P1450.4 meeting minutes - 08/10/05

Attendees: Tony Taylor, Daniel Fan, Ernie Wahl, Jose Santiago, Jim O'Reilly

Not present: Dave Dowding, Doug Sprague, Jim Mosley, Tom Micek, Yuhai Ma, Eric Nguyen, Chris Nelson, Oscar Rodriguez, Steve Lill, Bob Roberts

Summary:

- Discuss issues arising from syntax subgroup work: disconnects between conceptual model and syntax draft(s).
    - Test flows not independent from test program (contained completely inside test program). Is that what we want, or do we want test flows to be defined outside test program block, and only referenced in test program.
        - After much discussion about flows/subflows and the variables and parameters used with those flows, we seemed to arrive at a consensus that, yes, the TestFlowDefs block should also be outside the test program.
        - Issues:
            - Subflows vs. top-level flows – how are variables defined, and what is their scope?
            - How do we distinguish between top-level flows and subflows? Answer – there is no distinction in the blocks themselves – only in how they are used.
            - Ernie – missing for me is what our notion of variables (global or scoped), and how this relates to the paramaters for test flows (and test objects). Need to have this clarified . . .
            - In general, we want to make things as generic as possible in definition/construction, and differentiate only in how they're used.
            - Ernie – notion of private (local) variables, as well as in, out, and inout. Need to make sure we have this capability.
            - Variable space – need to allow for multiple variable domains – to permit, for instance, separation of test program variables from design space variables.
    - Terminology in conceptual model and in syntax drafts needs to be brought into sync.
    - In the TestExec portion of test object, if it's desired to execute more than one test method (i.e., a microflow), is this done with a subflow, or do we want to allow a list of one or more test methods in the TestExec.
        - If the latter, then we need to work out the rules for what happens when one method in a microflow fails – do we immediately stop, or do we continue, using only the results from some test methods and ignore the others, or aggrating the results from all test methods?
        - Ernie pointed out that the conceptual model does not distinguish between a microflow and a subflow (i.e., they're the same thing). Need to talk with Inovys and LTX folks (whose SW has the microflow concept) to understand how this has been handled in the past.
    - How to deal with exceptions? Do we want to use different types of handling for different types of exceptions? If an exception is recoverable, how do we handle that (in contrast to non-recoverable exceptions)?
    - Phase1/Phase2? Phase 1 is descriptive and expected to be translated to an executable form; phase 2 is intended to be directly executable. Intent is to produce a phase 1 language, but we don't want to do anything to preclude or make more difficult a phase 2.

General announcements (from Tony):

- Dot1 document proofs back from printer. Dot1 WG needs to review proofs, and mark up for final printing. Expect to complete this within the next few weeks; Dot1 should be complete by or before ITC in November.
- STIL User's group now has a website (http://www.stilusers.org).
- P1450.3 meetings are starting to make progress.

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