1450.4 meeting minutes – 08/26/14

Attendees: Ernie Wahl, Jim O'Reilly, Ric Dokken, Scott Franzen , Carey Garrenton, Greg Maston
Not present: Paul Reuter, Markus Seuring, Oleg Erlich, Julia DiChiaro, Ajay Khoche, Mitsuo Fujii

Agenda:

- Ernie has expressed a concern regarding modification to areas in which there has been previous agreement (including agreement from members of the WG who have participated in past years, but are no longer active on the working group). From an email sent by Ernie to the reflector, dated 8/21/14, Subject: Process Proposal

  Over approximately the last fourteen years, many have devoted their intelligence, knowledge, time, and effort to STIL.4. Having had to resolve numerous competing concepts may explain why it took so long to converge on the syntax we have today. We'd adopted the practice of color-coding syntax document text to differentiate between proposals (red), semi-stable (blue), and stable (black) syntax. The number of people that were needed to agree to set text to blue or black has varied with the number of participants but the numbers have never dropped below three for black and two for blue.

  I mention this because of late we have, in my estimation, been much too eager to discard hard-won agreements of the past only to start again from scratch. My hope is to build on what we've achieved, honoring the contributions of those no longer able to participate. To that end, I would like to ask for an up or down vote on the following proposal, i.e., that we:

  1. Require 4 votes to overturn black text in effect out-voting the minimum of 3 that had previously agreed
  2. Require 3 votes to overturn blue text in effect out-voting the minimum of 2 that had previously agreed
  3. Require a simple majority to approve red text

  In this context, I interpret adding features to existing syntax as a *proposal* and subtracting features as *overturning* the existing syntax.

  This in my opinion will help ensure convergence going forward and accelerate our progress towards completion.
- Vote on process proposal as outlined above.
- Data-capture proposal:
  - Consider Paul Reuter input if any
  - Review proposal:
    - Consider separating data-capture from manipulation (extract serial or parallel data) from interpretation.
    - Try using existing data-types before creating new ones.
  - Review ramifications of making *captureMemArm* a function returning a Boolean value (section 6.8 and 6.6.4). See line 2268 (17 of example), i.e., define as both *function* and *action*? Would defining a standard test that captures fail memory (and compares signatures?) preclude having to address the previous question?
- Actions:
  - Follow C language model and add action names to reserved words (section 6.4, Table 1)?
  - Should actions consistently use parentheses?
- Specify the meaning of SpecVariable member function isDefined, e.g.: selected value is defined or Typ is defined in the absence of a selector.

- Review section 6.11.3.2 Shared Global Variable Memory, special attention to initialization sequence.
- Review Annex G Block Sequence
- Review Annex B Name Spaces
- Seeking help with coding examples: writing coding examples is an excellent way to spot documentation shortcomings. More participation equals more scrutiny. A complete production test program would be useful.
- Review Syntax Document organization and general content in light of emails:
  - Ric Dokken Sat 5/17/2014 4:09 PM
  - Jim O'Reilly Mon 5/19/2014 12:45 PM
  - Ric Dokken Tuesday, May 20, 2014 3:52 PM
  - Jim O'Reilly Tue 5/20/2014 10:57 PM

Summary:
Line numbers if any are with regard to STIL.4 syntax document dated Aug. 25, 2014.

- Syntax development process guidelines:
  1. Require minimum 4 or 75% votes, whichever is higher, to overturn black text
  2. Require minimum 3 or ??%, whichever is higher, votes to overturn blue text (percentage presumably higher than 50 and less than 75, i.e., 66?)
  3. require a simple majority to approve red text
  4. Add assurance that informed decisions are made: to vote on an issue a participant must have attended 3 of the most recent 5 meetings (as recorded by meeting minute roll calls or email participation)

- ACCEPTED: Remove Phase I phase II distinction, i.e., current document is to cover ATPRG, test program translation, and native tester language (used to be phase II) in total. The group may want to decide whether we want to provide support in excess of what we already have regarding issues previously deferred to phase II, i.e.:
  o input/output operations (source/destination definition, formatting)
  o adaptive test: fail-record based dynamic test pattern resequencing
  o parallel execution
  o multisite
  o exception handling
  o check "Issues List"

ACCEPTED: move If/Else/While to reserved words (section 6.4, Table 1)

ACCEPTED: with regard to use of parentheses enclosed Action arguments, leave syntax as is.

ACCEPTED: suspend work on data capture pending additional information from Mentor Graphics.

Action Items:
-

Reference documents (If logged into your google account, can edit. If not, can only view.)
- http://spreadsheets.google.com/ccc?key=0AoKiPr1I9LY9dF95dkhSTVVqOU5GbWJyWFNhY0JPX0E&hl=en
- Namespace resolution examples document:
  http://docs.google.com/Doc?docid=0AYKiPr1I9LY9ZGY4dmNjNTNfMGZkOGJ2bmZy&hl=en
- Scratchpad spreadsheet: https://spreadsheets0.google.com/ccc?key=tQ93VDnAZ-Cl9RFKpPrPDzw&authkey=COzyro8K&hl=en&authkey=COzyro8K#gid=0
- Scratchpad "Word" doc: https://docs1.google.com/document/d/1zVu2M8nTJsrm0nFbBhiuM8-YRt4ErYqdy_uSa3x3_T4/edit?authkey=CLrgwrsG#

Next meeting: 09/02/14.

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