Defining for the standard.

Ken – comment #7. Lines 1346-1348. Seems to be missing a negation.

Carl – Agrees

Ken – line 2001 is not a sentence. “In addition, a signal ....”

Carl – agrees.

CJ – not sure you need the additional sentence.

CJ – solicits any other comments from the group.

Carl – until CJ says to do the re-circ PDFs, Carl will work on cleanup

Adam L – had sent Carl some comments before the last cutoff.

CJ – our approach is to provide a new re-circ draft and send a message to the ballot group and extend the time. Don't need to close it out and restart.

Carl – do you want an immediate PDF?

CJ – no. Would want to get the review of the working group.

Peter – What we felt was a requirement was not put in standard. Not sure how to continue now.

Carl – part of trying to figure out how to support what you want, we realized that the user key words, that it had not got into the standard. Had put that that back in. Will allow you and your tool, to add attribute to register fields. Also made sure there is nothing in the standard to stop you from doing what you wanted. We did make changes so you can do it the way you want to so you will be in the definition of the standard.

Peter – didn't study new draft, but as far as Peter knows he doesn't see how their problems are solved.

Carl – there is nothing preventing you from doing double scan in the standard.

Peter – you allow some tool dependency and that is something we don't like.

Carl – understood.

Wim – There is no portability between tool vendors. That is the real problem. Doesn't solve that I can do it right and if someone does it wrong on their tool is not helping. I will still have to defend my tool if I do it right.

Carl – standard does raise the issue and is something you can point ot.

CJ – there are problems when someone writes poor PDL there will be problems. But shouldn't require everyone to write extra scans. Added compromise to the standard to add key word and not restrict your method to standard.

Wim – will continue his discussion with CJ offline.

## IEEE 1149.1- 2012 JTAG Working Group Minutes

CJ – solicits addition feedback from Adam L, Peter, and Wim.

Adam L – not sure how to address the request.

Doesn't feel that there was must ever put behind the responses to his comments. Wasn't asked to provide any additional comment.

Vote stands.

CJ – feels that technical answers were provided with all of Adam's ballot comments.

Feels answers were sound.

Adam L – feels that the BNF should be described for pre and post substitution. And any tool vendor would see it that way.

CJ – feels that there were many tool vendors in the balloting group and no one else has raised the issue.

CJ – Also not hearing objections in p1687 about this and 1149.1 follows a similar methodology.

Adam L – not on the p1687 working group and will take these issues into consideration during balloting.

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

*Summary of Motions Voted on*

**0 Motions voted on**

**Next Meeting:** 12/4/2012 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.**