

**Date – 3/20/2012**

**Attendees(20):** Adam Ley, Brian Turmelle, Carl Barnhart, Carol Pyron, CJ Clark, Craig Stephan, Dave Dubberke, Dharma Konda, Francisco Russi, Heiko Ehrenberg, Hugh Wallace, Jeff Halnon, Josh Ferry, Ken Parker, Rich Cornejo, Roger Sowada, Roland Latvala, Sankaran Menon., Ted Eaton, Wim Driessen

**Agenda:**

- 1) Patent Slides and Rules of Etiquette
- 2) Use LiveMeeting “Raised Hand” to be recognized and take the floor
- 3) Editor’s comments on new draft
- 4) iSync discussions (Wim)
- 5) Proposal for alternative way to call iProcs for instances (Ted)
- 6) Proposal for alternative way to use iRead/iGet and PDL0 (Ted)

**Meeting Called to order at 10:30am EDT (Eastern Daylight Savings Time)  
Minutes:**

Hugh Wallace says that Agilent may have a patent that applies to this standard. CJ has asked Hugh to work with him to send the patent number to the reflector and/or to proceed with an LOA, if applicable. Hugh will work with his legal counsel.

Carl commented on the new draft from 3/19 that will be sent to MEC. Carl still has 8 items on his list for editorial changes in addition to changes to fix issues brought up in email feedback.

iSync question still remains as an outstanding issue before Carl will go to MEC. Once in MEC, we’ll start a pre-ballot review reviewing all new sections sine last standard release.

CJ has concerns that we will not make the deadline for release in 2012. The balloting in mid-May may not leave enough time for September RevCom. CJ addresses the need to get the draft to MEC ASAP.

Hugh stated that the WG needs to do its due diligence to fix problems in the standard. Carl states that he would not sign off to go to ballot until all known issues are addressed.

Carol asked that Carl add a comment in the standard saying that currently-shipping chips could be compliant to the new 2012 standard. The new changes in the standard do not break the many of the old designs.

Ken has asked if an old design can be fully described in the text of the 2012 standard. CJ and Carl reassured that this would be true. Text will be added to the new standard.

CJ asks if we should move forward with or without iSync command. Hugh asked if Wim would be presenting his iSync discussion to the working group.

5) discussion on a contextually procs or procs with namespace led by Ted Eaton

Should we extend the standard to use the namespace prefix to group a set of procs. Sets a group of procs to be associated with an entity name, a TDR register segment, an ATE, or other grouping.

CJ said the iProcGroup already performs this grouping.

Carl expressed that if we use the instance based grouping, then we can get back to an entity and its corresponding BSDL.

CJ talked to the iCall ATE::init\_setup; command.

Hugh stated that the new method to overload the init\_setup for running a modified init\_setup and add a new init\_setup if used on ATE/context can use a different modified init\_setup.

Ted commented that the IP provider may provide a different set of procs based on the mode of operation. Ted does not think that the end user would not have to hand modify the routines.

Ken asked about meaning of ATE in regards to init\_setup. Does the ATE engineer have to use multiple init\_setup procs? Ted said that ATE was not a good choice of group name. Ken agreed to dismiss his assumptions based on the name.

Ted said that she would group a set of procs to categorize the procs for a certain IP. The switch for the namespace is optional.

Carol talked to the init\_setup routine. Would a board-level test engineer modify the init\_setup to work for different namespaces? Ted responded that the namespace is a grouping.

Carl asked that we use a -context instead of -iProcNameSpace. Is there something that the tools would do with the namespace versus a prefix? Ted stated that the tool could use the namespaces in pull-downs.

Carl asks what is the advantage of this technique? No need for -direct.

Brian stated that he did not see much difference between the new method and the current method of namespace handling. Carl said that the standard does not support "::" now.

Heiko asked that procedure can have the same name in different namespaces. CJ responded yes.

## IEEE 1149.1- 2012 JTAG Working Group Minutes

Hugh addressed the difference between ATE\_name vs ATE::name. The benefit of the namespace is that you can state a sticky command with the namespace at the top of a file and then change the namespace can be changed as the script goes on. The PDL can use the useNameSpace command to select the grouping to pull the routines from.

CJ asked Ted if the scope can be set. Ted said that there is a command and that the commands can stand on their own and not need the UseNameSpace.

Hugh said that the namespace concept would be extremely helpful. Without the “use statement,” the command has not utility.

Ken has asked that namespace be described in the current standard.

Hugh has agreed to provide Carl the description of the proc target command as provided in the P1687 standard.

When does the iProc target command get cleared? End of the proc, end of the file? CJ stated that the use of the end of the file can't be used in Tcl.

Motion1:

Proposal to have the editor write a draft proposal to add –context to iProcGroup to support name spaces.

(This includes a use of ‘useNameSpace’)

(Required as this is PDL0)

Adam Ley	Abs	Dharma Konda	Abs	Ken Parker	Abs
Brian Turmelle	No	Franciso Russi	Abs	Rich Cornejo	Abs
Carl Barnhart	Yes	Heiko Ehrenberg	Abs	Roland Latvala	Yes
Carol Pyron	Yes	Hugh Wallace	Yes	Sankaran Menon	Yes
Craig Stephan	No	Jeff Halnon	Abs	Ted Eaton	Yes
Dave Dubberke	Abs	Josh Ferry	Yes	Wim Driessen	Abs

Totals: 7 Yes, 2 No, 9 Abstain

Motion Passed

Wim asked to talk about iSync. Wim is concerned that a test engineer would have to learn PDL to implement the init\_setup. CJ has stated that Wim should draft a counter proposal. Wim does not want to use PDL to set the init-setup register.

Ken Parker addressed that the standard says that PDL is given as a board test language. CJ said the standard shows a scan chain with multiple components and thinks that the diagram is intended to show how to talk to individual components on a chain.

Carol stated the concern that if Wim's idea that init\_setup be limited to one procedure with parameters would be too restrictive. Carol would need to carefully inspect any further changes to init\_setup.

## IEEE 1149.1- 2012 JTAG Working Group Minutes

Wim said that the init-setup is better done where all registers are provided in the BSDL. He has concerns that he would have to ask his customers to learn PDL to use init-setup. He proposed removing PDL from init-setup and the standard. Wim prefers to constrain init-setup to a single scan.

Carol stated the need for multiple scans to support power domain control.

Wim stated that the JTAG Tech tool can intelligently turn on domains.

CJ expressed the importance to design a standard that has an easy method to configure the chip for test. The PDL enables this.

Wim stated that his customers are not the type of people who can edit PDL, so he has to automate the process with GUIs. Wim is not a supporter of a PDL template because the signals are not always directly linked to the BSDL.

Carl stated that the init-setup template can be used directly or easily modified and the process for his example design was straight-forward.

CJ expressed the need for a language to describe how to configure and access complex chips.

Wim and CJ discussed transitioning state machine through the TAP states to perform a read-modify-write operation.

### **New topics:**

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

**Next meeting:** 3/23/2012 11:30am EDT. (Eastern Daylight Savings Time)

NOTES:

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

**[Join the meeting](#)**

**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: 2CQ2PQ

Entry Code: n&d]NqX(4

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.