IBIS 7.0 Known Editorial Issues

The following is a list of known issues found in the IBIS Specification Version 7.0 document. These are editorial issues deemed to have no functional impact on the specification. Functional issues are resolved through the IBIS BIRDs page at <http://ibis.org/birds/>.

This document also contains a separate list of editorial issues discovered in BIRDs approved for the next IBIS version after 7.0.

All page numbers refer to the Adobe PDF version <https://ibis.org/ver7.0/ver7_0.pdf>.

1. (from Arpad Muranyi, Mentor Graphics)

I discovered a minor spelling error in the list of BIRDs added to this version:

BIRD194 Revised AMI Ts4file Anaglog Buffer Models

1. (from Mike LaBonte, SiSoft)

The description for Aggressor\_Only does not make clear that the incomplete coupling implied by Aggressor\_Only will render the entire conductive path associated with the Aggressor\_Only terminal as possibly unsuitable for use as a victim in crosstalk analysis. For example, if a pad-to-pin Interconnect Model terminal for pin A1 is Aggressor\_Only, but a connected buffer-to-pad Interconnect Model terminal for pin A1 is not marked Aggressor\_Only, that connection path should still be regarded as having incomplete coupling. A sentence conveying that could be added after this paragraph on page 306:

The Aggressor\_Only column entry is allowed on all terminal locations for I/O terminals to indicate such incomplete coupling. Terminals that include the Aggressor\_Only entry may not be suitable to be simulated as victims, as they do not experience the full coupling present in the real physical structure. If an I/O terminal is not identified as Aggressor\_Only, then the interconnect to that I/O terminal includes coupling to all interconnections deemed necessary for coupled signal analysis. Within any Interconnect Model, if a terminal line is identified as Aggressor\_Only, then the corresponding terminal line associated with the same pin\_name shall also be identified as Aggressor\_Only. {add new text here}

1. (IBIS Open Forum September 27, 2019)

It is not 100% clear that all file references in IBIS may have forward slashes to denote directory hierarchy, but they may not have backward slashes. Supporting\_Files on page 232 and DLL\_Path on page 233 explicitly disallow back slashes. However, file references are used in other places where there is no explicit backslash prohibition:

* [Interconnect Model Group]
* [External Model]
* EBD [Reference Designator Map]
* [Algorithmic Model]
* AMI Ts4file
* [Interconnect Model]

We could consider adding the prohibition in the above places, or simply establishing a global prohibition in File Naming Definitions on page 15. That section has a graphic showing only forward slashes, but it does not contain the text “slash” at all. That would be a good place to explicitly disallow backward slashes in all IBIS file references. Also, the definition of path should state that slashes separate directory and file names in a path.

1. (From Bob Ross, Teraspeed Labs)

Section 3.3 Keyword Hierarchy

Change

│ ├── **[Bus Label]**

│ ├── **[Die Supply Pads]**

To

│ ├── **[Bus Label]** signal\_name

│ ├── **[Die Supply Pads]** signal\_name, bus\_label

1. (From Bob Ross, Teraspeed Labs)

Throughout document, keep capitalization of “Of” consistent in keywords

[Number of Pins]  [Number Of Pins]

1. (From Bob Ross, Teraspeed Labs)

Page 320-321, Example 8:

Under [Interconnect Model] Full ISS\_pad\_pin\_IO

Change

11 Buffer\_Rail signal\_name VSS

To

11 Pin\_Rail signal\_name VSS

Under [Interconnect Model] Full\_ISS\_buf\_pad\_IO

Change

11 Pin\_Rail signal\_name VSS

To

11 Buffer\_Rail signal\_name VSS

1. (From Arpad Muranyi, Mentor)

Throughout document, be consistent with hyphenation of “post-processing” instead of “post processing”. Both are used. Using the hyphen is consistent with other usages of “post-processed” and “post-processes”.

1. (From Michael Mirmak, Intel)

Page 289 of IBIS 7.0 lists “Rx\_Gaussian Noise” instead of “Rx\_GaussianNoise”.

1. (From Randy Wolff, Micron)

Page 265 of IBIS 7.0 has the keyword [Diff\_Pin] instead of [Diff Pin]. Underscore should be removed.

1. (From Randy Wolff, Micron)

“Tells the parser” is found in IBIS 7.0 in four keywords: [Number of Pins] (pg. 160) and [Pin Numbers] (pg. 161) under [Define Package Model] and [Number of Pins] and [Pin List] (pg. 174) under [Begin Board Description]. The [Pin List] description also contains a second instance of “parser” to fix. Recommended to change to “Defines”.

1. (From IBIS Open Forum, June 26, 2020)

Review the IBIS-AMI section for use of “DLL” vs. “executable model”. Either change instances of “DLL” to “executable model” or add statement noting their equivalency. This issue came up during the review and vote on BIRD204.

1. (From Randy Wolff, Micron)

Misspelling “Rx\_Receiver\_Sensitvity” on page 253 in Modulation parameter.

1. (From Interconnect task group, October 7, 2020)

Review keyword descriptions for language describing column headers (as sub-parameters) and the number of columns following the keyword. BIRD208 is an example of best practice.

1. (From Interconnect task group, January 6, 2021)

Remove repeated “in length” from [Interconnect Model Group] description on page 31, [Define Package Model] usage rules on page 159, [Begin Board Description] usage rules on page 174, [Interconnect Model Set] usage rules on page 298, and [Interconnect Model] usage rules on page 299.

1. (Arpad Muranyi, Siemens)

Remove repeated “using the Table format,” from Other Notes section of Rx\_Clock\_PDF description on page 244.

1. (Justin Butterfield, Micron)

Fix inconsistencies between usage of "time domain" vs. "time-domain".

Approved BIRDs Issues List

1. (from Curtis Clark, ANSYS)

BIRD197.7: In the Other Notes section, the sentence “The EDA tool may use any method to do this.” is repeated. Delete the second instance.

1. (from Randy Wolff, Micron)

BIRD202.3: keep capitalization of “Of” consistent in keywords

[Number of EMD Pins]  [Number Of EMD Pins]
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