VHDL-200x (VASG) 1076 WG Meeting

10 June 2004
San Diego Convention Center, San Diego, CA.

Attendence

Jim Lewis
Victor Berman
Steve Bailey
Jay Larwence
Tim Schneider
Dave Rich
Deepak
Alex Zamfirescu
Ajay
Dave Barton
Ryan Hinton
Roland Henrie
Chuck Swart
Jon Shield
Eric Marschner
Dave Bishop
DJ
Donggxiang Wu
John Willis

IEEE slide shown.

05-23-2004 meeting minutes reviewed
Alex motion, Jim Second.
 passed.

Discussion
Steve highlighted PAR proposal for 1076 to replace 1076.b because
of need for broader scope.
Steve hightlight proposal, scope, intellectual property, we have copyrighted
matierial but have donation leters.

Alex Zamfirescu Phone 415-412-6903, 877 332 0676

Eric and Chuck raised issues here.

Membership proposed as both corporate and individual membership.
Reason for corporate is for getting funding. Cost expected to be about 200k.

Issue of voting. Does corporate vote and employees both vote? One person
do both votes? Eric say NO.
Eric proposed that we do corporate with exception of experts that are
current members as exception members.
Issue of voting and participation. Dave Barton say remember IEEE want to
be inclusive. Steve voting and participation is different. Anyone can participate.
Definition of what an organizational member CAG, IEEE CS definitions are different.
CS allows for an individual who is self funded and not Corporate person.
Issue of stuffing the ballot box. Neither membership types fixes this issue.
Working group needs to approve proposal first before submitting proposal.
Must resolve voting rules. Does DASC have access to proposal? Steve yes?
How does money flow from CAG. Dues to CAG don't go directly to standard unless
CAG chooses to fund it. Funding options
1) Groups sign up to split the cost.
2) Groups provide amount, work done with what amount is raised.

IEEE doesn't provide function in either group CAG/DASC
CAG doesn't provide an advantage

Dave Rich, IEEE SA bylaws (2003) allow for an individual to vote twice if one
vote is for individual and for corporate.

Does par proposal change standard number. Eric, No Steve.

Vote no sooner than two weeks. But need answers to membership.

Status VHPI
 Francoise Martinolle,
 Jon Shields - Peter has a few more chapters to do. Review of complete
   up to date. Making steady progress expecting July.
   VHPI support for assertions. Action Steve: post proposals
     Integrate with current VHPI,
     UML model generated
     Header file extensions.

   Donated from Cadence Jun 7, 2004 electronic version received. Static access some
   runtime ability. Callbacks on status of assertions.

Eric PSL proposals presentation:
 PSL 1.1 approved June 9 by Accellera, transferred to IEEE approved pending
details.~1Month

 Has draft proposal of how PSL is incorporated into LRM by LCS.

Eric highlighted his proposal's structure.

3 issues remaining

New issue
  Ambiguity between concurrent assertion and PSL
  assert FOO; -- VHDL means for all type
  assert FOO; -- PSL means at the start only

Steve: Please look at and review. Will make sure discussion is in assertion group.

Interoperability/Portablity need to leave PSL portable between Verilog, VHDL, and C.

Deepak -- Encryption proposals.
  Not much update, could encoding be base64 or flexible allow sixel.
  Issue lex or pragma element.
  Encryption access issue, comments but no details.
  There are export issues for encryption.

When will it be done (Steve).
  Eric -> Depends on reaction, if no reaction 1 week.
  Deepak -> 1 month

  Peter's pathname needs some work, enhanced generics looks done

Review meetings end of month, first of next month, will have notice.
Jim Lewis FT proposals

Issues

FT1 Done Chuck was there an ISAC issue similar and rejected why. Chuck to research.
FT2 Done
FT3 Done
FT4 Done
FT5A AI: Jim to clean up
  Issue should they be defined for any character array or just string
  Should it be implicitly declared for any integer type? Has issue of which is declared
  first integer or string.

FT7
  No easy resolution of alias issues, will revert back to package proposal.

FT8 Done,
  Package needs testing.

FT9 Done
  Is there an issue with physical types with units of XS? John to look at.

FT10
  Discussion of why needed. Start thread on need and conflict ternary_expression.
  Should we split it to two proposals? Issues
  1) Can condition signal assignment moved into sequential scope?
  2) Do we need ternary operator.
  3) Using syntax for both is confusing?
  May have to strike or simplify
  Review must be done by?

FT11
  Signal expressions in port maps needs owner?
  Any volunteers?
  Eric M.

FT12
  Chuck will have a counter proposal to post in a few days.

FT13
  Done

FT14
  Done
FT15
  Issue with sensitivity lists? From Jay

FT16
  Has description, need proposed language changes. Dave Bishop may have
  concerns will post. Mark Done Jim

FT17
  Deferred

FT18
  Need to be reviewed with PSL proposal. Need to be consistent.

FT19
  What to do for subprogram issues? Issues is globals read within
  signals. How about attribute and lint check? Jay

FT20

Change to Done Jim

FT21
  Done, Dave B. needs to move match function into std_match
  Discussion on FP and fix point packages. Issue for 1076.3 not
  in yet. Dave B. add floating point and fix will remove if issue.
  Jim add link to Floating point proposal

FT22-FT25

FT26 Discussion but Done

FT27
  Alex believes there is an issue on elaboration.
  Issues on fully bound definition, John R.

  Issue of passiveness definition.
  If you really want to have optional architecture?

  Problem with making checkers in entity.
  Entity can't contain a signal assignment that is a port?

Jim refers to look at TBV2 for associated array using type generics.
 possible candidate for each

Next meeting proposal for short in-depth meetings weekly or
bi weekly. Is 30 day lead for meetings. Jim is to schedule
meetings and agenda. First meeting not next week.
In person meeting? We will see how telecom reviews go.