



Meeting minutes

19/12/2007

1. Goal of the meeting

The main topics for the meeting are:

- Communication with the ANR: status on ‘accord de consortium’
- Deliverable status:
 - D1.3 (ST)
 - D2.3 (LIP6)
 - D3.1 (LSV)
- Analysis of the ‘trial before study1’ performed by Etienne Andre’
- Planning of next tasks and deliverables

The meeting has been done by phone call due to the SNCF strike.

2. Attendees

Patricia Renault	LIP6
Emmanuelle Encrenaz	LIP6
Pirouz Bazargan-Sabet	LIP6
Dominique Ledu	LIP6
Laurent Fribourg	LSV
Etienne André	LSV
Remy Chevallier	ST

3. Summary of the meeting

3.1. Communication with the ANR: status on ‘accord de consortium’

The ‘Accord de consortium’ is a document which describes the rules between each partner and the patents.

At ST side, the legal department has taken the ownership of this task.

3.2. Status on Deliverables

3.2.1.D1.3 (ST)

ST has presented the effort for each step in the design flow. Before publishing on the internet, ST has to check that no confidential information is included.

3.2.2.D2.3 (LIP6)

The LIP6 has presented what has been decided in term of abstraction flow and timing flow.

3.2.3.D3.1 (LSV)

The LSV has presented the different possible models:

- The most accurate one, ‘Modèle extrait par LIP6’, which includes for a given logic function each rising and falling edge for each inputs for each input configuration.
- The model used in BlueBerries project which includes for a given logic function each rising and falling edge for each inputs.



Meeting minutes

19/12/2007

- The less accurate one, 'Modèle envisagé pour VALMEM', which models for a given logic function the rising or falling edge for each inputs.

We agreed that the modeling of the critical path of each study needs more capacity than for the BlueBerries project. In order to reach results as soon as possible we plan to use the 3rd model at the beginning and improve the critical part of the design with the second one if needed.

The difficult point is, at the end to define, if the verification is not succeeded which part of the design must be modeled more accurately. This work is dedicated to people who know how the design is working and formal methods.

The same job is performed by the digital designer with the digital formal proof engine.

The following points have to be check at the beginning:

1. Check on a small example 'Trial before study 1', that the real timings are bounded by the minimum timings and the maximum timings with the 3rd modeling proposal.
2. Check that a heterogeneous model, melt of 2nd and 3rd modeling proposal, can be build easily from a full 3rd model

These points have to be checked as soon as possible.

3.3.Next deliverables

- D1.3: The study3 is not stating because it is not requested by the laboratory. Moreover, ST needs feedback from them for the study2 before.
- D4.1 is cancelled: The task descriptions of the first study in D1.3 is very close to the task description for the other studies because we cannot go deeply into the description for confidentiality reasons. Thus, instead of duplicating the D1.3 inside the D4.1 we have decided to cancel the delivery D4.1.

4.Actions

- Provide updated deliverable D1.3 with the management agreement for publication on the internet (Remy) [week51]
- Check that the timing modeling presented by the LSV can easily mix different kind of timing models on 'trial before study1' (LSV) [year 2008 week3]
- Check that the timing modeling presented by the LSV with only the 3rd modeling proposal provide boundary timings which are improved by including part of the design with 2nd modeling (LSV) [year 2008 week3]
- Check that all the data included in the study2 is according to the LIP6 wishes (LIP6) [year 2008 week11]
- Provide to the LSV with the new common exchange data format a part of the first study (LIP6) [year 2008 week3]
- Use the modeling strategy defined during this meeting for the formal verification to check that the abstraction part of the study1 provided by LIP6 can be verified (LSV) [week11]

**Meeting minutes**

19/12/2007

5.Next meeting

The next meeting is planned at ST office in Crolles during the week 11 in 2008.

6.Deliverable overview

No.	Title	Deliv.	Resp.	Target	status
D1.1	State of Art in eSRAM conception	R	ST	0→6	done
D1.2	Build web site for the project	R	LIP6	0→6	done
D1.3	Description of the conception flow applied on a study	R	ST	6→12	Study 1 done Study 2 done Study 3 not started Run time of conception flow done
D2.1	State of art in memory verification methodologies	R	LIP6	0→6	done
D2.2	Definition of a new functional and timed model	R	LIP6	0→6	done
D2.3	Mixing of abstraction methods and temporal characterization	R	LIP6	6→12	done
D2.4	Abstraction tool prototype	P	LIP6	12→24	ongoing
D3.1	Temporal automaton modeling adapted to memory	R	LSV	6→12	Slides presented report ongoing
D3.2	Temporal automaton model checking adapted to memory	R	LSV	12→18	ongoing
D3.3	verification tool prototype	P	LSV	12→24	ongoing
D4.1	Description of the conception flow applied on other studies	R	ST	12→18	Not started
D4.2	Experimentation of prototypes on real study	R & D	ST	18→36	Not started
D4.3	Comparison of results from current verification methods and new methods	R	ST	30→36	Not started

The targets are described in months.

Delivery naming: (R: report / P: prototype / D: demonstrator)

wk: week number

Q: quarter