

Date – 07/08/2011

Minutes of the IEEE-1149.1 Working Group Friday meeting

Attendees:

Adam Ley,
Brian Turmelle,
Carol Pyron,
Craig Stephan,
Roland Latvala,
Carl Barnhart,
CJ Clark,
Francisco Russi,
John Braden,
Dave Dubberke,
Josh Ferry
Ken Parker
Wim Driessen
Ted Eaton

Excused:

Heiko Ehrenberg

Meeting called to order at 8:35 am MST

New Draft: [P1149 1 Draft 20110617.pdf \(_clean.pdf\)](#)

Agenda/Overview:

REGISTER_ASSEMBLY continued discussions
BSDL memory bist example from Carol

Minutes:

REGISTER_ASSEMBLY

- CJ mentioned that passing values in to override defaults was still necessary for register assembly.
- Carl mentioned that iRead and iReset have structural implications, but that iWrite and Safe do not.
- CJ mentioned that iWrite and Safe give the tool enough information to proceed.
- Francisco and Carol asked about overriding values and Carl responded that you can only override values that are * - or X, you cannot override the 0/1 hard coded values. You cannot override anything that was predefined.
- Ken asked what REGISTER_ASSEMBLY does? Carl responded that REGISTER_FIELDS no longer supports hierarchy, this can be done in REGISTER_ASSEMBLY when it assembles the fields.

- CJ and Carol added that it is easier for a novice to understand, and that you can also define an array of fields with REGISTER_ASSEMBLY.
- Ken raised concern again about BSDL files getting too large and full of information not required for board test, and asked if this could be removed from BSDL without syntax errors for easier readability by test engineers.
- Carol added that today chip manufacturers have several versions of BSDL already. (in house, nda only, general customers), but also added that her biggest concern is how to verify all the new instructions and fields, and hardware implied by NoPI and SAFE values for example.
- Carl referred to these as the 'trust me' features. If you leave off the optional <field assignments> then PDL becomes a 'trust me' situation.
- Ken again raised concern about large BSDL files with most content not meaningful for board test, and there being too much information in the BSDL
- Francisco asked about the minimum requirements for BSDL. Carl responded the same as today, a TDR and its opcode are the minimum.

Carol next presented a new BSDL example for memory bist:

- Ted asked why are we defining memory bist in Dot1, and raised his concerns about feature creep taking over our Dot1 work now.
- Carol asked that we note in the minutes this discussion on whether we are overlapping with 1687 too much and that 1149.1 may have valid reasons for clear documentation of TDRs.
- Carl mentioned that it is up to the WG to decide how far we want to take the Std, and that some of our work is needed for the init-data register, and some additional work is for debug. He felt that once we get the debug features defined they can then be voted on by the WG.

Meeting adjourned: 10:00am MST

Action Items:

- This coming week more on fields and assembly.

Next Friday Meeting:

- Next week Friday July 15, 2011