Minutes of Week5 Compliance RG meeting

This was almost entirely a discussion of the RFP.
Changes to draft2:

RFP guidelines move from sec 2 to sec 5
# of organizations and individuals changed to 125 (# of orgs; individuals can't be counted)

Added a phase0: development of a spec for the tests themselves. This would describe test formats, use of macros, etc., and should build on the existing tests, but formalize them for future use.

Added the requirement#4 to phase 1 that target (e.g. simulator) specific feature shall not be required in tests. Removed phase1#1c: "framework changes to enable D extensions to run on RV32D" as redundant, since we already require tests for the D extension on both RV32 and RV64

Changed the pointer for the existing test in Phase1#2 from /riscv-compliance to /riscv-isa-tests

Added phase3 #6c: an ISA level simulator

Changed 5.1para 1 (was sec2) to
If you intend to submit a proposal contact <acquirer contact person Gary Crumley?> via e-mail at <e-mail address TBD> no later than <30 days from the date of this proposal>.

(I also moved phase 2 (priv spec framework) after phase 3 (test framework development) and renumbered the phases, since the (previous) phase 2 is really framework development, not test suite development, and has dependencies on the (previous) phase 3

Work remaining:
- We need pointer to "existing support" for pase2, #4 Since CTG is responsible for evaluation, we need to develop a process for that
- How do we prevent conflict of interest and confidentiality if CTG members submit proposals and are also part of the evaluation group?
  - Voting on their own proposal
  - Voting or even viewing the proposal of competitors
- Instead of
  - detailing the work, and asking for how much it will cost, maybe
  - detailing the $, and let them bid on how much of the work they can do?
- A comment remains that the deliverable need to be more concrete
- How can someone bid on framework changes for privileged spec when it is still in draft form?

Previous changes:
- Dividing work into phases, to be did separately
- Elimination of the requirement to provide financial and previous customer details – this is now a requirement for some kind of reference, and financial or previous customers are examples only, not required.
- Added actual pointers to existing tests, framework and tools
- Removed wordage that were speculative