- In the last meeting there was some discussion about reviewing the validation and synchronization aspect of the proposal. I have talked with our failure analysis team and this is one of their biggest concerns. Besides the issue of converting from a tester datalog to a diagnostics engine input format they routinely have issues of either incorrect atpg to ate file matching, or in most cases ate files have been modified.
- Some of the modifications to the ate files that they have had to deal with are:
  - 1-added initialization sequence to ate.
  - 2-change in pin-name from atpg to ate.
  - 3-added cycle in capture portion of pattern
  - 4-removed cycle in capture portion of pattern
  - 5-change of expect data to X in ate pattern
- I believe that the first modification is being covered in the proposal, has the second modification been brought up before?
- Modifications 3 and 4 could be debated if these should be allowed or handled. Most atpg tools now allow specifying the sequences used during capture which should eliminate modifying the pattern during translation to ate. But, there are legacy parts and flows that are slow to adapt. If support for legacy patterns is planned then we'll need to discuss support of this type of pattern modification.
- The 5th modification should not affect the validation of the data since only failing ate values will be captured. But this could affect diagnostics as the diagnostic engine is assuming the expect value passed on the bad device, while on the tester it's unknown.
- When we do review the validation and synchronization portion I would like to suggest we also determine what type of pattern modifications will be supported and which type will not be supported.

Additional Issues

- Cycle count starting from 0 or 1
- Multiple files in a test suite
  - Clarification on what is a test suite
  - One GDR v/s multiple GDR
- Test Mode Identification

Simple TestFlow