Date – 08/28/2012
Attendees: CJ Clark, Adam Cron , Adam Ley, Bill Bruce, Bill Eklow, Bill Tuthill ,Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Carol Pyron, Craig Stephan, Dharma Konda, Francisco Russi, Jeff Halnon, John Braden, John Seibold, Ken Parker, Peter Elias, Roland Latvala, Wim Driessen,

Missing with pre-excuse: Roger Sowada,

Missing: Lee Whetsel, Matthias Kamm , Mike Richetti, Neil Jacobson, Ted Cleggett, Brian Erickson, Scott Wilkinson, Jason Chodora ,
Kent NG, Sam McMillan, Sankaran Menon, Ted Eaton,
Dave Dubberke, Heiko Ehrenberg, Hugh Wallace, Josh Ferry, Rich Cornejo,

Agenda:

1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
2) Use LiveMeeting "Raised Hand" to be recognized and take the floor
3) Editor's report is 8/29 our ballot draft?
4) Motion to submit 8/29 draft for ballot.   Do we need to do this?   We have done our best to reach consensus. 22 days later we are not at ballot.

Meeting Called to order at 10:56 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

Meeting unofficial got on its way with CJ and Wim discussing PDL and the use of multiple iApplys. This stemmed from an earlier thread on the reflector. Wim's example in tweemaalIApply.pdf which was sent to the reflector was shown.

Wim has some questions with the PDL that was written based on other examples he has seen. And wants to review this example.
Wim would like strict rules so that second iApply can be properly handled

Carl - There are no ordering rules in standard for multiple iApplies and how it relates to segments. Will address the section and add some clarity to the rule.

CJ – with 2 iApplys - the first does the update. The second does the capture.

Carl – In PDL0, the second iApply doesn't make sense.
        In PDL1 all of the data that gets scanned out gets put in the database so the iGets can look at it

CJ – the second iApply should be treated as a NOP and not illegal in PDL1.

Ken - There are two iWrites and one iApply. There must be multiple actions per iApply?
CJ – yes. Several things are happening behind the scenes
Ken – the order that the actions occur is unknown?
CJ – yes and their order not important.
        Only when you want to do interconnect between register A and register B.
        But we are trying to allow the DFT engineer to insert structures in a way that works for them and in a way that the tools can understand it.
Ken – you could put an iApply between the iWrites than it would become deterministic.
CJ - The register A and register B at the end will have the 0 and the 1 in them . but if you want to determine which register is written first and fully controlled than yes you can put the iApply in between.
Carl – can be written so that actions will be determined.
CJ – iWrites you don't tend to care which ones happen first. The iReads you tend to care which ones happen first.
Adam C – the iWrite is sticky?
CJ – correct
Adam C – the iRead is not sticky
CJ – correct
Adam c – the iWrite and iRead don't have to happen in this order.
        Issue is in fact that line 8 should be between 5 and 6.
CJ – line 9 iApply is the same as scan as on line 8. You don't know if you captured new data or not.
        If I was concerned I would put iApply after iWrites. And then iGet to verify what is in register.
        Than do the iRead.
Adam C – iGet is not doing iApply
CJ – correct, it is extracting data from database in PDL1
Adam C – it is from the iRead?
Carl – it is from the iApply
Adam C – if you never do an Iread and do an Iget than what happens.
Carl – when you do an Iget in PDL1 an iApply takes all of the scan data and puts it in a database. Iget so interrogates the data.
Adam C – Iread and Iwrite will give you the same information?
Carl – yes. iApply does all the work. The Iread and iWrite updates the database.
Bill B – what would the outcome be if the code was compiled as is.

CJ – iReads are used in PDL0. Setting expected data in PDL 0 and would not use iGets.
        In PDL1 the register is in the path and data is captured.

Ken – Spent over an hour looking at this code and ill at ease how much debate it generated.

Carl – will do what he can to clear up descriptive text in iApply.

CJ – this was being done on the fly and subject to mistake.

    Not bothered by the changing of the example and questions.

Bill B – iApply section is a bunch of facts. What is missing is on the order of an algorithm. Which outlines what happens when an iApply is issued.

CJ – let's take the improvements to the reflector.

Going to Ballot

CJ – would like to know what is the intention the vote that lets us go to ballot when the editor is ready? What is the criteria that dictates when the editor is ready?

Carl – whether I still have changes coming in or not. Still have enough changes coming in to keep busy with.

CJ – the vote on 8/7 to try to go to ballot.

      Would have liked to have a vote today to say if we are ready to go to ballot.

Ken – sense that there are still edits going on and we should see those edits before it goes to ballot.

Carl – there very few edits at the moment. Amount of input from people doing review and finding issues has dropped off significantly. If there is not a burst of new feedback than we go to ballot.

Carl – will sort through input to determine which are corrections and which are new features.

CJ – worried about when the "editor is ready" and concerned that the document will never be perfect and at some point we need to call it done and move to ballot.

Carol – is comfortable moving forward. And will continue to get feedback during the balloting

CJ – is interested to hear what the balloting process returns for feedback.

John S – today's discussion was clearing up some things and clearing up ambiguity. Was a good discussion

CJ – we can add clearer examples while going to balloting.

Carl – we only can add what is the balloting feedback.

CJ – can add that in as feedback during balloting.

John S – good to go with addition descriptive text on today's topic.

Carl – CJ are you happy with figure in B8?

CJ – yes.

CJ – who is the person that will decide if we are ready to go to ballot?

Carl – under the current circumstance I decide.

Carl – going to be this week unless legitimate corrections come in.

      iApply descriptive text needs to be dealt with.. It can either be done now or during ballot.

Adam L – Feels that the approved motion was a vote of confidence in editor and would allow him to exercise his best judgment as to when the draft is free of editorial concerns.

Meeting adjourned: 12:10 pm EST.
Summary of Motions Voted on
0 Motions voted on
Next Meeting: 9/04/2012 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.