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## 1. Introduction and Scope

Digital flight control systems for aircraft and spacecraft perform life or mission critical functions. Extremely high reliability requirements must be established and demonstrated for these systems. To meet the reliability and performance requirements, systems become complex. Complexity and demanding requirements combine to render the validation of system reliability difficult. Testing, sufficient to establish the high reliability of these systems, is not feasible. Consequently, sophisticated reliability modeling tools based on analytic models are needed to predict and validate reliability for both the design and development phases of fault tolerant systems. Reliability modeling tools depend upon the accurate determination of various model parameters such as fault coverage and fault latency. When system testing to determine such parameters is precluded, computer simulations can be used in some circumstances to stand-in for a system. This report describes the preparation for, conduct of, and results of a simulation-based fault injection experiment conducted using the AIRLAB Diagnostic Emulation (DE) facilities.

The primary objective of this experiment was to determine the effectiveness of the diagnostic self test sequences used to uncover latent faults in a logic network providing the key fault tolerance features for a flight control computer. Since this experiment resulted in the most extensive use of the AIRLAB Diagnostic Emulation facilities to date, a secondary, but essential, objective was to develop methods, tools, and techniques for conducting the experiment.

In this experiment, more than 1600 faults were injected into a logic gate level model of the Data Communicator/Interstage (C/I), a key component in the Charles Stark Draper Laboratories (CSDL) Fault Tolerant Processor (FTP). For each fault injected, diagnostic self test sequences consisting of over 300 test vectors were supplied to the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ model as inputs. For each test vector within a test sequence, the outputs from the $C / I$ model were compared to the outputs of a fault free $C / I$. If the outputs differed, the fault was considered detectable for the given test vector. These results were then analyzed to determine the effectiveness of various test sequences, to identify latent faults, and to identify opportunities for improving the performance of the diagnostic test sequences. Figure 1.1 diagrams the essential elements of the experiment design.

The Data Communicator/Interstage of the FTP was selected because of the following:

1. the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ network provides for the critical fault tolerance features of input source congruency, error masking, error reporting and system reconfiguration,
2. the quadriplex C/I network used the full capacity of the AIRLAB Diagnostic Emulator,
3. documentation for the C/I design at the logic gate level was available, and
4. the results of the experiment could provide valuable information about the FTP design.

To prepare for and complete this experiment, several major issues had to be considered. Chief among these were design capture for a complex network; validation of the model derived from the design capture; analyses and decisions that reduced the required simulation time while preserving essential information; the design of test sequences for a complex state network; the applicability of fault models for LSI technology; the complexity management issues associated with modeling, validating, and simulating a large network; CAD tools and procedures to handle the complexity management problems; techniques to maintain data integrity for extended simulations; techniques for improving fault coverage and latency; and performance measures and techniques for analyzing the effectiveness of test vectors. Each of these issues can develop into significant problem areas as system complexity increases with the advancement of integrated circuit and computer architecture technology. Specifically, simulation methods, techniques, and associated tools will have to advance to meet the demands of computer technology. Moreover, validation research in general will be significantly impacted by some of these issues.

Section 2 of this report provides an overview of the $C / I$ design and discusses the gate model used for various parts of the C/I. Section 3 describes the various activities involved in the experiment preparation process. Among the activities discussed are design capture, test sequence design, and model validation. In section 4 , the conduct of the experiment is reviewed and the results are presented and analyzed. Section 5 provides a summary of experiment results, a review of lessons learned from conducting the experiment and a discussion of extensions to this experiment.

Figure 1.1. Experiment Diagram

## 2. Overview of the Data Communicator/Interstage and the Associated Gate Level Model

### 2.1. Functional Description[1] [2] [3]

The Data Communicator/Interstage (C/I), which was modeled in this experiment, provides the Fault Tolerant Processor (FTP) with certain key fault tolerance mechanisms. These mechanisms include circuitry to support the correct replication of simplex source data in all good FTP channels, to detect and mask errors in a single FTP channel, and to support FTP reconfiguration by blocking out faulty channels.

Figure 2.1 shows a quadriplex FTP.
Figure 2.2 shows the data exchange network associated with a quadriplex FTP. Each channel, A, B, C, or D, has a transmit and receive register which can be accessed by the input/output processor (IOP) or computational processor (CP) via a shared memory bus.

Simplex source data, that is, data available to one FTP channel may be distributed correctly to all good FTP channels by using a FROM $X$ exchange. Referring to figure 2.2, a FROM A exchange, for example, will cause the data word in the communicator transmit register of channel A to be distributed to all other data communicators via the cross channel links. Data transfers between communicators and interstages are byte serial with two bytes comprising a data word. Data distributed to each communicator are passed to associated interstages.

Each interstage replicates the data and passes a copy to each communicator. Each communicator votes the data received from each interstage and writes the voted data into the Receive Register. The Receive Registers are then read by the associated channel processor. In this matter, simplex source data from channel A is replicated in all good processor channels. FROM B, FROM C, and FROM D exchanges occur in a similar manner except that the source channel is $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$, or D respectively.

If each channel has data which requires voting for fault masking, a FROM OWN exchange can be executed. Each channel places its copy of the data to be voted into its respective Transmit Registers. Data words are transmitted to the respective interstages which in turn replicate the data and distribute the copies to each communicator. Each communicator votes all copies of the data and returns the voted result to the Receive Register for subsequent reading by its associated computer.

Errors detected during the voting process of an exchange are recorded in the status Registers of each communicator. The Status Registers of each communicator can be read by their associated processors. It is intended that these error reports be used by the FTP to determine and isolate faulty channels.

A write only Mask Register allows a channel to be excluded from the voting process.

The capability to execute exchanges which by-pass the interstage and voter is provided for network testing.

## FAULT TOLERANT PROCESSOR (Quadriplex Version)



Figure 2.1

## C/I EXCHANGE NETWOR.K



Figure 2.2

Table 2.1 lists the transactions on operating that can be executed by the communicator.

FROM A Exchange
FROM B Exchange
FROM C Exchange
FROM D Exchange
FROM OWN Exchange
READ Receive Register
WRITE Receive Register
WRITE Mask Register
READ FROM A Status Register
READ FROM B Status Register
READ FROM C Status Register
READ FROM D Status Register
READ FROM OWN Status Register

## Table 2.1. Data Communicator Operations

### 2.2. Circuit Description and Modeling Issues

Figure 2.3 is a functional block diagram for the C/I. Each area and the associated gate level models will be described in the following paragraphs.

The processor interface consists of receivers for the 20 bit processor address bus; 16 bit bidirectional tri-state data bus driver/receivers; and receivers or drivers as required for processor control signals, data acknowledge, read/write, system reset, system clock and fault tolerant clock.

For purposes of simplifying the simulation model, the processor address bits associated with the base address for the memory mapped data communicator were consolidated into a single communicator select bit. This consolidation reduced the size of the input files for the simulation and speeded the simulation run time. A single and gate (address decoder) and the several address bit receivers were modeled as a single receiver. No essential fault coverage information was lost by this simplification.

The bidirectional processor data bus was modeled as separate input and output ports because the Diagnostic Emulator had capability for either input or output connections. No essential fault coverage information was lost due to this modeling restriction.


The Local Data Bus is a 16 bit tri-state bus used to communicate as follows:
From Processor Bus to Transmit Register
From Processor Bus to Mask Register (5 bits)
From Processor Bus to Receive Register
From Receive Register to Processor Bus
From Status Register (5 bits) to Processor Bus
From Status Register (5 bits) to Current Status Update Logic
From Result Bus to Receive Register Most Significant Byte

From Result Bus to Receive Register Least Significant Byte
From Transmit Register Most Significant Byte to Transmit Register Least Significant Byte

This bus was modeled by use of and gates at each data source, enabled by the appropriate source enable signal, and by an or gate to combine the various data sources to one signal line. The resulting model was functionally equivalent to a tristate bus. The or function is a phantom gate in that there is no identifiable device in the network to which it can be associated. Despite its phantom nature, stuck-at zero faults were asserted on these devices during simulation to cover certain kinds of bus faults.

The Transmit Register, Mask Register and Receive Register are all implemented with 74LS374 octal D-type latches with tri-state outputs. The storage portion of these devices were modeled directly as D-type flip-flops and the tri-state output portion were modeled as and gates feeding an appropriate bus or gate as indicated in the previous paragraph.

The Source Bus communicates data bytes from the Transmit Register to cross channel links and to the interstages. Also, data bytes from cross channel links can be transferred to the interstages. This bus was modeled with and gates and phantom or rates similar to the Local Data Bus.

The cross channel links which distributes data from each communicator Source Bus to all other communicators' source busses is a bidirectional tri-state bus. The circuitry is diagrammed in figure 2.4. An adequate model for this is shown in figure 2.5. Since this model required a significant number of connections (384) and phantom gates (96) and since these particular connections had to be hand edited into the network, the simpler model ( 192 connections and 0 gates) shown in figure 2.6 was used. This decision was based on incomplete analysis which indicated that the model adequately
captured the network behavior. While data is handled properly by this model, the effects of faults in the Source Select logic which supplies the enable signals for the cross channel links were not accurately modeled. Consequently, certain gate faults were not found by the C/I diagnostics. As discussed in a later chapter, these faults would have been found had the more complex and accurate model been used for the cross channel links.

The States Register file is implemented with two $74 \mathrm{LS} 1894 \times 16$ bit RAM chips. Only 5 status bits, A error, B error, C error, D error and Quad error, are recorded in each of the 5 exchange types. Thus, only $5 \times 5$ of the potential $8 \times 16$ bits are used for the Status Register file. The Status Register was modeled with five, five-bit D-type flip-flop registers and with the address decoder and selection logic necessary to direct five bits of data to and from these registers.

The Mask Transform block receives the Mask Register bits (Mask A, Mask B, Mask C, Mask D, and Source Lock), the two channel identification (ID) bits, and the three exchange type bits to determine which, if any, channel to block from the voter logic and to select the source of data to be routed to the Receive Register. This function is implemented with a $2048 \times 8$-bit registered programmable read only memory. To model this device directly required that a Diagnostic Emulator overhead feature be used. This feature assigns a block of memory outside normal device simulation which can be used to store the contents of the memory being modeled. Memory address and data bit connections are associated with and determined by designated nodes within the network being simulated. To access this memory, a change on a designated control line will stop normal simulation of the network and will invoke an action which uses the state of the designated address nodes to select a particular location in the assigned memory block and to impose the state of the bits in this memory location on the designated data bit nodes.

Since this operation is generally slower than gate simulation and since validation of the operation of this PROM was judged to be more difficult than validating an equivalent gate network for this case, a decision was made to model this block with a simple gate network at least until the rest of the $C / I$ network could be validated.

The interstages consist of drivers, receivers, and D-type flip-flops. These devices were modeled using the Diagnostic Emulator gate and flip-flop primitives.

The Source Select, Current Status Update, Syndrome Or, Voter, and Voter Syndrome blocks are implemented using programmable logic arrays (PLA). A diagram of a typical PLA is shown in figure 2.7. The logic equations programmed for each function were modeled directly. Figure 2.8 illustrates one of these functions. The adequacy of stuck-at gate fault models for these devices is questionable since certain bridging faults between conductors carrying the input functions and a cell with the array cannot be accurately represented by such a simple model. A more elaborate gate model which would better represent these faults was beyond the scope of this effort.

The Source Select block shown in figure 2.3 uses exchange type bits and channel ID bits to control the cross channel links. The Voter and Voter Syndrome block


Figure 2.4. Actual Circuitry for Cross Channel Links


Figure 2.5. More Accurate Model Used for Cross Channel Links


Figure 2.6. Simplified Model Used for Cross Channel Links
performs the bit-for-bit voting of non-masked data copies and detects and reports errors for non-consistent data copies. These voter related functions are implemented in four PLA's with two data bits (dibits) processed by each PLA. The Syndrome Or block consolidates errors (syndromes) reported by each Voter Syndrome dibit. The Current Status combines these consolidated errors with the contents of the Status Register.

The final major block is the Control. This block provides the timed control signals to direct the operation of the Data Communicator. It is implemented using three $2048 \times 8$-bit registered programmable read only memory devices. Since these devices
are connected so that particular processor interface control signals, processor interface address bits, and certain of their own output bits are used to control their address inputs; a classical state machine with inputs, outputs, and internal states is implemented. This state machine is depicted in figure 2.9. The circuit is modeled using D flip-flops for the PROM register and the external memory feature of the Diagnostic Emulator. However, it was found that the contents of the PROM were highly redundant and that its size could be reduced to 512 words instead of 2048 words without losing any capability. Further reductions were possible but were not carried out. Figure 2.10 shows the state diagram for the the Write Xmit operation controlled by this state machine. Review of this design indicated that, as a result of the redundancy in the contents of the PROM, the state machine would require substantial additional testing to establish functionality. The redundancy likely resulted from the use of a high level design tool. This observation has implications regarding the use of high level design tools for fault tolerant systems.

Except for the Control block, four complete C/I's were modeled. Only two Control blocks were modeled. One Control block provided control signals for channels B, C, and D. The other provided control signals for channel A. The Channel A C/I was the only $C / I$ module faulted in the experiment. In addition to the four $C / I$ 's, support logic which generated fault tolerant clock and processor clock had to be modeled. These signals were generated by a simple ring oscillator and a divide by counter. A ring counter was used to create a clock whose period in gate delays or event units is approximately equal to the actual processor clock frequency. The divide by counter used to generate the fault tolerant clock was set at 12 processor clock pulses instead of 10 as used in the FTP. This change reduced the required simulation time without losing essential information.

Every flip-flop in the C/I model has a pseudo-gate connected in line with its output so that the flip-flop output can be faulted. The addition of the pseudo-gate circumvented a Diagnostic Emulator constraint which does not allow flip-flop outputs to be directly faulted. The fault gate was automatically inserted into the netlist by the netlist translator software on each occurrence of a flip-flop. Pseudo-gates were inserted into the model for each external input to the $C / I$ that went to a flip-flop. These inserted gates were used to satisfy a Diagnostic Emulator requirement that no external input be directly connected to a flip-flop. Finally, external output devices which had no internal connections were connected to $\sin k$ gates. The sink gate


Figure 2.7. Programmable Logic Array

VOIER $\rightarrow$ /QUADERR

Figure 2.8. Voter Syndrome Quaderror Function


Figure 2.9. Communicator Control Sequencer


Figure 2.10. Write XMIT State Diagram
connection satisfied the restriction that all devices must have at least one internal connection. The output of each sink gate was in turn connected to one of its own inputs to meet this requirement.

## 3. Experiment Preparation

### 3.1. Introduction[4] [5]

Most of the effort expended in the experiment was directed toward developing and validating the Data Communicator/Interstage ( $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ ) gate level model and the associated experiment support software. This experiment preparation process can be divided into several general areas of activity. These areas are

1. the development and testing of experiment support software,
2. the activities associated with learning to use the diagnostic emulator,
3. the development of a gate level model of the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$,
4. the development of $C / I$ input sequences that would test the $C / I$ in accordance with the C.S. Draper Laboratories C/I diagnostic software description, and
5. the validation of the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ model.

A brief description of the process used to set up and use a Diagnostic Emulation model will be given in this paragraph. A complete description of the Diagnostic Emulation portion of this process is given in the user manual.[4] Figure 3.1 diagrams the process. A description of the C/I logic network was created by using FUTURENET, a logic schematic capture computer-aided design tool. The resulting network description file was translated to a format suitable for input to the NASA-LaRC Diagnostic Emulation network initializer. This file, labeled QM-1 network, combined with files describing initial values for network nodes and files establishing external connections to the network such as network input and memory data connections, was supplied to a network initializer program. The resulting initialized network file, combined with an emulation options file and external memory initialization files, was processed by an emulation initialization program. The resulting emulation file, along with option files, fault description files, and external input data files, was used as input to the emulation. If the FORTRAN Diagnostic Emulation program was to be used, these files were used directly. If the QM-1 emulation was to be used, these files were converted and then transferred to the NANODATA QM-1 machine for execution. The output of the emulation process was used to examine the behavior of the model during the debug and validation phase and to provide the inputs for post-processing during the experiment phase.

The process described above is shown in more detail in figures 3.2 and 3.3. Note that in figure 3.2 there is a loop through the network initializer, emulation


Figure 3.1. Systiem Flow Diagram
initialization, memory map creation, external connections, and back to the network initializer. This loop is necessary to establish the address references required to define the external connections file. This part of the process is done once, provided the network does not change. Also note that in figure 3.3 the difference between a VAX FORTRAN emulation and a NANODATA QM-1 emulation is detailed.

### 3.2. Experiment Support Software

To use the existing Diagnostic Emulator to the extent required by the experiment, a number of new software utilities and tools had to be developed or procured. These items included the following:

1. a FUTURENET schematic capture computer-aided design tool;
2. a translator to convert FUTURENET netlists to a format suitable for the Diagnostic Emulation process;
3. an expanded set of primitive control features for the Diagnostic Emulator;
4. a set of programs to facilitate the preparation of Diagnostic Emulation options, connection, fault lists, input, memory, and initialization files;
5. a C/I mnemonic instruction translator to aid the preparation of C/I diagnostic test sequences; and
6. a program to analyze the outputs of the Diagnostic Emulation.

At the start of this project, gate level models of hardware to be emulated had to be created using a hardware description language. The large text file that resulted was then translated to a netlist suitable for Diagnostic Emulation. Creating, maintaining, changing, and verifying this large test file was a tedious, time-consuming, and errorprone process. The FUTURENET computer-aided schematic capture tools were purchased to facilitate the creation of the $C / I$ emulation model or any other hardware models. It was felt that these tools would reduce the effort required for creating, maintaining, and verifying the $C / I$ model. Since the schematic level is the natural level at which design engineers work with and document designs, it was felt that models created at this level would be less subject to errors.

A software program to convert FUTURENET/TEGAS netlists to the netlist format for the Diagnostic Emulator was written by RTI personnel. For the purposes of minimizing the resources dedicated to this conversion software, the devices used in the C/I schematic were restricted to those used by the Diagnostic Emulator. Adding the capability to accept more general devices, which in turn would be translated to Diagnostic Emulator devices, is not precluded by this restriction.
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To meet the needs of a fault insertion experiment, new control primitives were required for the Diagnostic Emulator. The new primitives added were as follows:

1. the capability to assert a stuck-at logic one or zero fault on any device output for a defined number of emulation steps,
2. the capability to provide external logic inputs from an input data file at designated emulation event numbers,
3. the capability to direct the output of designated logic nodes to an output file,
4. the capability to assert a fault on a bit in external memory arrays, and
5. the capability to define the length of an emulation run and to recycle the emulation using the next fault defined in a fault list.

The capability to provide each of these primitive control features had been planned but had not been implemented at the beginning of this effort. These capabilities were added to both the VAX FORTRAN emulation and the NANODATA QM-1 emulation. The implementation of these software features was done by NASA personnel.

A $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{l}$ mnemonic instruction translator was written to simplify the preparation of test sequences for the experiment. This translator provided the conversion of mnemonic representations for each $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ instruction into the proper bit pattern. In addition, pseudo instructions that allowed for defining iterative loops were provided. This latter capability simplified the creation of long test sequences consisting of iterative data values. Table 3.1 shows the mnemonics used.

| NAME | DEFINITION |
| :--- | :--- |
| VECB | Pseudo op to define start of a new test vector |
| VECE | Pseudo op to define end of a test vector |
| LOOP | Pseudo op to set up a repetitive sequence of C/I operations. <br> Arguments specify the level of nesting and the iteration <br> increments and limits |
| END | Pseudo op to define the end of a loop |
| RDRR | Read receive register |
| WRCV | Write receive register; arguments are data for each C/I |
| WXMR | Write transmit register; arguments indicate source for each <br> C/I (A, B, C, D) and data for each |
| WMSR | Write mask register; arguments indicate mask to be written <br> for each C/I |

## Table 3.1. $\mathbf{C} /$ I Instruction Mnemonics

Emulation outputs from the experiment were processed to determine the faults detected by each test vector.

### 3.3. Learning Use of the Diagnostic Emulator and Testing of Software Items

A simple logic network was used as a vehicle to learn the use of the Diagnostic Emulator and to test the various new software items. In addition to simplicity, the network was designed to be similar to the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ and to require the use of all Diagnostic Emulator primitives in the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ model. These primitives include fault insertion, external inputs, external outputs, external memory arrays, and each type of logic device. successful setup and emulation of this network was an essential first step in learning the use of the Diagnostic Emulator and for validating the new software development items.

A block diagram of this network is given in figure 3.4. The network was first analyzed on a simple IBM PC-based simulator, EZCAD. The EZCAD results were used as a basis for comparing Diagnostic Emulator results.

### 3.4. Development of a C/I Gate Level Model

Some of the circuit details of the C/I gate level model are discussed in section 2. The desired process for creating the model is shown in figure 3.5. In this process, a schematic of the entire quad C/I network would be captured using FUTURENET.


Figure 3.4. Block Diagram of Test Circuit
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The resulting netlist would then be converted to a form suitable for the Diagnostic Emulator. Changes to the model would take place at the schematic entry level and would be followed by the translation process.

An attempt was made to carry out this process. However, the full quad C/I network was too large for certain of the FUTURENET support tools. Consequently, another less desirable process had to be employed. The actual process used is shown in figure 3.6. In this process, the full quad $C / I$ was broken into smaller subnets. Each subnet was translated and these subnets were concatenated into a larger net. The interconnections between subnets were handled by editing these interconnections into the translated net file. While the number of interconnections was small relative to the total network, the editing process to produce these interconnections was prone to error. Further, this step made it difficult to return to the schematic level for model checking and for any model changes. This limitation of FUTURENET and the manner in which the model was created made it difficult to realize the full potential of computer-aided design capture. Unanticipated model network configuration control problems had to be solved, and checking of certain parts of the model was rendered much more difficult since it had to be done at the netlist level.

An indicator of the potential for difficulties is found in the network size information. The full quad $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ network consisted of more than 5000 nodes (devices) and 15,000 connections. About 20,000 lines of text, or more than 300 pages, were required to list the network.

This network is relatively small compared to most VLSI designs. The only effective way to deal with such designs is with effective CAD tools.

### 3.5. Diagnostic Test Sequences for the Data Communicator/Interstage[6] [7] [8] [9]

The C/I plays a critical role in FTP fault tolerance by ensuring that all good processors receive identical data values (source congruency), by masking errors, and by providing for FTP reconfiguration after faults are detected. An important part of FTP operation is the use of diagnostic test sequences for the $C / I$ for both pre-mission and in-mission testing. These test sequences are used to uncover latent faults. This experiment was directed toward determining the effectiveness of proposed diagnostic test sequences.

A fault detection, isolation, and reconfiguration (FDIR) program is used in FTP. FDIR provides for hardware implemented fault detection and error reporting, software implemented fault isolation based on the analysis of error reports, software implemented reconfiguration by disabling failed channels, and software implemented self tests to uncover latent faults. The $C / I$ is tested with self tests that operate within the FDIR function. FDIR tests the C/I with a frequently executed high priority limited scope test, called Presence, and a somewhat exhaustive low priority test sequence, which is executed with a much lower frequency.


Figure 3.5. Network Model Preparation
(Desired)


Figure 3.6. Network Model Preparation (Actual)

The Presence test is a simple test that is executed at the beginning of a processing frame to determine the presence of each processing channel of the FTP. During this test, unique data values from each channel are exchanged via the C/I. Correct. exchange of a channel's unique values establishes presence.

The low priority C/I self tests of the FDIR assume that a certain class of C/I faults, such as hard errors in the data path, will be detected in the normal course of processing and/or by the Presence test. Those areas of the C/I logic not stimulated in the normal course of operation are the focus of the self tests. These areas include error detection, error reporting, fault masking, and reconfiguration logic.

The main components of the low priority $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ self tests are as follows:

1. the Voter PAL Test,
2. the Mask Transform Test,
3. the Voter Syndrome Or Test, and
4. the Current Status Update Test.

The $C / I$ voter is implemented using programmable logic array chips. The voting and error detection logic is contained in the voter PAL chips. Two bits of a data byte from each FTP channel are voted within a single PAL package. Four voter PAL packages are required for each communicator. The inputs to these PAL chips include dibits from each channel and a mask bit for each channel, as shown in figure 3.7. The Voter PAL Test consists of sequencing through all combinations of inputs to each voter PAL chip for both the least and most significant byte of a data exchange. This exhaustive test is used because certain failure modes of a PAL can result in any input to the chip coupling to any PAL output. This is true even if the gates associated with a given output are not programmed to accept all input signals. The total number of test vectors required for this test are $2^{16}$.

The Mask Transform Test targets the channel mask or blocking logic (see figure 3.8). This logic provides the capability to exclude a channel from the voting process. This component of the self test requires 192 test vectors.

The Voter Syndrome Or Test targets the two PAL chips associated with combining the error outputs of the 4 voter PAL chips. The test is intended to test only those gates not previously tested by the Voter PAL Test. This test was not completely defined at the time of the fault injection experiment.

The Current Status Update Test is intended to uncover faults in the current status update PAL chips (see figure 3.9). In this test, all combinations of data exchange errors are stimulated by selection of appropriate test vectors. Stimulated errors are logged into the Status Registers. These test vectors are followed by test vectors that stimulate additional data exchange errors. The Status Register is then checked to determine if it is properly updated.


Figure 3.7. Communicator/Interstage Exchange Network


Tests For Each PROM Input:

|  | Test Number |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Channel | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| A | A | D | A | B | A | C |
| B | B | C | A | B | B | D |
| C | B | C | C | D | A | C |
| D | A | D | C | D | B | D |

(Number of Mask Transfer PROM Test Vectors) $=6 \cdot 32=\mathbf{1 9 2}$

Figure 3.8. Mask Transform/Source Locking Test


Syndromes

- LBAD
- RBAD
- MBAD
- OBAD
- QERR

Figure 3.9. Error Logging/Masking Network (One Network for each Processor)

Figure 3.10 illustrates a typical sequence of $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ transactions associated with a single test vector. Three transactions are required to exchange data, read the results, and retrieve the associated error report. This does not include any special setup of the Mask Registers and Status Registers. Once exchange results and error reports are obtained, it is necessary for all channels to exchange this data. This allows all good channels to arrive at a consensus on the results of a test vector. A total of nine exchange and read transactions are required for each vector. Each exchange/read transaction pair requires about $10 \mu \mathrm{sec}$ to complete in real time.

Assuming that the C/I self test requires approximately $2^{16}$ test vectors, and that the self test is constrained to use only five percent of the $C / I$ throughput capacity, the C/I self test will require approximately two minutes to execute. This time sets a bound on the fault latency time for faults detectable via the C/I self tests.

Estimates of the time required to conduct a fault injection experiment using the Diagnostic Emulator are of interest. Consider an experiment that requires the injection of 2000 faults and requires that the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ self test sequence (about $2^{16}$ test vectors) be executed completely for each fault. Assume that the NANODATA QM-1 is used. Also assume that only the self test transactions must be executed, i.e., the $C / I$ throughput is $100 \%$ dedicated to self test for the experiment. The QM-1 version of the Diagnostic Emulator will execute approximately $50,000: 1$ slower than real time for the C/I network. The total simulation time required would be approximately 19 years. If the VAX FORTRAN version was used at $10^{6}: 1$ slower than real time, the simulation would require approximately 3.8 centuries!

The unacceptably long run times cited in the preceding paragraph provide motivation for restricting the extent of an experiment. If the simulation time requirements are reduced by a factor of about 1000,200 QM-1 hours would be required. Such a simulation time requirement would be well within the feasible range.

In the planning stage of this experiment, the self test for the $C / I$ used substantially fewer test vectors. The number of test vectors used by C.S. Draper Laboratories (CSDL) at that time would have resulted in reasonable simulation time requirements. The exhaustive test implemented by the new self tests greatly expanded the simulation time.

A reduction in simulation time by a factor of 9 can be obtained by recognizing that the exchanges required to share opinions in an actual FTP would not be required in an experiment. An additional factor of about 100 was needed and was obtained by reducing the number of test vectors.

Recall that the exhaustive testing addressed certain PAL failure modes. It was determined that these failure modes would not be reflected in a direct gate level model of the PAL logic. Consequently, the large set of test vectors could be reduced and not change the outcome of an experiment based on a gate level model. Further, it was decided to test the C/I voters only for the quadriplex and triplex configurations and only for one of the voter PAL chips.


9 Exchanges about $10 \mu \mathrm{sec}$ each

Figure 3.10. Typical C/I Self Test Sequence for a Single Test Vector

The tests prepared for the experiment are summarized in figures 3.11 and 3.12 . Tests are characterized by the number of test vectors within a test, by the number of $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ transactions or instructions required for the test, and by the number of DE simulation steps required for the test. These tests include about 600 test vectors that are in the desired range. Appendix A gives detailed listings of these tests.

### 3.6. Validation of the $\mathbf{C / I}$ Emulation Model

The purpose of the validation process was to establish, to the greatest extent possible, that the $C / I$ emulation model accurately reflected the behavior of the $C / I$. Most of the funding for this emulation experiment was directed toward this effort. In general, the validation of a complex model would be difficult. For this experiment, several factors further complicated the validation process.

Ideally, the emulation model for a network would be created automatically from a design data base using well-established software programs, and the design verification data base of test vectors and results would be available for use. In this experiment, design information used to create the emulation model was in the form of a schematic drawing and a design description. Furthermore, access to the C/I designer was limited. To create the emulation model, the schematic was manually entered into a computer using a CAD schematic capture tool. The devices used in the design were replaced with Diagnostic Emulation gate primitives prior to schematic capture. The translation of the netlist for the captured schematic to a form suitable for Diagnostic Emulation was accomplished using a software program developed for this experiment. As described in section 3.5, certain of the network model interconnections had to be established by editing the translated netlist text files. Additional experiment software, described in section 3.3, was developed to support the experiment. This software included modifications to the Diagnostic Emulator.

When discrepancies were found during testing/debugging of the model, errors in the design capture, errors in the new software, errors in the changes to the Diagnostic Emulator, errors in the use of the Diagnostic Emulator, and errors related to modeling issues were all candidates for the source of the problem. Engineering analysis based on limited design documentation was required to devise tests for the model, to determine the correctness of the responses, and to devise additional tests for isolating the source of detected errors.

The additional complications of the validation process for the $C / I$ can be attributed to the following:

1. the status of the Diagnostic Emulation facilities in AIRLAB (i.e., changes, limitations, and documentation) at the start of the experiment,
2. the design capture process that was employed,
3. the development of software to facilitate model development, and

- Voter Tests

Tested a single voter PAL chip (2 bits) in the quad and triplex configurations. Used both upper and lower bytes to give two test vectors per vote.

- Mask Transform Tests

Tested mask transform logic for quad and duplex configurations

- Current Status Update Test

Tested the current status update PAL

- Presence Test

Equivalent to CSDL "Presence"

- Basic Test

RTI test which tested a range of $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ functions beyond "Presence"

Figure 3.11. Tests Used for Experiment

| TEST <br> NAME | ABBREV | NBR <br> VECTORS | NBR <br> INSTRS | SIM <br> STEPS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presence | presence | 10 | 62 | 8400 |
| Current Status <br> Update | cstupd | 10 | 64 | 11900 |
| Basic | basic | 16 | 112 | 11900 |
| Mask Transform <br> Quad | msktrnq | 12 | 84 | 9900 |
| Mask Transform <br> XAXB | msktrnxaxb | 24 | 160 | 19200 |
| Mask Transform <br> XCXD | msktrnxcxd | 24 | 160 | 19200 |
| Voter Test <br> Quad1 | vb0lquad1 | 128 | 772 | 98000 |
| Voter Test <br> Quad2 | vb01quad2 | 128 | 772 | 98000 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XA | vb013xa | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XB | vb013xb | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XC | vb013xc | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XD | vb013xd | 64 | 388 | 48700 |

Figure 3.12. Diagnostic Sequences
4. the absence of a design verification data base of test vectors and responses.

The effort to validate a model could have been reduced considerably by the appropriate use of well-established CAD tools that were integrated into the hardware design data base. The uncertainty as to the possible sources of model discrepancies encountered in this first AIRLAB Diagnostic Emulation experiment would be reduced for additional experiments. Integration of the design data base into the Diagnostic Emulation facilities would eliminate problems associated with design recapture. Finally, integration of the design data base would permit the use of the design verification test vectors and responses and would reduce the need for the validator/experimenter to fully understand the operation of the network modeled and to analyze the detailed responses of the network.

The validation process for the $C / I$ model relied to some extent on the software testing afforded by the emulation of the simple network described in section 3.3. The approach to verifying the $C / I$ model was to verify the $C / I$ microsequencer logic and to then add additional $C / I$ functions. The $C / I$ microsequencer model was verified using a simple IBM PC-based simulator, EZCAD. This simulator provided easy-to-use graphical logic analyzer-type outputs. The microsequencer was verified against its documented state transition diagram for each operation type. A microsequencer model was prepared for the VAX FORTRAN Diagnostic Emulator and was verified for each state transition and output. This provided a source of correct control signals for subsequent testing of the C/I model.

The full C/I model that incorporated the verified microsequencer model was prepared for the VAX FORTRAN Diagnostic Emulator. This model was tested for each operation type with various data inputs. Numerous design recapture errors were found and corrected. Next, sequences of operations with various data values were emulated. Errors were found and corrected. Finally, all the diagnostic test sequences, except for the non-voter tests, were used as the emulator inputs. The emulator output for each test sequence was verified for correctness.

The QM-1 version of the Diagnostic Emulation was not available when the model verification was complete. Consequently, the experiment was started using the VAX FORTRAN version. Once the QM-1 version became available, a QM-1 C/I model was prepared. This model was verified against extensive emulation results from the VAX FORTRAN version for both good circuit and faulted circuit conditions. Non-faulted (//I outputs for each diagnostic test sequence are included in appendix $B$.

Errors stemming from each of the possible sources enumerated above were found during the validation process. However, most errors, including the most difficult errors to isolate, were traced to the manual editing of interconnections into the large netlist text file.

As noted earlier, the validation part of this experiment required the most effort. Without appropriate CAD tools integrated into the design data base, it would be difficult to justify the cost of experiments using other designs of similar complexity. This
experiment involved a network of relatively modest complexity ( 5000 gates) relative to modern VLSI (50,000 to 100,000 gates). Standards for verifying the accuracy of network models are much higher for highly reliable fault tolerant systems. The only costeffective way to manage the complexity of modern VLSI designs for a highly fault tolerant system will be with the use of well-established validated CAD tools that are integrated into a common design data base.

## 4. Diagnostic Emulation Experiment Description and Results

### 4.1. General Plan

The general plan for this experiment is to do the following:

1. emulate at the gate level the Charles Stark Draper Laboratories (CSDL) Fault Tolerant Processor's Communicator/Interstage (C/I) hardware using the AIRLAB Diagnostic Emulator facilities,
2. insert single faults into the gate level model,
3. for each inserted fault, use the CSDL diagnostic self test sequence for the $C / I$ as inputs for the emulation model,
4. determine if observable errors are produced in the emulation model output for each fault inserted, and
5. evaluate the results of the experiment.

Figure 4.1 diagrams the emulation setup. Test vectors from the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ diagnostic self test sequence were used as input to a gate level model of the C/I network. Faults that model stuck-at-one and stuck-at-zero gate output failures were inserted into the gate level model. Each fault was inserted for a complete pass through the diagnostic self test sequence, only one fault was present in the network during any pass through the self test sequence, and faults were only inserted into the channel A portion of the C/I. For each fault and test vector, outputs from the C/I model and both data and crror reports were compared against the outputs produced by a fault-free C/I model. If the outputs differed, the fault was designated as detectable for the test vector in question.

Figure 4.2 diagrams the output space for this experiment. Originally, 600 test vectors were planned (see section 3.5 ), but only 328 were used. These test vectors were grouped into tests associated with a particular purpose or functional area within the $C / I$. These tests are listed in figure 4.3 along with their associated parameters. Faults were grouped into sets associated with a particular functional area. Figure 4.4 lists the fault groupings, and figure 4.5 diagrams the functional areas associated with these fault sets. Note that within Voter and Voter Syndrome fault sets, devices associated with 2 of the 8 bits were faulted. Excluding these faults reduced the experiment


Figure 4.1. Communicator/Interstage Model
FAULTS (1670)

Figure 4.2. Simulation Result Space
-42-

| TEST <br> NAME | ABBREV | NBR <br> VECTORS | NBR <br> INSTRS | SIM <br> STEPS |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presence | presence | 10 | 62 | 8400 |
| Current Status <br> Update | cstupd | 10 | 64 | 11900 |
| Basic | basic | 16 | 112 | 11900 |
| Mask Transform <br> QUAD | msktrnq | 12 | 84 | 9900 |
| Mask Transform <br> XAXB | msktrnxaxb | 24 | 160 | 19200 |
| Mask Transform <br> XCXD | msktrnxcxd | 24 | 160 | 19200 |
| Voter Test <br> Quad1 | vb0lquad1 | 128 | 772 | 98000 |
| Voter Test <br> Quad2 | vb01quad2 | 128 | 772 | 98000 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XA | vb013xa | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XB | vb013xb | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XC | vb013xc | 64 | 388 | 48700 |
| Voter Test <br> B01 3XD | vb013xd | 64 | 388 | 48700 |

Figure 4.3. Diagnostic Sequences
duration. Since the network topology for the remaining 6 bits was the same as for the 2 bits where faults were injected, the results for the 2 bits could be used to determine the results for the remaining 6 bits. This grouping of faults and test vectors was found to be a useful way to interpret experiment results and to draw conclusions regarding the effectiveness of particular test vectors. Figure 4.6 shows a typical output from the emulation. The single number on a line is the simulation time step and the four numbers on a line are the outputs from the four channels of the C/I model. Figure 4.7 is a typical post-processing output. For each vector in a self test sequence and for each fault in a fault set, the faulty circuit emulation output values are compared to good circuit emulation output values. If the outputs differ, the fault is considered to be detected by that test vector. The " 1 " entry in figure 4.7 indicates that the fault was detected. The score (the number of faults found) for each vector is given at the bottom of the fault list, and the number of vectors in the designated test detecting a particular fault is given in the right hand column. The first run and additional runs within the fault list are for fault-free conditions. Emulator outputs from the first run were used as the reference for subsequent faulted outputs. Emulation runs required large amounts of computer execution time and complex setup procedures. The opportunity for errors was of concern. Consequently, additional fault-free runs were included to help ensure consistent results. This precaution did, in fact, result in finding several problems during the experiment.

### 4.2. The Experiment

Originally, the NANODATA QM-1 version of the Diagnostic Emulator was to be used for this experiment and the VAX FORTRAN version was to be used for validating the model. Since the changes to the QM-1 version were not completed when the model validation was complete, the experiment was started using the AIRLAB VAX computers. After the QM-1 version became available, it was used to complete the experiment. Figure 4.8 summarizes the use of AIRLAB computing resources during the experiment. It should also be noted that more than 300 K blocks of disk storage were in use at various points during the experiment. Figure 4.9 details some interesting experiment-related numbers. One interesting observation is that the total amount of real time operation of the $C / I$ that was simulated was only two seconds. Another interesting number is the average stack size ( 12 devices) for the emulation algorithm. This number indicates the average number of devices whose outputs change during a given simulation step. It is indicative of the potential savings in processing time that could be realized by an event-driven simulation versus a simulation that must compute all device outputs for each event time. The ratio of average stack size to total network size ( $12: 5000)$ is substantial and represents a considerable reduction in device computations. However, it is also indicative of a design that has low device activity. A ratio of $1: 2()$ should be more typical. From the numbers in figure 4.9 , it is possible to estimate the average device computations per second required for an equivalent non-eventdriven simulation of this network. Figure 4.10 summarizes these calculations. It should be noted that for fault simulation, a time resolution equivalent to $1 / 2$ or 1 clock cycle is often sufficient. It was found that the QM-1 version operated about 60K:1 slower than real time for this network, and that the VAX $11 / 780$ was about $1.2 \times 10^{6}$

| Group | Number of Faults |
| :--- | :---: |
| Local Data Bus | 128 |
| Source Bus | 370 |
| Status Register | 160 |
| Current Status Update | 106 |
| Source Select | 120 |
| Syndrome Or | 116 |
| Voter/MUX/Result Bus | 264 |
| Voter Syndrome | 132 |
| Mask Transform | 62 |
| Microsequencer \& Control <br> Fan-out | 216 |
|  | 1674 |

Figure 4.4. Fault Sets by Functional Group

Figure 4.5. FTP Communicator Fault Set Boundaries


Figure 4.6. Typical Good Circuit Output
a -ase volluatavar
$2=$ no fault
$3=$ stuck at " 0 "
$4=$ stuck at " 1 "

Eault file: CSTUPIEAULT.DAT
Vector file: CSTUPD.VEC
Data file: CSTUP1OUT.DAT


Figure 4.7. Typical Post-Processing Output

| Test | VAX 11/750 | VAX 11/780 | QM-1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Presence |  | 34 hrs . |  |
| Basic | 84 hrs . |  |  |
| Current Status Update |  | $38 \mathrm{hrs}$. |  |
| Mask Transform XAXB |  | 65 hrs. |  |
| Mask Transform Quad | 72 hrs . |  |  |
| Voter XA |  |  | 6.6 hrs . |
| Voter XB |  |  | 6.6 hrs . |
| Voter XC | 244 hrs . |  |  |
| Voter XD |  | 122 hrs . |  |
|  | 400 hrs . | 259 hrs . | 13.2 hrs |

Figure 4.8. Emulation CPU Time*
*Does not include post-processing

| Network size | $>5000$ devices |
| ---: | :--- |
|  | $>15000$ interconnections |

Simulation resolution 1 gate delay - 5 ns
Gate delays per clock ..... $18-120 \mathrm{~ns}$
Clocks/Fault tolerant clock ..... $12^{*}$
Average stack size of
Event-driven simulation ..... 12 devices
Maximum stack size of
Event-driven simulation ..... $\sim 500$ devices
Total faults ..... 1670
Total C/I transactions cycles/fault ..... 2034
Transaction cycles in experiment ..... $\sim 3 \times 10^{6}$
Simulation steps$\sim 3.6 \times 10^{8}$
Total real time$\sim 2$ seconds
*Actual fault tolerant clock has 40 processor clock periods. The simulation was scaled to 12 to reduce run time.

Figure 4.9. Some Diagnostic Emulation Experiment Numbers

| Processor | Gate Events/Sec | Real Time Ratio |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| VAX $11 / 750$ | $1 \times 10^{3}$ | $2.4 \times 10^{6}: 1$ slow |
| VAX $11 / 780$ | $2 \times 10^{3}$ | $1.2 \times 10^{6}: 1$ slow |
| QM-1 | $37 \times 10^{3}$ | $60 \times 10^{3}: 1$ slow |

- Establishing equivalence to a non-event-driven simulation is difficult
- If equivalent time resolution is required for the non-event-driven simulation, the comparable speeds are

VAX 11/750
VAX 11/780
QM-1

500k Gates/Sec
$1 \times 10^{6}$ Gates/Sec $20 \times 10^{6}$ Gates/Sec

- If $1 / 2$ clock period time resolution is required, then the comparable speeds are
VAX 11/750
VAX 11/780
QM-1
50k Gates/Sec
100k Gates/Sec
$2 \times 10^{6}$ Gates/Sec

Figure 4.10. Summary of Diagnostic Emulation Speed
slower than real time.

### 4.3. Analysis of Experiment Results

The experiment data presented in this section are not adjusted or modified to account for certain modeling problems identified after the experiment was complete. These problems will be discussed in a later section. Primarily, results are organized by diagnostic test and fault set. For each self test/fault set pair, the percentage of faults detected relative to the number of faults injected within the fault set are presented. Test vectors with the best and worst scores for each test/fault set pair are identified. The relative and combined performance results of the self tests are presented. Finally, the percentage of faults found by the best vector within a test relative to the number of faults detected by the test are examined.

Before reviewing these results, it should be noted that conclusions and observations are subject to the following:

1. There are limitations due to the adequacy of a gate level fault model for the C/I implementation technology;
2. Faults were only injected in a single emulated C/I;
3. The number of faults within a fault set varies;
4. Self tests reflect RTI's understanding of the CDSL self test description;
5. Faults were injected in devices associated with two of the eight voter bits.

The Presence ( P ) test results shown in figure 4.11 are of particular interest. CDSL executes all vectors of this test prior to every FTP processing frame (typically 10 msec to 40 msec ) under their FDIR program. Presence is a short test (small number of test vectors) relied on to establish the general health of the C/I channels. Note that the results for the Mask fault set are not shown due to loss of these computer data. As can be observed from figure 4.11, this test is very effective for detecting data path faults (Local Data Bus and Source Fault Sets). However, the performance for other fault sets such as the Voter Syndrome set is about $50 \%$. Overall, the performance of this test is about $62 \%$ against the injected faults. However, when adjusted for the devices not faulted in the Voter and Voter Syndrome fault sets, the performance is closer to $5.5 \%$. Note also that both the single best and worst test vectors for the entire test will detect about $50 \%$ of the faults. Since this test is executed frequently, the average latency time for about half of all C/I faults is very short. Further, each vector is very effective relative to overall test performance. Since this test requires a small number of test vectors, it will require only a small portion of the FTP processing resources. These data confirm the CSDL assumption regarding the effectiveness of


Presence for data path faults.
Figure 4.12 gives the results for the Current Status Update (CSU) test. This short test is designed to test certain of the Status Register update logics, and of necessity must exercise parts of the error reporting logic. As can be observed and as is expected, this test performs substantially better than the Presence test for the Status Update and Syndrome Or fault sets. CSU test performance is considerably less than Presence for the data path fault sets and is about the same for the remaining fault sets. The overall performance is about $50 \%$ against the injected faults. When adjusted to include the devices that were not faulted in the Voter and Voter Syndrome fault sets, the performance is about $40 \%$. The low CSU test performance for the Source Select fault set should also be noted.

The results for the two Mask Transform tests are given in figures 4.13 and 4.14 . The Mask Transform Quad (MTQ) test has 12 test vectors and the Mask Transform XAXB (MTA/B) test has 24. Both tests target the C/I reconfiguration logic. Overall, both tests perform better than Presence. As should be expected, their performance against the mask fault set is somewhat better than the ubiquitous $50 \%$. Also, their performance against the Voter Mux fault set is good. Their overall performances are near $70 \%$. When adjusted for the additional voter bits, their performance is still above $65 \%$.

The results for the last non-voter test, Basic (B), are given in figure 4.15. This test is an abbreviated version of the one of the tests designed by RTI for the validation of the $C / I$ model. These results are included as a point of reference. Since the test was not optimized against a comprehensive fault model, it is not intended as a recommended test. It does demonstrate that simulations can be used to consider alternative tests and demonstrates the potential for improvement in test performance. Basic requires 16 test vectors. The Basic test performs well on the data path faults and has better performance than Presence against the Status Reg, Status Update, Syndrome Or, and Control fault sets. Further, its performance approaches that of MTQ and MTA/B for the Mask fault set. The overall performance of Basic is in excess of $70 \%$ against the injected faults and exceeds $65 \%$ when adjusted for the devices not faulted in the Voter and Voter Syndrome functions.

The overall performance of each non-voter is shown in figure 4.16. The combined performance is close to $90 \%$ and is not significantly affected when adjusted for the devises not faulted in the Voter and Voter Syndrome functions. Figure 4.17 shows the combined performance of all non-voter tests for each fault set. Also shown are the performance improvements provided by the voter tests. With the voter tests included, overall performance is $92 \%$. The voter tests used were XA, XB, XC, and XD and required a total of 256 test vectors. The non-voter tests required a combined total of 72 test vectors. Figure 4.18 identifies and shows the performance of the best test for each fault set. Figure 4.19 shows the performance of the worst test for each fault set. The extremely poor performance of CSU against the Source Select fault set is not shown. Instead, the next worst test, MTA/B is indicated. Figure 4.20 shows the performance of the best single vector for each fault set and for the entire set of test






vectors. It is interesting to note that the performance of the best single vector is about $50 \%$. Figures 4.21 through 4.25 show for each fault set and test the percentage of faults found by the best vector within the test relative to the total number of faults found by the test. These results tend to support an assertion that for C/I network configuration, a high percentage of the faults that can be detected by a given test will be detected by a small percentage of the test vectors. Such an assertion is not true for all network configurations and care must be exercised in the conclusions that can be drawn from these data. However, the concept of identifying those test vectors that are more effective in terms of detecting more faults has special significance for fault tolerant systems. The time required to find a fault is at most $T$ and on average is $\mathbf{T 2}$. The average time that faults remain latent within a system can be reduced by using the more effective test vectors more frequently than the less effective vectors. The potential for reduction of fault latency time is discussed in more detail in section 4.5.
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### 4.4. Review of Undetected Faults

A detailed review and analysis of the device faults that were not detected in this experiment is presented in this section. Failure to detect certain of the faults will be found to be due to bus modeling problems. Other fault detection failures will be found to be due to deficiencies in the tests used. A few fault detections failure will be found to be undetectable by any test.

The total number of faults that were not detected by any test was 141. Of these, 47 were found to be contained in the Source Select fault set. Also, figure 4.17 shows that the combined performance against Source Select faults is less than for any other fault set. A detailed examination of the devices associated with these undetected faults indicated that most, if not all, were associated with one of two problem areas. One problem area was in a group of devices whose faulted condition could not be detected due to the bus modeling problem discussed in section 2.2. An accurate model of the cross channel interconnections would likely have resulted in these faults being detected.

The remaining undetected faults in the Source Select fault set were associated with the C/I channel ID logic. The ID logic permits C/I modules to be used for any $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ channel. When a module is used in a channel A processor, hardwired inputs force the ID logic to allow the module to function as the channel A C/I. Similarly, ID logic establishes the identity of modules used in other channels. If certain of the devices associated with channel ID are faulted in such a manner that the local channel identity is unchanged, these faults are indistinguishable from fault-free devices. Since there are no provisions for stimulating different channel ID inputs under processor control, none of these faults can be detected. It is not clear whether the effects of these faults are of significance. If the devices for a given $C / I$ fail in the manner described, the $C / I$ module will continue to operate properly so long as the module is always used for that channel. Non-coverage of these faults could, however, affect maintenance procedures. It is not uncommon for replicate modules within a system to be interchanged with a module that is suspected of being faulty. The potential for ambiguous results exists if an apparently functioning module with one of these latent faults is substituted for a suspected faulty module.

The fault set with the next largest number of undetected faults is the Control set with 26. Examination of the associated devices indicated several problem areas. Again, certain of the undetected faults were traced to the cross channel bus modeling problem and to the ID logic problem. Several other undetected faults were traced to devices that provide certain control signals directly to the processor interface. These faults would be detected by the associated FTP channel processor. Either these devices should not have been included in the fault set, or their outputs should have been included in the C/I model's external outputs and subsequently checked for proper state in the experiment post-processing. Finally, three undetected faults were found to be associated with devices which propagate the system reset signal. Failure of these devices in a state equivalent to an inactive reset signal cannot be detected if the failure occurs after a valid reset has occurred. The significance of such latent faults is open to
speculation. Failure to be able to reset could have only transient and inconsequential effects on a system provided that the C/I microsequence controller always returns itself to an idle state. However, these faults are undetectable during normal operation and as such represent a potential problem.

The Voter Syndrome fault set had 19 undetected faults. After examination of the associated devices, it is believed that the Voter Quad test, which was not used for this experiment, should detect these faults. Although planned for the experiment, the use of the Voter Quad test could not be completed prior to the end of the experiment.

The Status Update fault set contained 16 undetected faults and the Syndrome Or fault set contained 14 undetected faults. An assessment of these faults was inconclusive, but it is believed that the Voter Quad test would detect some portion of these.

The Status Register fault set contained 15 undetected faults. An examination of these determined that the decode logic in the Status Register memory was associated with the undetected faults. They are undetected because the C/I Status Registers automatically reset after a Read Status Register operation and because the CSDL self test diagnostics, as understood by RTI, include a Read Status Register for each test vector. Unless a test causes different errors to be written in each Status Register prior to a read of any of the registers, address decode logic faults cannot be distinguished from fault-free behavior. A simple modification of the self tests should render these faults detectable.

The four undetected faults in the Mask fault set were associated with the ID logic problem described above. Fault sets, Source Bus, Voter Mux, and Local Data Bus contained no undetected faults.

Table 4.1 summarizes the undetected faults, the causes for not being detected, and the estimated relevant undetectable faults.

If the assessments of the undetected faults are correct and if the ID logic faults are considered inconsequential, the adjusted performance for the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ self tests would exceed $98 \%$ and could approach $99.8 \%$. If the reset faults are inconsequential, the performance approaches $100 \%$.

| Fault Set | Undetected <br> Faults | Source | Comments | Estimated <br> Undetectable |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Source Select | 47 | Cross channel <br> model \& ID logic |  | 0 |
| Control | 26 | ID logic \& cross <br> channel + product <br> interface \& reset |  | 3 |
| Voter Syndrome | 19 | 16 | not known | Run Voter Quad Test |
| Status Update | 14 | not known | Run Voter Quad Test | $0-16$ |
| Syndrome Or | 15 | Status Reg |  |  |
| Status Reg. | 4 | ID logic | modify self test | $0-14$ |
| Mask | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| Local Data Bus | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Voter Mux |  |  |  | 0 |
| Source Bus | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Combined | 141 |  |  | 0 |

Table 4.1. Summary of Undetected Faults

### 4.5. Inferences Drawn from Experiment Results

As indicated in the previous section, care must be exercised in the use of the experiment results. Performance numbers derived for the various tests are subject to the limitations of fault models, network models, and the correctness of the self tests. While such results cannot be considered to be precise, they can be used in some instances to support specific observations and conclusions. This section reviews the inferences drawn from the experiment data.

The experiment results support the CSDL assumption that the Presence test will detect a high percentage of the $C / I$ data path faults. In addition, Presence detects approximately $60 \%$ of device output faults.

Certain faults occurring in the C/I ID logic and the system reset logic cannot be detected. The significance of these undetectable faults is open to speculation and an assessment of such is beyond the scope of this report.

Particular faults occurring in the Status Register address decode logic cannot be detected by reading the Status Register after every test vector input to the C/I. If the CSDL self tests use this procedure, these faults will be undetectable. A simple modification of a portion of the self test would remedy this problem.

Finally, the results suggest that certain of the test vectors detect a considerably larger number of faults than do other test vectors. Even though certain test vectors are less productive, they may be required to detect faults that are undetectable with the most productive test vectors. Average fault latency time could be reduced if these more productive test vectors are used more frequently than the less productive, but necessary, test vectors.

To demonstrate the potential for reduction in average latency time for faults within a network, consider a test composed of $V$ different test vectors which detects all network faults. Assume that each vector can be imposed on the network in time T. If all faults are equally likely to occur and if each vector is used once per test repetition, the average latency time for faults is $V T / 2$. Suppose that $4 / 5$ of the faults are detected by $1 / 5$ of the test vectors. Define a new test composed of the same test vectors. Since the prime test vectors are four times more effective than the remaining test vectors, repeat the prime vectors four times more frequently than the remaining test vectors. The time required to complete such a test would be $8 / 5 V T$. The average latency time for a fault would be $8 / 25 T$. Thus, the new test would give a shorter average latency time. This would directly reduce fault recovery times, which would reduce the exposure to near-coincident faults.

Consider the average latency of the C/I FDIR self tests. From section 3.5, it is known that the Presence test is repeated in every processing frame and that the remaining $C / I$ self tests could require approximately two minutes to complete. Assume that a processing frame is typically 40 msec . Experiment results indicate that the performance of the Presence test is about $60 \%$. The remaining $40 \%$ of the faults must be found by the slow FDIR self tests. Average latency time for C/I faults using FDIR becomes

$$
\overline{\mathrm{L}}=\frac{1}{2}[0.6 \times 0.04 \mathrm{sec}+0.4 \times 120 \mathrm{sec}] \approx 24 \mathrm{sec} .
$$

Experiment data indicates that the performance of the Presence test could be improved by modest increases in the number of test vectors. Both Basic and Mask Transform Quad have better performance than Presence and require fewer test vectors. Assume that this opportunity is not exploited. Experiment results also indicate that the combined performance of all non-voter tests ( 72 test vectors total) is on the order of $90 \%$. When adjusted for model discrepancies and the ID logic, the performance is closer to $95 \%$. Assume that a new FDIR test is designed. Assume that it consists of 100 test vectors that are executed with a frequency of 5 seconds and that it detects $35 \%$ more faults than does the Presence test. The slow FDIR is expected to detect the remaining $5 \%$ of the faults. The average latency for this scenario becomes:

$$
\overline{\mathrm{L}}=\frac{1}{2}[0.6 \times 0.04 \mathrm{sec}+0.35 \times 5 \mathrm{sec}+0.05 \times 120 \mathrm{sec}] \approx 4 \mathrm{sec} .
$$

The improvement in average latency from 24 seconds to 4 seconds is substantial.
The results of this experiment have been used to identify potential problem areas and to identify areas where performance can be improved by relatively modest changes to the self test diagnostics.

## 5. Conclusions, Observations, and Recommendations

The objective of this section is to briefly summarize the relevant conclusions and observations discussed in detail throughout this report. In addition, several efforts that are natural extensions to this experiment are discussed.

The results of the experiment summarized in section 4.6 are as follows:

1. Presence detects a high percentage of data path faults;
2. Presence detects about $60 \%$ of all $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ gate output faults;
3. Certain faults in the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I} I \mathrm{D}$ and reset devices cannot be detected by any test vector;
4. Faults in the address decode logic of the Status Register will not be detected by test vectors that include a Status Register Read after each transaction;
5. Opportunities to reduce average fault latency and to improve overall performance are suggested by the results.

Most of the effort in this experiment was directed toward recapturing the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ design and validating the C/I model derived from the recapture process. To effectively deal with VLSI scale designs, well-established CAD tools that are integrated into a design data base containing design verification test vectors will be required.

Faster simulators will be required to support the complexity of VLSI. However, significant work can be accomplished with existing simulators. For studies where simulation results are examined in detail, faster simulators would provide results more rapidly than could be assimilated.

The applicability of the gate level fault model used in this experiment is limited for modern devices such as gate arrays [8][9]. Since bipolar technology was employed for the current C/I implementation, the experiment results are more applicable than if FET based technology had been used. The main exception to this observation is the PAL devices used in the design.

Network size relative to the tools and techniques used impacted all phases of this effort. The complexity management problems for this modest-sized network not only lead to the validation problems discussed above, but impacted areas such as experiment run times, model configuration management, and computer storage requirements. Dealing with more complex designs without better tools would not be cost-effective.

The amount of computer time required to complete simulations of this scale or greater and the standards for the integrity of results derived for highly reliable systems combine to require that a methodology for using simulations include fault tolerance and error detection mechanisms. For example, the chances of a computer error affecting the results derived from an extremely long simulation run can become significant.

The microsequencer for the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ was designed using a high-level design tool. The state transition table generated by this tool was highly redundant due to the manner in which certain address bits were allowed to reach the microsequencer register, PROM. While the design was functionally correct and was easy for the designer to create, it was much harder to test. This relatively minor example suggests that the new high-level design tools used to support cost-effective modern VLSI design could produce designs that are less testable and more expensive to validate. These tools are optimized for design functionality and for cost-effective designs. They are not optimized for testability.

The experiment provided information on the performance of the Diagnostic Emulator. The VAX FORTRAN version is a factor of $1.2 \times 10^{6}$ slower than a real time C/I. The QM-1 version is about a factor of $60 \times 10^{3}$ slower. For the $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{I}$ with its unusually low activity gates, the QM-1 version of the Diagnostic Emulation should compare favorably with higher performance parallel non-event-driven VAX-based simulators.

Natural extensions to the experiment described in this report are as follows:

1. to execute the Voter self tests that were not completed;
2. to modify diagnostic tests to confirm that Status Register address decoder faults can be detected;
3. to modify cross channel link models and confirm that certain faults become detectable;
4. to modify the DE fault model to include faults on gate inputs and to repeat the experiment;
5. to inject faults into other C/I channels and observe test vector performance;
6. to fault the PROM bits of the $C / I$ microsequencer to determine performance against these faults;
7. to build a gate level model of the PAL device that more accurately models the failure modes in gate arrays, to run self tests, and to compare results to the less sophisticated fault model;
8. to inject some double faults to determine the probability of a double fault leading to system failure.

These possible extensions of the original experiment would benefit from the fact that a C/I model has been created and validated.
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## APPENDIX A <br> Listing of the Diagnostic Tests

## Presence Test Program

```
RSTR A A A A
RSTR B B B B
RSTR C C C C
RSTR D D D D
RSTR O O O O
WMSK M31 M31 M31 M31
VECB WXMR A A A A AO DO DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A A A
VECB WXMR A A A A Al Dl Dl Dl
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A A A
VECB WXMR B B B B Dl BO DI DI
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B B B
VECB WXMR B B B B DO Bl DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B B B
VECB WXMR C C C C DO DO CO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR C C C C
VECB WXMR C C C C Dl Dl Cl Dl
RDRR
VECE RSTR C C C C
VECB WXMR D D D D D1 D1 D1 D2
RDRR
VECE RSTR D D D D
VECB WXMR D D D D DO D0 DO D3
RDRR
VECE RSTR D D D D
VECB WXMR O O O O AO AO AO AO
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Al Al Al
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O OO
```


## Current Status Update Test Program

```
WMSK Ml5 Ml5 M15 Ml5
RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O AO Al Al Al
WXMR O O O O Al Al Al Al
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Al AO AO AO
WXMR O O O O AO Al Al Al
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Bl BO Bl Bl
WXMR O O O O Bl Bl Bl Bl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O BO Bl BO BO
WXMR O O O O Bl BO Bl Bl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Cl Cl CO Cl
WXMR O O O O Cl Cl Cl Cl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O CO CO Cl CO
WXMR O O O O Cl Cl CO Cl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Dl Dl Dl DO
WXMR O O O O Dl Dl Dl Dl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O DO DO DO Dl
WXMR O O O O DI DI DI DO
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Al Cl Cl
WXMR O O O O Dl Dl Dl Dl
VECE RSTR O O O O
VECB WXMR O O O O BO BO DO DO
WXMR O O O O CO CO AO AO
VECE RSTR O O O O
```

Basic Test Program

```
RSTR A A A A
RSTR B B B B
RSTR C C C C
RSTR D D D D
RSTR O O O O
VECB WRCV DO DO DO DO
VECE RDRR
VECB WRCV D2 D2 D2 D2
VECE RDRR
VECB WRCV D3 D3 D3 D3
VECE RDRR
WMSK MO MO MO MO
VECB WXMR A A A A D2 DO DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A A A
VECB WXMR A A A A D3 DO DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A A A
VECB WXMR B B B B DO D2 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B B B
VECB WXMR B B B B DO D3 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B B B
VECB WXMR C C C C DO DO D2 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR C C C C
VECB WXMR C C C C DO DO D3 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR C C C C
VECB WXMR D D D D DO DO DO D2
RDRR
VECE RSTR D D D D
VECB WXMR D D D D DO DO DO D3
RDRR
VECE RSTR D D D D
VECB WXMR O O O O AO BO CO D8
RDRR
RSTR O O O O
VECE RSTR O O O O
WMSK Ml Ml Ml Ml
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Bl Cl D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
WMSK M2 M2 M2 M2
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Bl Cl D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
WMSK M4 M4 M4 M4
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Bl Cl D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
WMSK M8 M8 M8 M8
VECB WXMR O O O O Al Bl Cl D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
```


## Mask Transform Quad Test Program

```
RSTR A A A A
RSTR B B B B
RSTR C C C C
RSTR D D D D
WMSK M31 M31 M31 M31
VECB WXMR A B B A AO BO DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D DO DO CO D8
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C Al DO Cl DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXMR A B A B AO Bl DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D D0 Bl D0 D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO Cl D9
RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
WMSK M15 Ml5 Ml5 M15
VECB WXMR A B B A Bl Cl DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D D0 D0 D9 Al
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C BO DO D8 D0
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXMR A B A B Bl CO DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D DO CO DO D8
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D D0 D0 D8 Al
RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
```

RSTR A A A A
RSTR B B B B
RSTR C C C C
RSTR D D D D
WMSK M30 M30 M30 M30
VECB WXMR A B B A D2 B2 D0 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D DO DO C2 D5
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C D3 DO C3 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXIM A B A B D2 B3 D0 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D DO B3 D0 D6
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO C3 D6
RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
WMSK M14 M14 M14 M14
VECB WXMR A B B A B3 C2 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D D0 D0 D6 D2
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C B2 DO D5 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXMR A B A B B3 C2 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D DO C2 DO D5
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D D0 D0 D5 D3
RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
WMSK M29 M29 M29 M29
VECB WXMR A B B A C2 D5 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D DO DO D2 B2
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C C3 DO D6 DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXMR A B A B C2 B3 DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B

VECB WXMR B B D D DO D3 DO C3 RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO D5 C2 RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
WMSK MI3 MI3 MI3 MI3
VECB WXMR A B B A DO D1 DO DO RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D DO DO AO B2 RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C C2 DO Bl DO RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB WXMR A B A B Al C3 DO DO RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D DO D5 DO Bl RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO C3 B3 RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D

Mask Transform XCXD Test Program

| RSTR | A A A A |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RSTR | B B B B |  |
| RSTR | $C \subset \subset C$ |  |
| RSTR | D D D D |  |
| WMSK | M27 M27 M27 M27 |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B B A D2 | B2 DO DO |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B B A |  |
| VECB | WXMR D C C D DO | D0 C2 D5 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR D C C D |  |
| VECB | WXMR A A C C D3 | D0 C3 D0 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A A C C |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B A B D2 | B3 D0 D0 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B A B |  |
| VECB | WXMR B B D D DO | B3 D0 D6 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR B B D D |  |
| VECB | WXMR C D C D DO | D0 C3 D6 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR C D C D |  |
| WMSK | Mll Mll Mll Mll |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B B A B3 | C2 DO DO |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B B A |  |
| VECB | WXMR D C C D DO | D0 D6 D2 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR D C C D |  |
| VECB | WXMR A A C C B2 | DO D5 DO |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A A C C |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B A B B3 | C2 DO DO |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B A B |  |
| VECB | WXMR B B D D DO | C2 D0 D5 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR B B D D |  |
| VECB | WXMR C D C D DO | D0 D5 D3 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR C D C D |  |
| WMSK | M23 M23 M23 M23 |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B B A C2 | D5 DO DO |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B B A |  |
| VECB | WXMR D C C D DO | D0 D2 B2 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR D C C D |  |
| VECB | WXMR A A C C C3 | D0 D6 D0 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A A C C |  |
| VECB | WXMR A B A B C:2 | B3 D0 D0 |
| RDRR |  |  |
| VECE | RSTR A B A B |  |

VECB WXMR B B D D DO D3 DO C3
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO D5 C2
RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D
WMSK M7 M7 M7 M7
VECB WXMR A B B A DO DI DO DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A B B A
VECB WXMR D C C D DO DO AO B2
RDRR
VECE RSTR D C C D
VECB WXMR A A C C C2 DO Bl DO
RDRR
VECE RSTR A A C C
VECB RDRR
VECE RSTR A B A B
VECB WXMR B B D D DO D5 DO Bl
RDRR
VECE RSTR B B D D
VECB WXMR C D C D DO DO C3 B3 RDRR
VECE RSTR C D C D

## Voter Test Quad 1 Program

```
WMSK M15 M15 Ml5 Ml5
RSTR O O O O
LOOP O 1 1 0 3 1 0 3 l 0 3 l
VECB WXMR O O O O T4 T4 T4 T4
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
```


## Voter Test Quad2 Program

```
WMSK Ml5 Ml5 Ml5 Ml5
RSTR O O O O
LOOP 2 3 1 0 3 1 0 3 l 0 3 1
VECB WXMR O O O O T5 T5 T5 T5
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
```


## Voter Test B01 3XA Program

RSTR O O O O WMSK Ml4 Ml4 Ml4 Ml4 LOOP 000 VECB WXMR O O O O DO T4 T4 T4 RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O END
LOOP $0 \begin{array}{llllllllllll} & 0 & 0 & 2 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1\end{array}$ VECB WXMR O O O O DO T5 T5 T5 RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O END

## Voter Test B01 3XB Program

```
RSTR O O O O
WMSK Ml3 Ml3 Ml3 Ml3
```



```
VECB WXMR O O O O T4 DO T4 T4
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
LOOP 2
VECB WXMR O.O O O T5 DO T5 T5
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
```


## Voter Test B01 3XC Program

RSTR O O O O
WMSK Mll Mll Mll Mll
LOOP 01110031100000131 VECB WXMR O O O O T4 T4 DO T4 RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
LOOP $22 \begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 3 & 1\end{array}$
VECB WXMR O O O O T5 T5 DO T5
RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END

## Voter Test Bol 3XD Program

RSTR 0000
WMSK M7 M7 M7 M7
LOOP 0111103310131000 VECB WXMR O O O O T4 T4 T4 DO RDRR
VECE RSTR O O O O
END
LOOP $2 \begin{array}{llllllllllll} & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ VECB WXMR O O O O T5 T5 T5 DO RDRR
VECE RSTR 0000 END

# APPENDIX B <br> Diagnostic Emulation Outputs for Non-faulted C/I 

| PRESENCE |  | GOOD CIRCUIT |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $0$ | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 100 |  |  |  |  | 6706 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52652 | 52652 | 52652 | 52652 |
|  | 244 |  |  |  |  | 6832 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 388 |  |  |  |  | 6958 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $7462^{0}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 5320 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15744 | 7462 15744 | 15744 | 15744 |
|  | 676 |  |  |  |  | 7588 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 802 |  |  |  |  | 7714 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 910 |  |  |  |  | 8218 |  |  |
| 0 | $1414^{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 162033 | $\begin{aligned} & 162033 \\ & 8344 \end{aligned}$ | 162033 | 162033 |
| 15744 | 15744 |  | 15744 | 15744 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| $0^{1}$ | 1540 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1666 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1620331 | 162033 | 31 | 162033 | 162033 |  |  |  |  |
| $0^{2}$ | 2296 |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2422 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2926 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 143071 | $\begin{aligned} & 143071 \\ & 3052 \end{aligned}$ | $11$ | 143071 | 143071 |  |  |  | - |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3178 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3682 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34706 | 34706 |  | 34706 | 34706 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 3808 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3934 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4438 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1305161 | 130516 | 61 | 130516 | 130516 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 4564 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4690 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5194 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 47271 | 47271 | 1 | 47271 | 47271 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5320 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5446 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5950 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1251251 | 125125 | 51 | 125125 | 125125 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6076 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | ${ }^{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6202 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Current Status Update Test


| BASIC | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COOD } \\ & 12 \end{aligned}$ | CIRCUIT |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 100 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 2440 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 388 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 5320 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 676 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 802 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 910 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1018 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1126 |  |  |
| 125125 | $\begin{aligned} & 125125 \\ & 1234 \end{aligned}$ | 125125 | 125125 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1342 |  |  |
| 52652 | 52652 | 52652 | 52652 |
|  | 1450 |  |  |
| 0 | 1558 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2062 |  |  |
| 125125 | 125125 | 125125 | 125125 |
|  | 2188 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2314 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2818 |  |  |
| 52652 | 52652 | 52652 | 52652 |
|  | 2944 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3070 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3574 |  |  |
| 125125 | 125125 | 125125 | 125125 |
|  | 3700 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3826 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4330 |  |  |
| 52652 | $\begin{gathered} 52652 \\ 4456 \end{gathered}$ | 52652 | 52652 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4582 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5086 |  |  |
| 125125 | 125125 | 125125 | 125125 |
|  | 5212 | 0 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5338 |  |  |



## Mask Transform Quad Test

| MSKTRNQ |  | GOOD CIRC | UIT |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 120 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 100 |  |  |  | 6670 |  |  |
| 0 |  | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 173577 | 173577 | 173577 | 173577 |
|  | 244 |  |  | 37 | ${ }^{1} 796$ | 37 | 37 |
| 0 | $388{ }^{0}$ | 0 | 0 | 37 | 6922 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 532 |  |  |  | 7426 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 0 0 | 0 | 167273 | 167273 | 167273 | 167273 |
| 0 | 658 | 00 | 0 | 37 | 755237 | 37 | 37 |
| 0 | 766 | 0 | 0 |  | 7678 | 37 | 37 |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1270 |  |  |  | 8182 |  |  |
| 143071 | 15744 | 415744 | 143071 | 134716 | 134716 | 134716 | 134716 |
| 11 | 13966 | 66 | 11 | 37 | 87 | 37 | 37 |
|  | 1522 |  |  |  | 8434 |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 | 0 | 0938 | 0 | 0 |
| 130516 | 2026 66223 | 366223 |  | 176737 | 8938 176737 | 176737 | 176737 |
| 130516 | 2152 | -66223 | 130516 |  | 9064 |  |  |
| 11 |  | 66 | 11 | 37 | 937 | 37 | 37 |
| 0 | 2278 | 00 | 0 | 0 | 9190 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2782 | 0 |  |  | 9694 |  |  |
| 47271 | 47271 | 1162033 | 162033 | 166233 | 166233 | 166233 | 166233 |
| 3 | 2908 | 314 | 14 | 37 | $37$ | 37 | 37 |
|  | 3034 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3538 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 34706 | 15744 | 434706 | 15744 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $3664{ }_{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | $3790{ }^{12}$ | 25 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 00 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4294 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 111554 | 111554 | 434706 | 34706 |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  | 314 | 14 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4546 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 111554 | 47271 | 1111554 | 47271 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5176 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 12 | 25 | 12 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5302 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5410 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  | 00 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5914 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 77777 | 77777 | 777777 | 77777 |  |  |  |  |
| 37 | ${ }^{6040} 37$ | 37 | 37 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 6166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Mask Transform XAXB Test

| MSKTRNXAXB |  | GOOD | CIRCUIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 244 |  | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 388 |  |  |
| 0 | 5320 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 658 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 766 |  |  |
| 0 | $1270^{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 146063 | 146063 | 14.6063 | 146063 |
|  | 1396 |  |  |
| 11 | $1522^{11}$ | 11 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2026 |  |  |
| 34307 | 34307 | 34307 | 34307 |
|  | 2152 |  |  |
| 11 | $2278{ }^{11}$ | 11 | 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2782 |  |  |
| 143470 | $\begin{aligned} & 143470 \\ & 2908 \end{aligned}$ | 143470 | 143470 |
| 3 | 3 | 3. | 3 |
|  | 3034 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 3538 |  |  |
| 31714 | 31714 | 31714 | 31714 |
| 5 | 3664 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 3790 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 4294 |  |  |
| 107760 | 107760 | 107760 | 107760 |
|  | 4420 |  |  |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 4546 |  |  |
| 0 | 5050 | 0 | 0 |
| 107760 | 107760 | 107760 | 107760 |
|  | 5176 |  |  |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 5302 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5410 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 5914 |  |  |
| 34307 | 34307 | 34307 | 34307 |
|  | 6040 |  |  |
| 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
|  | 6166 |  |  |


| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $107760$ | 6670 |  |  |
|  | 107760 | 107760 | 107760 |
|  | ${ }^{6796} 11$ | 11 | 11 |
| 11 | 6922 |  | . 11 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 7426 |  |  |
| 70017 | 70017 | 70017 | 70017 |
| 7552 |  |  |  |
| 3 | $7678{ }^{3}$ | 3 | 3 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8182 |  |  |
| 34307 | 34307 | 34307 | 34307 |
| $8308$ |  | 5 | 5 |
| 5 | 8434 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 8938 |  |  |
| 70017 | 70017 | 70017 | 70017 |
| 3 | 9064 <br> 3 | 3 | 3 |
|  | 9190 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 9694 | 52652 | 52652 |
| 52652 | $9820$ | 52652 | 52652 |
| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
|  | 9946 |  |  |
| 10054 |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{0} 10558{ }^{0}$ |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 34307 | 34307 | 34307 | 34307 |
| $10684$ |  |  |  |
| 10810 |  | 6 | 6 |
| 11314 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 146063146063 |  | 146063 | 146063 |
| $6^{11440}$ |  | 6 | 6 |
| 11566 |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12070 0 10 |  |  |  |
| 107760 | 107760 | 107760 | 107760 |
| 12196 |  |  |  |
| 12322 |  | 3 | 3 |
|  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{0} 12826^{0}$ |  | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 34307 | 34307 | 34307 | 34307 |
| 12952 |  |  |  |
| 13078 |  | 12 | 12 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 13582 |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{rr}143470 & 143470 \\ 13708\end{array}$ |  | 143470 | 143470 |
|  |  |  |  |



$$
C-2
$$

Mask Transform XCXD Test



| $\begin{gathered} 162033162033 \\ 17596 \end{gathered}$ | 162033 | 162033 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $12 \quad 12$ | 12 | 12 |
| 17722 |  |  |
| $0 \quad 0$ | 0 | 0 |
| 18226 |  |  |
| 7001770017 | 70017 | 70017 |
| 18352 |  |  |
| 1414 | 14 | 14 |
| 18478 |  |  |
| 00 | 0 | 0 |
| 18982 |  |  |
| 143470143470 | 143470 | 143470 |
| 19108 |  |  |
| 1212 | 12 | 12 |

Voter Test Quad 1

| VBOIQUADI |  | GOOD | CIRCUIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 12 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 820 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 208 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 334 |  |  |
| 0 | 830 | 0 | 0 |
| $100000$ | 838 |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 100000 \\ & 964 \end{aligned}$ | 100000 | 100000 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 1090 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100000 | 1594 |  |  |
|  | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 |
|  | 1720 |  |  |
| 10 | $1846^{10}$ | 10 | 10 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 2350 |  |  |
| 100000 | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 |
| 10 | $2476$ | 10 | 10 |
|  | 2602 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100000 | 3106 |  |  |
|  | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 |
|  | 3232 |  |  |
| 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
|  | 3358 |  |  |
| 0 | $3862{ }^{\circ}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 100000 | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 |
|  | 3988 |  |  |
| 4 | ${ }^{4}$ | 4 | 4 |
|  | 4114 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 4618 |  |  |
| 100001 | 100001 | 100001 | 100001 |
|  | 4744 |  |  |
| 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
|  | 4870 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 5374 |  |  |
| 100000 | 100000 | 100000 | 100000 |
|  | 5500 |  |  |
| 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
|  | 5626 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 6130 |  |  |
| 100001 | 100001 | 100001 | 100001 |
|  | 6256 |  |  |
| 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 |
|  | 6382 |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|  | 6886 |  |  |



100000100000100000100000 $12_{1}^{14572}$ $0^{14698}$ 15202
100001100001100001100001 15328

| $35{ }_{15454}^{35}$ | 35 | 35 |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

100001100001100001100001

| 16084 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $0_{16210}^{162}$ | 31 | 31 |
| 0 |  |  |

${ }^{0} 16714000$
100001100001100001100001 16840

| 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17470

100001100001100001100001


```
100001 100001 100001 100001
        18352
    11 11 11 11
```



```
100000100000 100000 100000
        19108
        6 % 6 % % 6 % % % %
100001 100001 100001 100001
        19864
        25 19990 25 %ra
100002100002100002100002
        20620
        23 20746 23 0
100003100003100003100003
        21376
```



| $100001 \underset{22132}{100001}$ | 1100001 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3535 | 535 | 35 |
| 22258 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 22762 |  |  |
| 100001100001 | 1100001 | 100001 |
| 22888 |  |  |
| 5 | 55 | 5 |
| 23014 |  |  |
| 00 | $0 \quad 0$ | 0 |
| 23518 |  |  |
| 100003100003 | 3100003 | 100003 |
| 23644 |  |  |
| 33 | 333 | 33 |
| 23770 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 24274 |  |  |
| 100003100003 | 3100003 | 100003 |
| 24400 |  |  |
| 2323 | 323 | 23 |
| 24526 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 | 0 |
| 25030 |  |  |
| 100000100000 | 0100000 | 100000 |
| 25156 |  |  |
| 22 | 22 |  |
| 25282 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 |  |
| 25786 |  |  |
| 100000100000 | 0100000 | 100000 |
| 25912 |  |  |
| 1212 | 212 | 12 |
| 26038 |  |  |
| 00 | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 26542 |  |  |
| 100002100002 | 2100002 | 100002 |
| 26668 |  |  |
| $25 \quad 25$ | 525 | 25 |
| 26794 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 |  |
| 27298 |  |  |
| 100002100002 | 2100002 | 100002 |
| 27424 |  |  |
| $35 \quad 35$ | 35 | 35 |
| 27550 |  |  |
| 00 | 00 |  |
| 28054 |  |  |
| 100000100000 | 0100000 | 100000 |
| 28180 |  |  |
| 6 6 | $6 \quad 6$ |  |
| 28306 |  |  |
| 00 | $0 \quad 0$ |  |
| 28810 |  |  |
| 100001100001 | 1100001 | 100001 |
| 28936 |  |  |
| 2323 | 323 | 23 |
| 029062 |  |  |
| $0_{29566}{ }^{0}$ | 0 |  |



100003100003100003100003 30448

${ }^{27}{ }^{37}{ }^{30574}$| 27 | 27 | 27 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

100002100002100002100002 31204
$31 \quad 31 \quad 31 \quad 31$ 31330
$\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ 100002100002100002100002 31960
$\begin{array}{rrrr}31 & 31 & 31 \\ 0_{32086}^{31} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$
100002109002100002100002 32716

| 1 |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 032842 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |

100002100002100002100002 33472

100002100002100002100002 34228
$\begin{array}{llrr}35 & 35 & 35 \\ 0_{34354} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$
100003100003100003100003 34984

| 33 |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $0_{35110}^{3514}$ | 0 | 33 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |

100002100002100002100002 35740

| 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0_{36876}$ | 0 | 0 | 0 |

100003100003100003100003 36496
$233_{3622}^{23}$
$0_{37126} 0$
-98-

```
100000 100000 100000 100000
``` 37252
\begin{tabular}{llll}
2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 27378 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 38008
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
27 & 27 & 27 & 27 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 38638
100002100002100002100002 38764
 39394
100003100003100003100003 39520 \(\begin{array}{rrrr}25 \\ 0^{39646}{ }_{40150}^{25} & 0 & 0 & 25 \\ & 0\end{array}\)
100001100001100001100001 \(\begin{array}{rrr}33{ }_{40276}^{4023} & 33 & 33 \\ { }^{40402}{ }_{40906} 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100001100001100001100001 41032
\begin{tabular}{llll}
3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 41662
100003100003100003100003 41788
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
35 & 35 & 35 & 35 \\
\(0_{42418}^{45}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 42544 \(25 \quad 25 \quad 25 \quad 25\) 42670 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 43174
100002100002100002100002 43300
\(33 \quad 33 \quad 33\) 43426 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 43930
100003100003100003100003 44056 \(\begin{array}{llll}35 & 35 & 35 & 35\end{array}\) 44182
\({ }^{0} 44686\)

100002100002100002100002
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\(3^{44812}\) & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\(0^{44938}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 45568
25
0 \({ }^{45694}\)\begin{tabular}{l}
25 \\
0
\end{tabular} 46198
100003100003100003100003 31
\(\begin{array}{lrrr}31 & 31 & 31 & 31 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 46954
100003100003100003100003 47080 \(\begin{array}{rrrr}31 & 31 & 31 \\ 0_{47206}^{41} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 47836
31
47962
\(0 \quad 0 \quad 0\)
100003100003100003100003 148592
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\(1_{48718}\) & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
\(100000 \stackrel{49222}{100000} 100000100000\) 49348
\begin{tabular}{llll}
1 \\
49474 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 \({ }_{26} 50104\)
\(\begin{array}{rlrr}26{ }_{50230} & 26 & 26 & 26 \\ { }_{50734} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100000100000100000100000 50860

100001100001100001100001
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
36 \\
\({ }^{51616} 31742\) & 36 & 36 & 36 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001
52372

53002
100001100001100001100001 53128
\({ }^{2} 53254\)\begin{tabular}{lll}
2 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

53758
100001100001100001100001 53884
\({ }_{0}^{32} 54010^{32} \quad 0 \quad 32 \quad 32\) 54514
100001100001100001100001 54640
\({ }^{12}{ }_{54766}{ }^{12}\) 0 \(\quad 12 \quad 12\)

100000100000100000100000 55396
\begin{tabular}{llll}
5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
\({ }_{0}^{55522}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 56152
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 2626 & 26 & 26 \\
\hline 56278 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular} 56782
100002100002100002100002 56908
\begin{tabular}{crrr}
23 & 23 & 23 & 23 \\
07034 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 57664
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
27 & 27 & 27 & 27 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 58294
100001100001100001100001 58420
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
36 \\
\({ }_{58546}{ }^{36}\) & 36 & 36 \\
59050 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 59050
100001100001100001100001 59176
\({ }_{0}^{6} 59302\) 59806

100003100003100003100003 59932
\(33 \quad 33 \quad 33 \quad 33\) \(0^{60058} 0 \quad 0 \quad 0\) 60562
100003100003100003100003 60688
\({ }^{23}{ }^{60814}{ }^{23} 0 \quad 23 ~ 230\) 61318
100001100001100001100001 61444
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
\(34{ }_{61570} 34\) & 34 & 34 \\
\(0_{62074}^{6154}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001

\({ }^{4} 62326{ }^{4} \quad 0 \quad 4 \quad 4\) 62830
100001100001100001100001
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
34^{62956} 34
\] & 34 & 34 \\
\hline 63082 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular} 63586
100001100001100001100001 63712
 64342
100001100001100001100001 64468
\({ }_{0}^{10} 64594{ }^{10}\) 0 \(\quad 10 \quad 10\) 65098
100001100001100001100001 65224
\begin{tabular}{llll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
065350 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 . 65980
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
10 \\
66106 & 10 & 10 & 10 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001
66736
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\(10{ }_{6682}{ }^{10}\) & 10 & 10 \\
\(0_{67366}\) & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 67492
\begin{tabular}{llrr}
\(34{ }^{67618}\) & 34 & 34 & 34 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 68122

0
100001100001100001100001 68248
\(\begin{array}{llll}4 & 4 & 4 & 4\end{array}\) \(0^{68374} 0\) 68878
100003100003100003100003 69004
\(\begin{array}{llll}37 & 37 & 37 & 37\end{array}\) 69130 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
1000031000031000031.00003 69760
\(27 \quad 27 \quad 27\) 69886 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 70390
100001100001100001100001 70516
\({ }^{14}{ }_{70642^{14}} 14 \quad 14\) \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 71146
100001100001100001100001 71272
\begin{tabular}{llll}
4 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 71902
100003100003100003100003 72028
\(33 \quad 33 \quad 33 \quad 33\) 72154
\(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 72784
\(\begin{array}{ccrr}2372910 & 23 & 23 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 100000100000100000100000 73540 \(\begin{array}{llll}3 & 3 & 3 & 3\end{array}\) 73666


100001100001100001100001
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
74296 \\
267426 & 26 & 26 \\
074926 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100002100002100002100002 \(\begin{array}{lrrr}25 \\ { }^{75052} 25 & 25 & 25 \\ { }^{75178}{ }^{25} 20 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 75808
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
27 \\
75934 & 27 & 27 & 27 \\
076438 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 76564
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
32 & 32 & 32 \\
\(0_{76690}{ }^{32}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 77320
\begin{tabular}{llll}
2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
077446 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 78076
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
37 \\
\({ }^{78202}\) & 37 & 37 & 37 \\
78706 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 78832


100002100002100002100002 79588
\({ }^{31} 79714\)\begin{tabular}{rrr}
31 & 31 & 31 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 80344
 80974100002100002
100002100002100002100002 81100
\begin{tabular}{llll}
1 \\
0 & 1226 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 81730
100003100003100003100003
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
27 \\
\({ }^{81856} 81982\) & 27 & 27 & 27 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
```

100003100003100003100003
82612
33 33 33 33
82738
0 0 0 0
83242

```
100003100003100003100003
        83368
        \(\begin{array}{llll}33 & 33 & 33 & 33\end{array}\)
        83494
        83998
100003100003100003100003
        84124
        \(\begin{array}{llll}33 & 33 & 33 & 33\end{array}\)
        \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 84880
\begin{tabular}{llll}
3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 85510
100001100001100001100001 85636


100001100001100001100001 86392
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\(6_{8} 86518\) & 6 & 6 & 6 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 87148 \(\begin{array}{llll}35 & 35 & 35 & 35\end{array}\) \(\begin{array}{lllll}87274 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 87778
100003100003100003100003 87904 \(25 \quad 25 \quad 25 \quad 25\) \(\begin{array}{llll}88030 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 100001100001100001100001 88660
 89290
100001100001100001100001 89416
\begin{tabular}{llll}
2 \\
\({ }_{0} 89542\) & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 90046

100003100003100003100003 90172
 90298 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 90802
100003100003100003100003 90928
\begin{tabular}{rlrr}
25 \\
\({ }^{25} 91054\) & 25 & 25 & 25 \\
91558 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 91684
\(\begin{array}{lrrr}35 \\ 0_{91810}{ }^{35} & 0 & 35 & 35 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 92440
\(\begin{array}{lrr}35 \\ 0_{92566}{ }_{93070}^{35} & 35 & 35 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 93196
 93826
100003100003100003100003 93952
\begin{tabular}{llll}
5 \\
94078 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

94582
100003100003100003100003 94708
\(31 \quad 31 \quad 31 \quad 31\) 94834 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 95338
100003100003100003100003 95464
\(31 \quad 31 \quad 31 \quad 31\) 95590 \(\begin{array}{llll}0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 96220
\({ }_{0}^{11} 96346{ }^{11}\) 0 \(\quad 11 \quad 11\) 96850
100003100003100003100003 96976
11
1
1
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{VB01QUAD2} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{GOOD C} & CIRCUIT \\
\hline & 12 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & 82 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 208 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 334 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 25 & \[
838_{25}
\] & 25 & 25 \\
\hline & 964 & & \\
\hline 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline & 1090 & & \\
\hline 0 & \(1594^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 25 & \[
1594_{25}
\] & 25 & 25 \\
\hline & 1720 & & \\
\hline 11 & 11 & 11 & 11 \\
\hline & 1346 & & \\
\hline 0 & 2350 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1025 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 350 \\
& 1025
\end{aligned}
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 2476 & & \\
\hline 26 & 26 & 26 & 26 \\
\hline 0 & 26020 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 3106 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 3232 & & \\
\hline 36 & 36 & 36 & 36 \\
\hline 0 & 3358 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 3862 & & \\
\hline 25 & 25 & 25 & 25 \\
\hline & 3988 & & \\
\hline 5 & \[
4114
\] & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 4618 & & \\
\hline 425 & 425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline & 4744 & & \\
\hline 23 & 23 & 23 & 23 \\
\hline 0 & 4870 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 5374 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 5500 & & \\
\hline 26 & 26 & 26 & 26 \\
\hline 0 & 5626 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 6130 & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & 6256 & & \\
\hline 27 & 27 & 27 & 27 \\
\hline & 6382 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 6886 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 7012 & & \\
\hline 32 & 32 & 32 & 32 \\
\hline & 7138 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 7642 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 7768 & & \\
\hline 32 & 32 & 32 & 32 \\
\hline 0 & 7894 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 8398 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 2 & \[
8524
\] & 2 & 2 \\
\hline & 8650 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 9154 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 9280 & & \\
\hline 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 \\
\hline & 9406 & & \\
\hline 0 & \[
9910^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 10036 & & \\
\hline & 36 & 36 & 36 \\
\hline & 10162 & & \\
\hline 0 & \({ }^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 10666 & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & 10792 & & \\
\hline & 33 & 33 & 33 \\
\hline & 10918 & & \\
\hline 0 & \(1{ }^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 11422 & & \\
\hline 1025 & 1025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline & 1548 & & \\
\hline 6 & 1674 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline & 1674 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 12178 & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & 2304 & & \\
\hline & 23 & 23 & 23 \\
\hline & 12430 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 2934 & & \\
\hline & 25 & 25 & 25 \\
\hline & 3060 & & \\
\hline 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline & 3186 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 3690 & & \\
\hline 425 & 425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline & 3816 & & \\
\hline 25 & 25 & 25 & 25 \\
\hline & 3942 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 4446 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 18352 & & \\
\hline \(27 \quad 27\) & 27 & 27 \\
\hline 18478 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \({ }^{18982}\) & & \\
\hline \[
1025{ }_{19108}^{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 3232 & 32 & 32 \\
\hline 19234 & & \\
\hline \({ }^{0} 197380\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
19738 \\
1425 \quad 1425
\end{gathered}
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 19864 & & \\
\hline \(37{ }^{197}\) & 37 & 37 \\
\hline 19990 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 20494 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 20620 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 20746 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 21250 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 21376 & & \\
\hline 27 27 & 27 & 27 \\
\hline 21502 & & \\
\hline \(0{ }^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 22006 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1425 & 1425 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 142522132 & 1425 & 1425 & 29692 & & \\
\hline \(33 \quad 33\) & 33 & 33 & \(4{ }^{4} 4\) & 4 & 4 \\
\hline 22258 & & & \[
029818
\] & & \\
\hline \(0_{22762} 0\) & 0 & 0 & \[
30322
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425 \quad 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 22888 & & & \(7^{30448}\) & & \\
\hline 33133 & 33 & 33 & \(27{ }_{30574}{ }^{27}\) & 27 & 27 \\
\hline \(0^{23014} 0\) & & 0 & \[
0_{0}^{30574}{ }_{0}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
0_{23518}
\] & 0 & 0 & 31078 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 23644 & & & \(10^{31204}\) & & \\
\hline 33 & 33 & 33 & \(1031330{ }^{10}\) & 10 & 10 \\
\hline \(0^{23770} 0\) & & & \(0^{31330} 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
0_{24274}
\] & 0 & 0 & 31834 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 24400 & & & \(10^{31960}\) & & \\
\hline \(3{ }^{3}\) & 3 & 3 & \(10{ }_{32086} 10\) & 10 & 10 \\
\hline \(00^{24526} 0\) & & & \[
32086
\] & & \\
\hline \[
{ }_{25030} 0
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
32590
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \({ }_{34}{ }^{25156} 34\) & & & \[
32716
\] & & \\
\hline \[
3_{25282}^{34}
\] & 34 & 34 & 328420 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 25786 & & & \(1025{ }^{33346}\) & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \({ }_{34}{ }^{25912} 34\) & 34 & 34 & \(10^{33472} 10\) & 10 & 10 \\
\hline \[
26038
\] & 34 & 34 & 33598 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 26542 & & & \(1025{ }^{34102}\) & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & \(1025{ }_{34228}^{1025}\) & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \[
4^{26668} 4
\] & 4 & 4 & \(14{ }^{34228} 14\) & 14 & 14 \\
\hline 26794 & & & 34354 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1027298 & & & \[
1425{ }^{34858} 1425
\] & & \\
\hline \[
{ }^{1025} \underset{27424}{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
34984
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 1414 & 14 & 14 & 33 & 33 & 33 \\
\hline 27550 & & & \(0^{35110}\) & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & \({ }_{35614} 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
28054 \\
1025 \quad 1025
\end{gathered}
\] & & 1025 & \(1025{ }^{35614} 1025\) & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \[
{ }_{28180}^{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 & 135740 & & \\
\hline \(34 \quad 34\) & 34 & 34 & \(4{ }^{4}\) & 4 & 4 \\
\hline 28306 & & & \(0^{35866}\) & & \\
\hline \(0{ }^{0}\) & 0 & 0 & \[
36370
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425{ }^{28810} 1425\) & & & & & \\
\hline \[
{ }^{1425} \underset{28936}{1425}
\] & 1425 & 1425 & \[
\begin{gathered}
14 \\
36496
\end{gathered}
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \(37 \quad 37\) & 37 & 37 & 23123 & 23 & 23 \\
\hline 29062 & & & 36622 & & \\
\hline \[
0_{29566}^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
{ }^{0} 37126
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
{ }^{1025} \underset{37252}{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
10251025
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \(36 \quad 36\) & 36 & 36 & \[
44812
\] & & \\
\hline 37378 & & & \({ }^{2} 44938{ }^{2}\) & 2 & 2 \\
\hline \[
0_{37882}^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
0^{44938} 0
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425 \quad 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 & 45442 & & \\
\hline 38008 & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 35 & 35 & 35 &  & 25 & 25 \\
\hline \(0^{38134} 0\) & & & \({ }_{45694}\) & & \\
\hline \[
0_{38638^{0}}
\] & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & & & \\
\hline \(6^{38764}\) & & & \[
463242
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \({ }^{6} 38890{ }^{6}\) & 6 & 6 & 3131 & 31 & 31 \\
\hline \(0^{38890} 0\) & 0 & 0 & 46450 & & \\
\hline 39394 & & & \(0_{46954} 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & \(1425{ }^{46954} 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \(5^{39520}\) & & & 47080 & & \\
\hline \(25{ }^{25}\) & 25 & 25 & 1111 & 11 & 11 \\
\hline \[
39646
\] & & & 47206 & & \\
\hline \[
40150
\] & 0 & 0 & \(0_{47710^{0}}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & \(1425 \quad 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \({ }_{35}{ }^{40276} 35\) & & & 47836 & & \\
\hline \[
{ }_{40402^{35}}
\] & 35 & 35 & 31313 & 31 & 31 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \[
0_{0}^{47962} 0
\] & 0 & \\
\hline \(1425{ }^{40906} 1425\) & & & 48466 & & \\
\hline \(1425{ }_{41032} 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \(35^{41032} 35\) & 35 & 35 & 48592 & & \\
\hline 41158 & & & \[
1_{48718}
\] & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 441662 & & & 49222 & & \\
\hline \[
{ }_{41725}^{1425}
\] & 1425 & 1425 & 25 25 & 25 & 25 \\
\hline \(35 \quad 35\) & 35 & 35 & \(1{ }^{49348} 1\) & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 41914 & & & 149474 & & \\
\hline \(0_{42418}{ }^{0}\) & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425{ }^{42418} 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 & 49978 & & \\
\hline \({ }_{5} 42544\) & & & \[
425 \underset{50104}{425}
\] & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 545 & 5 & 5 & \(27 \quad 27\) & 27 & 27 \\
\hline \(0{ }_{0}^{42670} 0\) & & & . 50230 & & \\
\hline \({ }_{43174} 0\) & 0 & 0 & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1025{ }^{43174} 1025\) & 1025 & 1025 & 50734 & & \\
\hline 10254300 & 1025 & & \[
10251025
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 1212 & 12 & 12 & \(27 \quad 27\) & 27 & 27 \\
\hline 43426 & & & 50986 & & \\
\hline \[
0_{43930}
\] & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 21490 & & \\
\hline 44056 & & & \(1425{ }_{51616}\) & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \[
3_{44182^{35}}
\] & 35 & 35 & 26 & 26 & 26 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & \(0{ }_{0}^{51742} 0\) & 0 & \\
\hline 44686 & & & 52246 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{82612} & 1425 \\
\hline 32 & 32 & 32 & 32 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{82738} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{83242 0}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{83368} \\
\hline 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 \\
\hline & 94 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{83998}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & 32 & 32 & 32 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{84250} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{84754 0}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }_{2}^{84880} 2\)}} \\
\hline & & 2 & 2 \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(085510^{0}\) O 0}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & 34 & 34 & 34 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{85762} \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{86266} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{86518 -}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{870220} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & 34 & 34 & 34 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\({ }_{87274}^{34} 3034\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\({ }^{0} 87778{ }^{0}\)}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{87904} \\
\hline & 4 & 4 & 4 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{88030} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{8853400}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{88660} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{88786}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{89290} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{89416} \\
\hline 34 & 34 & 34 & 34 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{89542} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{90046}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Voter Test B01 3XA
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline VB013XA & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{GOOD CIRCUIT} & 100000100000 & 100000 & 100000 \\
\hline 0 & 12 & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & \(5{ }_{5}^{7012} 5\) & & 5 \\
\hline & 100 & & & 5138 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 0 & \[
226
\] & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 076420 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 0 & & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 100000100000 & 100000 & 100000 \\
\hline 0 & 334 & 00 & 0 & 157768 & & \\
\hline & 838 & 0 & 0 & \(157894{ }^{15}\) & 15 & 15 \\
\hline 100000 & 100000 & 0100000 & 100000 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 1 & & 11 & 1 & 8398 & & \\
\hline & 1090 & 1 1 & 1 & 100002100002 & 100002 & 100002 \\
\hline 0 & & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 33 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 100000 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1594 \\
& 100000
\end{aligned}
\] & & & 8650 & & \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1000 \\
& 1720
\end{aligned}
\] & 100000 & 100000 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 11 & 11 & 111 & 11 & 100002100002 & 100002 & 100002 \\
\hline & 1846 & & & 1000019280 & & \\
\hline 0 & & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & \(13 \quad 13\) & 13 & 13 \\
\hline 100000 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2350 \\
& 100000
\end{aligned}
\] & 0100000 & & - 9406 & & \\
\hline & \[
2476
\] & 100000 & 100000 & \(09910^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 11 & \({ }^{11}\) & 111 & 11 & 100000100000 & 100000 & 100000 \\
\hline & 2602 & & & 10036 & & \\
\hline 0 & & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 55 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline & 3106 & & & 10162 & & \\
\hline 100000 & \({ }_{3232} 10000\) & 100000 & 100000 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 11 & 11 & 11 & 11 & 10666 & & \\
\hline & 3358 & & & 100001100001 & 100001 & 100001 \\
\hline 0 & & 00 & 0 & 77 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline & 3862 & & & 10918 & & \\
\hline 100000 & 100000 & 100000 & 100000 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 5 & 39885 & 5 5 & 5 & \({ }_{10000211422}^{100002}\) & & \\
\hline & 4114 & & & 100002100002
11548 & 100002 & 100002 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 77 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline & 4618 & & & 11674 & & \\
\hline 100001 & 100001 & 1100001 & 100001 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 3 & 4744 & 3 & 3 & \(100003^{121788}\) & & \\
\hline & 4870 & & & 10000312304 & & 100003 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 33 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline & 5374 & & & 12430 & & \\
\hline 100000 & 100000 & 100000 & 100000 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 5500 & & & 12934 & & \\
\hline 15 & 15 & 515 & 15 & 100000100000 & 100000 & 100000 \\
\hline & 5626 & & & 13060 & & \\
\hline 0 & \(6130^{0}\) & 00 & 0 & 33 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 1000011 & 6130
100001 & 100001 & 100001 & 13186 & & \\
\hline & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1000 \\
& 6256
\end{aligned}
\] & 100001 & & \[
0_{13690}{ }^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 13 & 13 & 313 & 13 & 100001100001 & 100001 & 100001 \\
\hline & 6382 & & & 13816 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 55 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline & 6886 & & & 13942 & & \\
\hline & & & & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & & & & 14446 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

100000100000100000100000


100001100001100001100001 15328
\({ }^{15}{ }^{15454}\)\begin{tabular}{crr}
15 & 15 & 15 \\
\({ }_{15958}\) & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 16084


100001100001100001100001 16840
\begin{tabular}{llll}
1 \\
\(0_{16966}\) & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001


11
0
11

100001100001100001100001 18352
\({ }^{11} 18478\) \(0 \begin{array}{llll}18478 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
18982
\(100000_{1000}^{1000}\) 19108
\({ }^{7} 19234\) \({ }^{19738}\)
100001100001100001100001


100002100002100002100002 20620
\(\begin{array}{llrr}3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 0^{20746} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 21250 & & & \end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 21376
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\(7^{21376}\) & 7 & 7 & 7 \\
0 & 7502 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}


100001100001100001100001 22888
\begin{tabular}{lllll}
5 & 5 & 5 & 5 \\
\({ }_{2}^{23014}\) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
23518 & 0 & & 0
\end{tabular} 100003100003100003100003

100003100003100003100003 24400

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
{ }^{1025} \underset{29592}{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 55 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 29818 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 30322 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 30448 & & \\
\hline \(7 \quad 7\) & 7 & 7 \\
\hline 30574 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 31078 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 31204 & & \\
\hline 1111 & 11 & 11 \\
\hline 31330 & & \\
\hline \[
0_{31834} 0
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 31960 & & \\
\hline 1111 & 11 & 11 \\
\hline 32086 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 32590 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 32716 & & \\
\hline 11 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline 32842 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 33346 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 33472 & & \\
\hline 1111 & 11 & 11 \\
\hline 33598 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 34102 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 34228 & & \\
\hline 1515 & 15 & 15 \\
\hline 34354 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 34858 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 34984 & & \\
\hline 1313 & 13 & 13 \\
\hline 35110 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 35614 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 35740 & & \\
\hline 55 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 35866 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 36370 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 36496 & & \\
\hline 33 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 36622 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 37126 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}



\section*{Voter Test B01 3XB}

100000100000100000100000
 15202
100001100001100001100001 15328
\begin{tabular}{llrr}
\(16{ }^{15454}{ }^{16}\) & 16 & 16 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
100001100001100001100001 16084

100001100001100001100001 16840
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\(2_{16966}\) & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\(0{ }_{17470}\) & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}
100001100001100001100001 17596
\(\begin{array}{rrrr}12 \\ 0^{17722^{12}} & 0 & 12 & 12 \\ { }^{18226} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 100001100001100001100001 18352
\(\begin{array}{crr}122_{18478}^{12} & 12 & 12 \\ 0_{18982}^{18} & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100000100000100000100000 19108
\(\begin{array}{llll}{ }^{7} & 7 & 7 & 7 \\ 0^{19234} & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
19738
100001100001100001100001 19864
\(\begin{array}{llll}6 \\ 0_{0} 19990 & 6 & 6 & 6 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100002100002100002100002 20620
\(\begin{array}{llll}3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\ 0 & 30746 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003 21376
\(\begin{array}{llll}7_{21502} & 7 & 7 & 7 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)

100001100001100001100001


100001100001100001100001 22888
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\(6_{22888}\) & 6 & 6 & 6 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100003100003100003100003 23644
\(\begin{array}{crr}133_{23770}^{13} & 13 & 13 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003
24400
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(3{ }^{3}\) & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 24526 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 25030 & & \\
\hline \(25{ }_{25156}{ }^{25}\) & 25 & 25 \\
\hline \[
3^{25156}
\] & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 25282 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \({ }_{25} 25786\) & & \\
\hline \[
{ }^{25} 25912^{25}
\] & 25 & 25 \\
\hline \(13 \quad 13\) & 13 & 13 \\
\hline 26038 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 26542 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 26668 & & \\
\hline 6 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline 26794 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
27298 \\
1025 \\
1025
\end{gathered}
\] & & \\
\hline \[
{ }_{27424}^{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline 27550 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 28054 & & \\
\hline \(25 \quad 25\) & 25 & 25 \\
\hline 7281807 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline 28306 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 28810 & & \\
\hline 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 28936 & & \\
\hline 3 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 29062 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 29566 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
{ }^{1025} 1025
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
{ }_{37252^{25}}
\] & 25 & 25 \\
\hline \(6 \quad 6\) & 6 & 6 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 29818 & & & 37378 & & \\
\hline 0 0 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \({ }_{1425} 30322\) & & & & & \\
\hline \[
14251425
\] & 1425 & 1425 & \[
\begin{gathered}
425 \\
38008
\end{gathered}
\] & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 77 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline 30574 & & & 38134 & & \\
\hline \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1025 \begin{gathered}31078 \\ 1025\end{gathered}\) & 1025 & 1025 & \(1025{ }^{38638} 1025\) & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 31204 & & & 1025 38764 & & \\
\hline \(12 \quad 12\) & 12 & 12 & 7 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline 31330 & & & 38890 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 102531834 & & & \[
1425 \stackrel{39394}{1425}
\] & & \\
\hline \[
{ }^{1025} 1025
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
1425{ }_{39520}^{1425}
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 1212 & 12 & 12 & 6 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline 32086 & & & 39646 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{0} 40150\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1025{ }^{32590}\) & & & \(425{ }^{40150}\) & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
10251025 \\
32716
\end{gathered}
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
425425 \\
40276
\end{array}
\] & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 22 & 2 & 2 & \(13{ }^{13} 13\) & 13 & 13 \\
\hline \(0^{32842} 0\) & & & \(0^{40402}\) & & \\
\hline \[
0_{33346}{ }^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
{ }_{40906} 0
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 33472 & & & 41032 & & \\
\hline \[
12{ }_{33598}^{12}
\] & 12 & 12 & \[
3_{41158}^{3}
\] & 3 & 3 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 34102 & & & 41662 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 34228 & & & 41788 & & \\
\hline 1616 & 16 & 16 & 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline \[
0^{34354} 0
\] & 0 & 0 & \(0^{41914} 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 34858 & & & 42418 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 34984 & & & 642544 & & \\
\hline \[
13_{35110^{13}}
\] & 13 & 13 & \[
{ }_{42670}{ }^{6}
\] & 6 & 6 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 35614 & & & 43174 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 35740 & & & 43300 & & \\
\hline 6 ) & 6 & 6 & 1313 & 13 & 13 \\
\hline 35866 & & & 043426 & & \\
\hline \[
0_{36370} 0
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
0_{43930} 0
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425 \quad 1425\) & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 36496 & & & 44056 & & \\
\hline 33 & 3 & 3 & 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline 36622 & & & 44182 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & \({ }^{0} 44686^{0}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
1025{ }_{44812}^{1025}
\]} & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(44938{ }^{3}\)}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\(0_{45442} 000\)} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{45568 1425 1425} \\
\hline 6 & \({ }^{5694}{ }^{6}\) & 6 & 6 \\
\hline & 5694 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\({ }^{0} 46198 \quad 0 \quad 0\)} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & 6324 & & \\
\hline & \[
6450^{12}
\] & 12 & 12 \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{46954} \\
\hline 1425 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1425 \\
& 17080
\end{aligned}
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{47206} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\({ }_{47710}{ }^{\circ} 00\)} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline & 7836 & & \\
\hline 12 & 12 & 12 & 12 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{47962} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{484660} \\
\hline 1425 & 1425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{48592} \\
\hline 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
\hline 100000 & 100000 & 100000 & 100000 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(6 \quad 6 \quad 6 \quad 6\)}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{7138} \\
\hline 0 & 7642 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{100000100000100000100000}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 16 & \[
7894^{16}
\] & 16 & 16 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{0} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline & 8398 & & \\
\hline 100002 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 100002 \\
& 8524
\end{aligned}
\] & 100002 & 100002 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


Voter Test B01 3XC

```

100000 100000100000100000
14572
15
14698
0 0 0 0
15202
1000011100001 100001 100001
15328
16}1616 16 16
15454
0 0 0 0
15958
100001 100001 100001 100001
16084
14 14 14 14
0
16714
100001100001 100001 100001
16840
416966 4
17470
100001 100001 100001 100001
17596
14 17722 14
18226
100001 100001 100001 100001
18352
14 18478 14
18982
100000100000100000100000
19108
7 719234 7 0 % 0
19738
100001 100001 100001 100001
19864
6 % 6 % % 6 % % %
100002100002100002100002
20620
5 20746 5 0 % 5 0 0
21250
100003100003100003100003
21376
l}\mp@subsup{}{7}{21502 }\mp@subsup{}{0}{7
22006

```

100001100001100001100001 22132


22762
100001100001100001100001 22888


23518
100003100003100003100003 23644
\(15{ }^{23770} \begin{array}{rrrr}15 & 15 & 15 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 24274
100003100003100003100003
24400


-119-
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(372522^{25} 25\)}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 5 5 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 37378 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{378820} \\
\hline 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{38008} \\
\hline 7 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline 38134 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{38638 0 0}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{38764 1025 1025}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 738 & 7 & 7 \\
\hline \[
38890
\] & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
39394
\]} \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 39520 & & \\
\hline \[
{ }_{39646}{ }^{6}
\] & 6 & 6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\({ }_{40150} 00\)}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 40276 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{40402 1s}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{40906}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 41032 & & 425 \\
\hline 55 & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 41158 & & \\
\hline \[
0 \ldots 0
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
41662
\]} \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 41788 & & \\
\hline 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{41914} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{42418}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 42544 & & \\
\hline \(6 \quad 6\) & 6 & 6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{42670} \\
\hline 0 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{43174} \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 43300 & & \\
\hline 1515 & 15 & 15 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{43426} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{142543930}} \\
\hline & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 44056 & & \\
\hline 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline 44182 & & \\
\hline \({ }_{44686} 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 44686 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
{ }_{-44812}^{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \(5 \quad 5\) & 5 & 5 \\
\hline 44938 & & \\
\hline \[
{ }^{0} 45442^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 45568 & & \\
\hline 6 & 6 & 6 \\
\hline \[
0_{0}^{45694}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 46198 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 46324 & & \\
\hline 1414 & 14 & 14 \\
\hline 46450 & & \\
\hline 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
46954 \\
1425 \\
1425
\end{gathered}
\] & & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
1425{ }_{47080}^{1425}
\end{gathered}
\] & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 1414 & 14 & 14 \\
\hline 47206 & & \\
\hline \(0_{47710^{0}}\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline \(1425 \quad 1425\) & 1425 & \\
\hline 47836 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 14 & 14 & 14 \\
\hline \(0^{47962} 0\) & & \\
\hline \[
48466
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 48592 & & \\
\hline 44 & 4 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Voter Test B01 3XD}


100000100000100000100000
\(\begin{array}{rrrr}12 & 7138 & 12 & 12 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
\(100000 \begin{array}{lll}7642 \\ 100000 & 100000 & 100000\end{array}\)
\(16{ }^{7768}{ }_{16} \quad 16 \quad 16\) 7894 8398
100002100002100002100002 8524
\(1180_{0} 8650^{11} \quad 111011\) 9154
100002100002100002100002 928
15 9406
0990
100000100000100000100000 1003
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
\(122_{10162}^{12}\) & 12 & 12 \\
\(0_{10666}^{1012}\) & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
\(13^{10792}{ }_{10918}^{13}\) & 13 & 13 \\
\(0_{11422} 0\) & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100002100002100002100002
11548
\(\begin{array}{ccc}133_{11674}^{13} & 13 & 13 \\ 0_{12178}^{13} & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
100003100003100003100003

100001100001100001100001 13816
\begin{tabular}{crr}
\(12{ }_{13942}^{12}\) & 12 & 12 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100000100000100000100000 14572
\begin{tabular}{ccrr}
15 \\
\(0^{14698}\) & 15 & 15 & 15 \\
0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 100001100001100001100001
 \(\begin{array}{lll}15958 \\ 100001 & 100001 & 100001\end{array}\) 16084
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
\(14{ }^{16084}{ }^{16210^{14}}\) & 14 & 14 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 16714
100001100001100001100001 16840
\begin{tabular}{crr}
\(100^{16840} 10\) & 10 & 10 \\
\(0^{16966} 0\) & 0 & 0
\end{tabular}

100001100001100001100001 17596
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
14 & 14 & 14 & 14 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 18226
100001100001100001100001 18352
\begin{tabular}{rrrr}
14 & 14 & 14 & 14 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{tabular} 18982
100000100000100000100000 19108
\(\begin{array}{rrrr}13 \\ 0 & 19234 & 13 & 13 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\) 19738
100001100001100001100001 19864
\(12 \quad 12 \quad 12 \quad 12\) \(0^{19990} 000\) 20494
100002100002100002100002 20620 \({ }_{0}^{1120746} \begin{array}{rrrr}11 & 11 & 11 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}\)
10000312100003100003100003
 22006

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
{ }^{1025}{ }_{29692}^{1025}
\] & 1025 & 1025 & \[
{ }^{25}{ }_{37252^{25}}
\] & 25 & 25 \\
\hline 1212 & 12 & 12 & \(11 \quad 11\) & 11 & 11 \\
\hline 29818 & & & 37378 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 30322 & & & 37882 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline \(3^{30448}\) & & & 38008 & & \\
\hline 1313 & 13 & 13 & 1313 & 13 & 13 \\
\hline \(0^{30574} 0\) & & & 38134 & & \\
\hline \[
0^{0} 31078^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
0_{38638}^{0}
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline \(14{ }^{31204} 14\) & & & 38764 & & \\
\hline \(14{ }_{31330} 14\) & 14 & 14 & 1313 & 13 & 13 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 31834 & & & 39394 & & \\
\hline 1.0251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 31960 & & & 139520 & & \\
\hline \(14{ }_{32086} 14\) & 14 & 14 & 1212 & 12 & 12 \\
\hline \[
0^{32086} 0
\] & 0 & 0 & \[
39646
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 32590 & & & \[
40150
\] & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & \(425 \quad 425\) & 425 & 425 \\
\hline 32716 & & & 40276 & & \\
\hline 1010 & 10 & 10 & 1515 & 15 & 15 \\
\hline 32842 & & & 40402 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 33346 & & & 40906 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 425425 & 425 & 425 \\
\hline \[
14^{33472} 14
\] & 14 & 14 & 41032 & & \\
\hline 33598 & & & \[
11_{41158^{11}}
\] & 11 & 11 \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 34102 & & & 41662 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 34228 & & & 41788 & & \\
\hline 1616 & 16 & 16 & 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline 34354 & & & 41914 & & \\
\hline \(0 \quad 0\) & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 14254858 & & & 42418 & & \\
\hline \(1425{ }_{34984}^{1425}\) & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline \(15^{34984} 15\) & 15 & 15 & \(12^{42544} 12\) & 12 & 12 \\
\hline 35110 & & & \[
42670
\] & & \\
\hline 0 0 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 35614 & & & 43174 & & \\
\hline 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 & 10251025 & 1025 & 1025 \\
\hline 35740 & & & 43300 & & \\
\hline 1212 & 12 & 12 & 1515 & 15 & 15 \\
\hline 35866 & & & 43426 & & \\
\hline 00 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 36370 & & & 43930 & & \\
\hline 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 & 14251425 & 1425 & 1425 \\
\hline 36496 & & & 44056 & & \\
\hline 1111 & 11 & 11 & 1616 & 16 & 16 \\
\hline 36622 & & & 44182 & & \\
\hline 0 0 & 0 & 0 & 00 & 0 & 0 \\
\hline 37126 & & & 44686 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

```

