IEEE 1149.10 High Speed JTAG Working Group Minutes

Date – 07/14/2014
Attendees: CJ Clark, Adam Ley, Bill Tuthill, Brian Turmelle, Craig Stephan, Dharma Konda, Ismed Hartanto, Jon Colburn, Tapan J Chakraborty,Teresa McLaurin,

Absent with Excuse : Frans de Jong, Steve Sunter, Bob Gottlieb,
Not Present for ¾ of meeting:

Missing: Bill Huott, Carol Pyron, Jim Wilson, Kent Ng, Kevin Gorman, Tom Wayers, Heiko Ehrenburg,
Dave Armstrong, Roger Sowada, Dwayne Burek, Zahi Abuhanmdeh,
Mike Ricchetti, Philippe Lebourg, Saman Adham,
Gobinathan Athimolom, Gurgen Harutyunyan, Josh Ferry, Marc Hutner,

Agenda:

1) Patent Slide
2) Voting
          Are non-verbal yea/nay allowed in the WG voting
        (voting through chat window or otherwise)
3) Begin review of Clause 7
        a. Review of 7.1 and 7.2. These have been in prior versions. Comments?
4) Old business
        a. Change to arrows in 5
        b. Additional information on signals/states required for 1149.1 in 5
        c. Minor tweaks to Clause 4 spelling/grammar.
5) New Business
6) Adjourn

Meeting Called to order at 11:00 am EDT

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

<u>Voting concerning non verbal vote casting</u>

CJ – General rule is that you need to be present to vote.   If you chat for your vote, are
        you really present at the meeting? Are you actively participating?
Adam – chief concern is ascertaining the identity that are submitting vote by chat. Not
        that there is any suspect of attempting to circumvent due process.
        Email votes could be a different case.
CJ – not expecting anyone to bias the voting but would like process to be above board.
No other comments

IEEE 1149.10 High Speed JTAG Working Group Minutes

Adam made motion that During a working group meeting vote the Secretary is only to
      accept vocal responses.
Brian Seconded

Discussion?
No discussion
Yes

Adam	Craig	Ismed
Bill	Dharma	Tapan
Brian	Jon	

No
-
Abstain
Teresa

*Mike R was not eligible to vote

Motion passes
8-0-1

<u>Review of 7.1 and 7.2.</u>
Tapan – BNF is it a super set of 1149.1 BNF for BSDL?
CJ – not sure it is a superset. It is a BSDL extension.. 1149.1 allows you to create your
      own extensions, so this is more an extension
Tapan – the compiler for this should also be able to compile 1149.1 BSDL?
CJ – if you are already supporting 1149.1 and 1149.6 you would have an incremental
      amount of work to support p1149.10
CJ – it will work like 1149.6 does. We will have a package file that will declare first
      HSTAP as an extension

Tapan – I think we are heading in the right direction but need to digest the details.
CJ – Min and max differential swing? Any comments on that? Do we need to separate
      the transmitter vs the receiver differential swing?
Jon – feels we do need both
Dharma – need more time to digest it.
Cj – for completeness you are right, but in 1149.6 we had a similar discussion. Will go
      back and allow the person to have two different types of differential swing.
CJ – For the Physical Confection to the chip, there are not a good standard in testing
      today to plug your tester into a chip. Want to try and catch this right so you
      immediately know what your interface requirements are to get your chip to work.
      Critical piece we make sure we get right. Not able to support every interface in
      the world.
Ismed – are we going to by 1 by one or use an example? Are we going to cover
      individual protocol?
CJ – it is just an example. We can develop another example. This one happens to be
      SATA. Would like to show an SPI example, would be good to show the clock

On the SERDES our clock is embedded

CJ – any examples you would like to see.

Ismed – concerned that there would be many examples.

CJ – we are not obligated to show every interface. Can enhance the description some, but it's really the specifications. We need a robust specification to handle all the interfaces.

Would be beneficial to show interfaces that are different like SERDES and SPI.

CJ – the reason showing SATA instead of PCI Express, because PCIe is a trade mark. So we tried to avoid that.

Tapan – SATA txp and SATA rxp , does it imply the protocol behind it?

CJ – just a port name. just signal names. In mission mode they would be SATA IO pins, but we don't care about that when using 1149.10. In 1149.10 we are hijacking these pins for our HSTAP

Tapan – could lead to confusion. If you use the name people might think we are hijacking the SATA protocol.

CJ – in 1149.1 we used SATA and XAUI as pneumonic and didn't think we confused anyone, but in this context we can add more text.

Maybe for the first example we don't use SATA protocol names and use SERDES name.

Would like to keep the name though to illustrate the sharing of the pins between mission mode and 1149.10

Teresa – what was said was clear but not sure if there is anything missing.

Call for New Business

No new business

Please use reflector to review what is in the Draft.

Please send comments to reflector.

Anything that needs to be fixed or you would like discussed

Motion to Adjourn: Brian
Seconded: Jon
Meeting adjourned: 12:00 pm EDT

Next Meeting:
July 21st, 2014 11:00am

Motion Summary

> *1 motions made*
>> *a.* During a working group meeting vote the Secretary is only to accept vocal responses.
>>> *i.* Passes
>>>> *1.* 8-0-1

IEEE 1149.10 High Speed JTAG Working Group Minutes

Action Items
~~*Bill Tuthill – 10-21-2013 -Add minutes and Attendance spreadsheet to the website.*~~
~~*CJ   11-11-2013   Reach out to ATE industry and Probe Industry to get update on future of ATE equipment to see which data speeds and protocols they are heading towards.*~~
Philippe – Look into alternative method to create control information (pause, start, terminate, etc.) rather than using K characters in packet.
Bob – create a case study to show use of Attributes
Frans – will start some block diagrams of a simple use case to help illustrate the current architecture
~~*Dwayne – present to the group his ideas for a simplified scheme – Direct Interface.*~~

NOTES:

1149.10 working group website - http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1149/10/

Here is the WebEx conference link.

https://meetings.webex.com/collabs/meetings/join?uuid=MAG12PB7HN5W24AM2EOKIOM9KS-KERT

You can use VOIP on your computer or dial-in using the phone number below.
Audio Connection
+1-415-655-0001
Access code: 194 196 960