

## **P1450.4 meeting minutes - 02/04/04**

Attendees: Dave Dowding, Jim O'Reilly, Tony Taylor, Doug Sprague, Ernie Wahl, Tom Micek, Don Organ, Eric Nguyen, Jim Mosely, Jose Santiago

Not present: Yuhai Ma

### **Agenda:**

- Stylus presentation by Steve Cannon (Inovys) (1<sup>st</sup> hour of 2 hour meeting)
- Update on PAR status
- Follow-up questions/discussion from Stylus demo
- Progress report on STC/STIL .4 collaboration

### **Stylus presentation:**

Steve Cannon of Inovys went through a demo (~1 hour, 15 min., including questions/comments) of the Inovys software tools (especially the flow editor) to illustrate the flow constructs in Inovys' Stylus tester language. Very good demo (thanks to Don Organ and Steve for their efforts in setting up and presenting the demo!).

General impressions: Most WG members felt that Stylus could be a very good starting point. The demo generated a lot of questions and comments, as WG members probed how it mapped onto the constructs we've been developing. It doesn't have all the elements and capabilities that we've been discussing over the past several months, but could prove to be a good starting point. If the STC/STIL.4 collaboration goes forward, the STC flow language (essentially, Advantest's TPL language) could also prove to be a rich source from which to draw.

We (the WG) feel that drawing elements from those two existing languages (and extending them as needed) should speed up our progress.

Among the issues and concerns raised were:

- Questions about the language's flexibility - can user-defined elements (in particular, user-defined test methods) be added?
- The distinction between flow-nodes and test-method instantiations - can two different flow-nodes call or point to the same test?

We on the WG are hopeful that Inovys can at least provide documents describing the flow syntax (and best-case, as discussed in the 01/28/04 meeting, perhaps access to the SW to allow the WG to experiment with and learn more of the language nuances).

### **Progress on STC/STIL.4 collaboration**

STC Members and board are favorably disposed to working with STIL.4 group. Still working through the process of making this happen.

### **PAR status:**

Update from Tony: PAR P1450.4 resubmitted, approved by Rochit Kapur (TTTC chair), and forwarded to IEEE. Approval of PAR is expected at the April (?) IEEE meeting - no difficulties are expected.

### **Face-to-face meeting:**

We again mentioned that we need to pursue a face-to-face WG meeting within the next few months. Based on the locations of the majority of WG members, the west coast (Bay Area) or perhaps Colorado is probably the best location for such a meeting. WG members should explore the feasibility of attending the meeting (Tony had previously recommended scheduling a 2-day session, rather than just a single day).