

## **1450.4 meeting minutes – 05/15/13**

**Attendees:** Ernie Wahl, Jim O'Reilly, Mitsuo Fujii

**Not present:** Markus Seuring, Julia DiChiaro, Oleg Erlich, Ajay Khoche, Paul Reuter

### **Summary:**

Line numbers are from syntax document dated May 7, 2013

Discussed Mitsuo-san's request to not support MCPs and MCWs in phase I with the following observations:

1. We're trying to remain true to the tradition established with STIL.0 of integrating features requested by individual committee participants. As a result, more features are likely to be supported than any one individual committee participant may need or wish to use.
2. The current structure is backward compatible with STIL.0 in that named Signals blocks are not required for testing a single or packaged chip. STIL.4 uses keyword Device instead of Environment, the keyword used in the STARC example. Although the mechanism differs, it appears that the content hierarchy is the same as that used by STARC in that a single test program is assigned to the Device/Tester/TestHead/Partition hierarchy. STIL.4 refers to the test program by name. The STIL.1 environment statement illustration uses an Include statement requiring contents to reside in separate files. STIL.4 contents may be kept in separate files.

Would it be sufficient for STARC to ask their clientele to temporarily:

1. Not use named signals blocks and
2. Keep test programs for individual devices in separate files

to continue to use current methods and delay support for MCPs and MPWs?

We'll discuss this with SCSWG (SEMI-CAST STIL Working Group)

**Next meeting:** 05/22/13

For reference STIL .4 information can be found at the IEEE STIL website: <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/> (select the [P1450.4](#) link from the table) or use the direct link <http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/1450/dot4/index.html>