Number	Author	Comment	Classification	Status
1	(Intel)	Conditional netlists:(.IF, .ELSEIF, .ELSE, .ENDIF) need to be supported in IBIS-ISS. To make this truly useful, section 5.3 "String parameters" should expand to allow instantiation of string parameters in conditional statements. This requires definition of the semantics of relational operators applied to strings. Pattern matching would be useful in the semantics.	Feature Request	a) deferred possibly until a later version
2	(Intel)	Quote characters: Section 4.2 "Statements and Arguments" lists these as not allowed in parameters or node names: ( ) = " ‘ Table 3: "IBIS-ISS Special Characters" in section 4.3 "Special Characters" allows " Double-quotes, and ‘ ’ Single quotes To be consistent, the "double quotes" entry should have to "open quote" / "close quote" pair: “ ” Quoting of strings throughout the document is inconsistent (examples: section 5.2: " .PARAM x=’y+3’ ", section 5.4: " str('string') ", and Section 6: " .INCLUDE ‘file_path file_name’ " However - To simplify syntax and reduce confusion, only quotation marks ("), ASCII 0x22 should be used in the specification, unless there is some syntax that will distinguish between quotation marks and apostrophes ('), ASCII 0x27. The "open quote" and "open apostrophe" (no ASCII designation) should not be allowed. As a weak alternative (the "committee weasel"), all four characters could be allowed, but use of anything but quotation marks should be deprecated.	Editorial	Revise document to use "directionless" quotes; specify ASCII characters that are allowed and prohibited; specify that "directional" quotes are prohibited; scrub document for usage of both
3	(Intel)	Section 5.1, Table 7, ".PARAM Statement Syntax and Examples": Please clarify the difference between a "User-defined Function" and a "Predefined Analysis Function", as the syntax only indicates a difference in quoting.	Technical	*further research required*
4	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 1-13, Section 4.3, and many other places (p. 16, Section 4.8, second bullet, and all Elements – Section 11) – please unify the guidelines/requirements regarding names and the use of special characters in the names. (For example, the text “Subsequent characters in a parameter name shall each be either a digit, or one of the following characters: …” contradicts the phrase “…, followed by up to 1023 alphanumeric characters”. If (see Page 16) only “! # % [ ] _“ are listed it should be clear whether it is just a recommendation (then Table 3 should contain a phrase “avoid usage” for all other symbols) or a requirement (then Table 3 should contain a note “illegal”).	Technical	*further research required & document scrub for consistency*
5	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 8 – move the second paragraph of Section 4.2 to the end of Section 4.1 where it belongs.	Editorial	approved
6	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 8, Section 4.2 – add “Statements may occupy more than one line, provided a line continuation character or sequence (defined later) is used. No more than one statement may appear in any single line.”	Editorial	approved
7	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 9, second bullet – should “non-alphanumeric” read “non-blank”?	Editorial	
8	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 9, last bullet – please remove the requirement “part of” if it is not needed.	Editorial	
9	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 10 – perhaps “Remarks” should be used instead of “Comments” for the title of the last column.	Editorial	
10	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 13 – last row of Table 3 – the content of the column “Node Name” is confusing and seems to be out of place.	Editorial	
11	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 4.4, first sentence of Section 4.4 – should “first character” read “first non-blank character”?	Editorial	
12	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 15, row “V” of Table 5 – remove the right parenthesis.	Editorial	
13	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 17, the first word of Section 4.11 – replace “Input” by “Statements”.	Editorial	
14	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 17, the last line – add “as the first non-blank character in the continuation line.	Technical	
15	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 18, first bullet – add “as the last two characters in the line to be continued”	Technical	
16	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 17 and 18 – the three bullets do not address the following questions: a. is the whitespace allowed only in the quoted strings b. can leading whitespaces be present at the beginning of the continuation line and if so, what is their impact?	Technical	*research required*
17	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 19, first paragraph – remove “or that are calculated based on circuit solution values” since it refers to post-processing and is not applicable to IBIS-ISS.	Technical	
18	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 20, third paragraph and Page 27, first paragraph – perhaps a phrase like “tail-truncated” would be more precise than “ordered”.	Editorial	
19	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 21, second bullet – perhaps “expressions” is a better word than “algebra”	Editorial	
20	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 21, second paragraph – it does not belong here; also it needs to be stated whether any whitespace that precedes the double backslash becomes a legitimate character in the string.	Technical	
21	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 22, the first three rows – remove “(radians)”.	Technical	confirmed; remove (radians)
22	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 24, Table 10 – it does not belong to Section 5.2, please move it to Section 5.1; suggested title of the table: “IBIS-ISS Reserved Parameter Names”; please also add the following: “Parameters with the following/above names shall not be defined anywhere in IBIS-ISS. Their usage should be avoided.”	Technical	prohibit redefinition of these special names; do not assume they are used or present
23	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 26, second paragraph – “is be” should read “is”; also, please remove “an instance of” – parameters are not instantiated; also, please add a note that the quotes are not used in the call str(*parameter_name*).	Technical	
24	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 26, first paragraph in Section 5.4 – suggested improvement: say “the subcircuit within which it is defined” instead of “that subcircuit”.	Editorial	

25	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 26, Section 5.4 example – please change ".param x=3" to ".param x=4" and provide explanation regarding actual instantiation of the resistor "r1".	Editorial	
26	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 27, first row of Table 11 – the second paragraph in the Description column should be a general comment made outside of the table.	Editorial	
27	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 28, first paragraph – should "the first character" read "the first non-blank character"?	Editorial	
28	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 28, example – an explanation is needed why the dollar sign in "1w$comment" and in "1k$comment" is treated as the comment character.	Technical	remove a=1w example but note that k and other suffixes are valid numeric expressions
29	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 29 – please remove two sentences: "They can be …" and "Note that .MODEL …" – they both offer some confusing interpretation.	Editorial	
30	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 30, Syntax –the ".subckt" definition statement can optionally include parameter definition(s) – this should be shown; also, assuming that "*n1*" is required, please correct the example on Page 26.	Technical	
31	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 32, second paragraph of Section 1.1 – remove an extra " . ".	Editorial	
32	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 32, Syntax – remove the line break in the syntax definition.	Editorial	
33	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 32, Table 12 – please unify definition of the node arguments in Tables 12, 13, 14 and 15.	Technical	
34	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 32, Table 12 – in the last row "an integer" should read "a positive integer". Similar corrections are needed in several other places.	Technical	
35	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 34, Table 15 – add "DC" to the description of the **DC** argument.	Editorial	
36	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 35, Table 16 – improve the description of the **K** argument to read "This is a non-zero unitless number"	Editorial	
37	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 35, Section 11.7 – make "*[* " and "*]* " non-italic.	Editorial	
38	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 36, Table 18 – make "*I* " lower case in "*In* " (for consistency with the syntax).	Editorial	
39	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 37, first paragraph – remove it.	Editorial	
40	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 37, Syntax – either **RLGCMODEL** or **TABLEMODEL** shall be specified – remove "[" and "]".	Technical	
41	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 37, Table 19 – "non-zero" should read "positive"; also search for similar usage of "non-zero".	Technical	
42	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 37, Table 19 – rows 3 and 5 – change "terminal" to "terminals".	Editorial	
43	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 38, third bullet – remove this item since it is not supported (unless the argument **RLGCfile** is added).	Technical	
44	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 38, second paragraph – does "interspersed" imply any order? If so, I do not believe it.	Technical	
45	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 38, Format 1 – remove/improve the second and the fourth bullet items.	Technical	
46	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 38, Syntax – move "]" to the end.	Technical	brackets around each element, from Ro through Lgnd; research required on parameter interaction
47	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 39, Table 20 – arguments **L** and **C** should read **Lo** and **Co**.	Editorial	
48	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 39, Table 20 – align the units.	Editorial	
49	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 39, Table 20 – "grounds" should read "ground".	Editorial	
50	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 41, third paragraph – this should only be a recommendation.	Technical	
51	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 42 – remove the text from "An alternative value …" to the end of the section. The parameter **fgd** should be added to appropriate table and syntax.	Technical	
52	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 44 – make a comment that "*npts* " is not an argument (it is the first value under the **DATA** argument).	Editorial	
53	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 44 –"*filename* " in "**DATA**=" should read "*data* ".	Editorial	
54	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 45, Table 22 – "**RLMODEL**" should read "**RMODEL**".	Editorial	
55	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 46, first sentence – please improve it (the S-element is not network data, it is a component).	Editorial	
56	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 46, Table 23 – "With an N reference node" should read "With N reference nodes".	Editorial	
57	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 47 – remove the text from "All optional …" to "a higher priority".	Editorial	
58	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 48 – modify the text according to making the argument **N** as required.	Editorial	
59	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 49 – remove description related to "s#p".	Technical	
60	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 49 – remove the last sentence.	Technical	
61	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 50 – Pole-Zero Function syntax – replace all "a" by "α".	Editorial	
62	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 50, the last row – remove extra parentheses.	Editorial	
63	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 51, second paragraph – "Re[pi]" should read "$Re\{p_i\}$"; also remove the second sentence.	Editorial	
64	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 51, after the second paragraph – apparently an example is missing, to which the last paragraph refers.	Editorial	
65	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 53 – the purpose of **Note** is not clear.	Technical	
66	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 53 and 54, Elements **F** and **G** – the direction of the source current needs to be specified.	Technical	
67	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 53 and 57, Elements **F** and **H**, Tables 26 and 28 – add a comment about the direction of the probed current (in a V-element).	Technical	
68	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 53, last row – "Names" should read "Name".	Editorial	
69	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 54 – similar to Comment 61.	Editorial	
70	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 54, second paragraph – "Table VCCS Parameters" should read "Table 27: G-element Arguments".	Editorial	
71	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 56 – similar to Comment 65.	Technical	
72	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 57 – similar to Comment 68; also, remove the second sentence.	Editorial	

73	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 58 – see Comment 4.	Technical	
74	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 59 and 60 – several corrections are needed if Section 13 stays.	Technical	
75	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 61 – fix the references to follow IEEE styles; make sure that the titles are all included; remove any references not needed anymore; add a reference to HSPICE manuals.	Editorial	
76	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 12, the "Period" special symbol – if used within instance or parameter names it may conflict with subcircuit hierarchy – please make it illegal.	Technical	
77	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 20, Table 8 – the first column corresponds to ".OPTION PARHIER GLOBAL" which is not supported by IBIS-ISS and should be removed. Furthermore, the content of the second column is not clear. Perhaps a text description of the parameter passing precedence, similar to the text above Table 8, would be a better choice. Furthermore, any description here needs to be consistent with Sections 5.4 and 11.1.	Technical	
78	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 26, Section 5.3 – please clarify whether the construct str() is required – examples, e.g., page 40, are inconsistent with the rules of Section 5.3.	Technical	
79	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 27, Syntax – the syntax definition seems to be incorrect: it suggests a whitespace separating the path and the file names; also, any restrictions on the path should be specified (e.g., no absolute path, relative path, but relative to what).	Technical	
80	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 32, Table 12 – please remove the text ", but is overridden by a value set in a .PARAM statement" – it contradicts the parameter passing concept.	Technical	
81	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 38, 39 – please remove the **wp** (**Wp**) parameter (argument) from the syntax description and Table 20 for the W-element static model. Also remove Section 13. It seems that the presence of the parameter **wp** by itself is ignored. It requires another parameter (INCLUDEGDIMAG=yes) to take effect. However, that parameter is not included. Another argument against keeping **wp** is that it cannot be simply added to an existing static W-element data to fix non-causality: GD data is simply not reusable (even the units are different). Furthermore, for the purpose of generating causal models the tabular, not static, W-element data has been used in recent years. Thus, the need for this parameter is doubtful, as there may be very few, if any, models for which both this parameter and the data is consistently defined.	Technical	Remove wp; add note at end
82	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 43, Table 21, SP model arguments – please remove **MATRIX** – the only type needed for the W-element is "SYMMETRIC" (the lower triangle of the matrix is specified) which is the default.	Technical	
83	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 43, Table 21, SP model arguments – please remove other than "REAL" as available values for the **VALTYPE** argument since the W-element does not use complex matrices. The parameter has to stay though, since in HSPICE the default value is "CARTESIAN".	Technical	
84	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 44 – the default for the **INTERPOLATION** argument is very unfortunate – perhaps the "LINEAR" selection should be left as the only choice or the one that is strongly recommended.	Technical	
85	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 45 – please remove the **FITGC** argument from the W model syntax and Table 22 – this is a simulator control parameter.	Technical	
86	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 46, 47, 48 and 49 – please remove the **FBASE** and **FMAX** arguments – they are simulation control parameters.	Technical	
87	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Page 48, S-Element Model Syntax – please make the arguments **N** and **TSTONEFILE** as required.	Technical	
88	Radek Biernacki, Agilent	Pages 51 and 55 – description of the **FOSTER** type of the E-element and the G-element is not sufficient – the meaning of individual parameters is required. Examples are good but they can only illustrate the specification.	Technical	
89	Bob Ross, Teraspeed Consulting Group	Page 42 - "used used" should be simply "used"	Editorial	
90	Bob Ross, Teraspeed Consulting Group	Page 46 - formatting issue in Table 23	Editorial	
91	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 5 erroneously refers to netlists	Editorial	
92	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 6 erroneously states that independent sources are not supported	Editorial	
93	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 7 contains an unclear description of where italics are used	Editorial	
94	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 8 uses "dot" in place of the more appropriate "period"	Editorial	
95	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 9 refers to quoted filenames; this should be clarified to mention paths as well	Editorial	
96	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 13 should clarify the differences between "lines" and "line-termination sequences"	Editorial	
97	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 15 and 16, Table 6 uses inconsistent capitalization	Editorial	
98	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 17, Section 4.9 uses inconsistent fonts	Editorial	
99	Michael Mirmak, Intel	Page 25 forces tool support of transient and AC analyses, plus temperature parameters. Was this intended?	Technical	
100	Michael Mirmak, Intel	A section 4.12 should be added to state that "IBIS-ISS files shall include at least one subcircuit at the top level, aside from any included files." The section should clarify the structural requirements of IBIS-ISS files.	Technical	