

Summary of Cliff's votes (see attachment for comments)

SVDB 909 Yes
SVDB 1265 Yes
SVDB 1278 No
SVDB 1360 Yes
SVDB 1487 Yes
SVDB 1489 Yes
SVDB 1573 Yes
SVDB 1610 Yes
SVDB 1645 No
SVDB 1750 No
SVDB 1993 Yes
SVDB 2006 Yes
SVDB 2029 Yes
SVDB 2081 No
SVDB 2092 Yes
SVDB 2097 Yes
SVDB 2102 Yes

(Although this restriction is not nearly as useless or cumbersome as the required difference between reg and wire, which also causes users to needlessly change code when moving code back and forth between always and assign)

SVDB 2140 Yes

SVDB 909 Yes
SVDB 1265 Yes

SVDB 1278 No

I am not strongly opposed to this proposal, but I actually prefer "initial block," "always block," "clocking block," "final block," etc., to initial construct, etc. I would rather see the BNF changed to reflect the _block style. I like the shorter, 1-syllable "block" to the longer 2-syllable "construct" (since I have to say it 100's of times in each training class).

Note that Draft4 of the 1800 standard has changed all "block" and "construct" instances to "procedure," which I more strongly oppose (see editor's note next to section 9.2). I think of a procedure as being a subroutine (like in VHDL) or a

medical operation. Even though we talk about procedural code, I don't like to refer to an initial procedure (sounds like the first step in a methodology).

So my preferences would be:

- (1) blocks
- (2) constructs
- (3) procedures

I agree that the LRM should be consistent. I don't think we should spend a lot of time debating. I think we should have quick arguments in the BC meeting and then put it to a vote and be done with it.

SVDB 1360 Yes

SVDB 1487 Yes

SVDB 1489 Yes

SVDB 1573 Yes

SVDB 1610 Yes

SVDB 1645 No

I believe the original restriction is good and that ``begin` directives should be paired to avoid the potential case where multiple files are compiled in the same compilation unit and somebody forgot to turn off the keywords somewhere in the middle of the list of files. To silently turn off the keywords by reaching an EOF is a bad idea (in my opinion). An error for a missing ``end_keywords` directive can be quite useful.

SVDB 1750 No

I am not strongly opposed and I even like the idea, but I would like to discuss this in committee. I would prefer to see a more strict definition of what is required in the printed statements as opposed to so many "implementation MAY ..." definitions.

SVDB 1993 Yes

SVDB 2006 Yes

SVDB 2029 Yes

SVDB 2081 No

Synthesis tools allow task enables as long as there are no event controls in the tasks. Why would this not be allowed with `always_comb` and `always_latch`?

SVDB 2092 Yes

SVDB 2097 Yes

SVDB 2102 Yes

(Although this restriction is not nearly as useless or cumbersome as the required difference between reg and wire, which also causes users to needlessly change code when moving code back and forth between always and assign)

SVDB 2140 Yes