Introduction to Computer Architecture

Lecture 6: Timing and Verification

Pooyan Jamshidi

Week 8: February 27, 29

**Engineering
and Computing**
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Readings (This Week)

- **Hardware Description Languages and Verilog**
  - H&H Chapter 4 in full

- **Timing and Verification**
  - H&H Chapters 2.9 and 3.5 + (start Chapter 5)

- By tomorrow, make sure you are done with
  - **P&P Chapters 1-3   +   H&H Chapters 1-4**

Readings (Next Week)

- **Von Neumann Model, LC-3, and MIPS**
  - P&P, Chapter 4, 5
  - H&H, Chapter 6
  - P&P, Appendices A and C (ISA and microarchitecture of LC-3)
  - H&H, Appendix B (MIPS instructions)

- **Programming**
  - P&P, Chapter 6

- **Recommended:** Digital Building Blocks
 - H&H, Chapter 5

What Will We Learn Today?

- Timing in **combinational circuits**
  - Propagation delay and contamination delay
  - Glitches

- Timing in **sequential circuits**
  - Setup time and hold time
  - Determining how fast a circuit can operate

- **Circuit Verification**
  - How to make sure a circuit works correctly
  - Functional verification
  - Timing verification

Tradeoffs in Circuit Design

Circuit Design is a Tradeoff Between:

- Area
  - Circuit **area** is proportional to the **cost** of the device

- Speed / Throughput
  - We want **faster**, more **capable** circuits

- Power / Energy
  - Mobile devices need to work with a **limited** power supply
  - High performance devices **dissipate** more than 100W/cm^2

- Design Time
  - Designers are **expensive** in *time* and *money*
  - The **competition** will not wait for you

# Requirements and Goals Depend On Application

Circuit Timing

- Until now, we investigated **logical functionality**

- What about **timing**?
  - How **fast** is a circuit?
  - How can we make a circuit **faster**?
  - What happens if we run a circuit **too fast**?

- A design that is logically correct can still **fail** because of real-world **implementation issues**!

# Part 1:
# Combinational Circuit Timing

Digital Logic Abstraction

- **"Digital logic"** is a convenient **abstraction**
 - Output changes *immediately* with the input

Combinational Circuit Delay

- In reality, **outputs** are **delayed** from **inputs**
    - Transistors take a finite amount of time to switch

Real Inverter Delay Example

Image source: Sandoval-Ibarra, F., and E. S. Hernández-Bernal. "Ring CMOS NOT-based oscillators: Analysis and design." *Journal of applied research and technology,* 2008.

Circuit Delay and Its Variation

- Delay is fundamentally caused by
  - **Capacitance** and **resistance** in a circuit
  - Finite **speed of light** (not so fast on a nanosecond scale!)

- ***Anything*** affecting these quantities can change delay:
  - **Rising** (i.e., 0 -> 1) vs. **falling** (i.e., 1 -> 0) inputs
  - Different **inputs** have different **delays**
  - Changes in **environment** (e.g., temperature)
  - **Aging** of the circuit

- We have a **range of possible delays** from input to output

Delays from Input to Output Y

- **Contamination delay (t_{cd}):** delay until Y **_starts changing_**
- **Propagation delay (t_{pd}):** delay until Y **_finishes changing_**

<u>Example Circuit</u>

<u>Effect of Changing Input 'A'</u>

Cross-hatching
means value is changing

Calculating Longest & Shortest Delay Paths

- We care about **both** the ***longest*** and ***shortest*** *delay* paths in a circuit (we will see why later in the lecture)

Critical Path

Short Path

- **Critical (Longest) Path:** $t_{pd} = 2\ t_{pd\_AND} + t_{pd\_OR}$
- **Shortest Path:** $t_{cd} = t_{cd\_AND}$

Calculating Longest Delay Path (Critical Path)

Critical Path

- **Critical (Longest) Path:** $t_{pd} = 2\ t_{pd\_AND} + t_{pd\_OR}$
- **Shortest Path:** $t_{cd} = t_{cd\_AND}$

16

# Calculating Shortest Delay Path

Short Path

- **Critical (Longest) Path:** $\quad t_{pd} = 2\ t_{pd\_AND} + t_{pd\_OR}$
- **Shortest Path:** $\quad\quad\quad t_{cd} = t_{cd\_AND}$

Example t_{pd} for a Real NAND-2 Gate

Symbol	Parameter	Conditions	25 °C			−40 °C to +125 °C		Unit
			Min	**Typ**	**Max**	**Max (85 °C)**	**Max (125 °C)**	
74HC00								
t_{pd}	propagation delay	nA, nB to nY; see Figure 6 [1]						
		V_{CC} = 2.0 V	-	25	-	115	135	ns
		V_{CC} = 4.5 V	-	9	-	23	27	ns
		V_{CC} = 5.0 V; C_L = 15 pF	-	7		-	-	ns
		V_{CC} = 6.0 V	-	7	-	20	23	ns

- Heavy **dependence** on **voltage** and **temperature**!

Source: Nexperia 2-input NAND (74HC00) Datasheet, Section 10

Example Worst-Case t_{pd}

- Two different **implementations** of a **4:1 multiplexer**

<u>Gate Delays</u> <u>Implementation 1</u> <u>Implementation 2</u>

Gate	t_{pd} (ps)
NOT	30
2-input AND	60
3-input AND	80
4-input OR	90
tristate (A to Y)	50
tristate (enable to Y)	35

$t_{pd\_sy} = t_{pd\_INV} + t_{pd\_AND3} + t_{pd\_OR4}$
$= 30\ \text{ps} + 80\ \text{ps} + 90\ \text{ps}$

(a) $= 200\ \text{ps}$ ⟷ **(b)** $= 125\ \text{ps}$

$t_{pd\_dy} = t_{pd\_AND3} + t_{pd\_OR4}$

$= 170\ \text{ps}$ ⟷ $= 50\ \text{ps}$

$t_{pd\_sy} = t_{pd\_INV} + t_{pd\_AND2} + t_{pd\_TRI\_SY}$
$= 30\ \text{ps} + 60\ \text{ps} + 35\ \text{ps}$

$t_{pd\_dy} = t_{pd\_TRI\_AY}$

- **Different designs** lead to very **different delays**

19

Aside: A Third 4:1 MUX Implementation

$$t_{pd\_s0y} = t_{pd\_TRLSY} + t_{pd\_TRI\_AY} = \textbf{85 ns}$$
$$t_{pd\_dy} = 2\, t_{pd\_TRI\_AY} = \boxed{\textbf{100 ns}}$$

Figure 2.74 4:1 multiplexer propagation delays: hierarchical using 2:1 multiplexers

Disclaimer: Calculating Long/Short Paths

- It's **not** always this easy to determine the long/short paths!
  - Not all **input transitions** affect the **output**
  - Can have **multiple different paths** from an input to output

- In reality, circuits are **not** all built equally
  - Different instances of the **same gate** have **different delays**
  - **Wires** have **nonzero delay** (increasing with length)
  - Temperature/voltage affect circuit speeds
    - Not all circuit elements are affected the same way
    - Can even **change the critical path**!

- Designers assume **"worst-case" conditions** and run many **statistical simulations** to balance yield/performance

Combinational Timing Summary

- Circuit outputs change some time **after** the inputs change
    - Caused by finite speed of light (not so fast on a ns scale!)
    - Delay is dependent on inputs, environmental state, etc.

- The range of possible delays is characterized by:
    - **Contamination delay (t_{cd}):** *minimum possible* delay
    - **Propagation delay (t_{pd}):** *maximum possible* delay

- Delays **change** with:
    - Circuit design (e.g., topology, materials)
   - Operating conditions

Output Glitches

Glitches

- **Glitch: one** input transition causes **multiple** output transitions

Circuit initial state

Glitches

- **Glitch: one** input transition causes **multiple** output transitions

0

$1 \to 0$

1

$1 \to ?$

Glitches

- **Glitch: one** input transition causes **multiple** output transitions

Slow path (3 gates)

Fast path (2 gates)

Glitches

- **Glitch: one** input transition causes **multiple** output transitions

0

1 -> 0

1

Slow path (3 gates)

1 -> 0 -> 1

Fast path (2 gates)

Glitches

- **Glitch: one** input transition causes **multiple** output transitions

Slow path (3 gates)

(B) 1 -> 0

n1

n2

(Y) 1 -> 0 -> 1

Fast path (2 gates)

B

n2

n1

Y

glitch

Time

Optional: Avoiding Glitches Using K-Maps

- Glitches are **visible** in **K-maps**
  - Recall: K-maps show the results of a change in a **single input**
  - A glitch occurs when **moving between prime implicants**

$$Y = \overline{A}\,\overline{B} + BC$$

Optional: Avoiding Glitches Using K-Maps

- We can **fix** the issue by adding in the **consensus** term
  - Ensures **no transition** between different **prime implicants**

(A) 0

(B) 1 -> 0

(C) 1

$\overline{A}\,\overline{B}$

BC

$\overline{A}C$

(Y) 1 -> 1

No dependence on B => No glitch!

$Y = \overline{A}\overline{B} + BC + \overline{A}C$

Avoiding Glitches

- **Q:** Do we **always** care about glitches?
  - **Fixing** glitches is **undesirable**
    - More chip **area**
    - More **power consumption**
    - More **design effort**
  - The circuit is **eventually** guaranteed to **converge** to the **right value** regardless of glitchiness

- **A:** No, not always!
  - If we only care about the **long-term steady state output**, we can **safely ignore** glitches
  - Up to the **designer to decide** if glitches matter in their application
    - When examining simulation output, important to recognize glitches

Part 2:
Sequential Circuit Timing

Recall: D Flip-Flop

- Flip-flop **samples D** at the **active clock edge**
  - It outputs the **sampled value** to Q
  - It **"stores"** the **sampled value** until the next active clock edge

CLK

D → Q

- The D flip-flop is **made** from **combinational** elements
- **D, Q, CLK all have timing requirements!**

D Flip-Flop Input Timing Constraints

- **D** must be **stable** when **sampled** (i.e., at active clock edge)

- *Setup time* (t$_{setup}$)**:** time **before** the clock edge that data must be stable (i.e. not changing)

- *Hold time* (t$_{hold}$)**:** time **after** the clock edge that data must be stable

- *Aperture time* (t$_a$)**:** time **around** clock edge that data must be stable (**t$_a$ = t$_{setup}$ + t$_{hold}$**)

Violating Input Timing: Metastability

- If D is **changing** when sampled, *metastability* can occur
  - Flip-flop output is **stuck** somewhere between '1' and '0'
  - Output eventually settles **non-deterministically**

Example Timing Violations (NAND RS Latch)

CLK

Q

Metastability

Non-deterministic Convergence

Source: W. J. Dally, Lecture notes for EE108A, Lecture 13: Metastability and Synchronization Failure (When Good Flip-Flops go Bad) 11/9/2005.

Flip-Flop Output Timing

- **Contamination delay clock-to-q (t_{ccq}):** earliest time after the clock edge that Q starts to change (i.e., is unstable)

- **Propagation delay clock-to-q (t_{pcq}):** latest time after the clock edge that Q stops changing (i.e., is stable)

Recall: Sequential System Design

- Multiple **flip-flops** are connected with **combinational logic**
- **Clock** runs with period T_c (cycle time)

- **Must meet timing requirements for both R1 and R2!**

Ensuring Correct Sequential Operation

- Need to ensure correct input timing on **R2**

- Specifically, **D2** must be **stable**:
  - at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge
  - at least until t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

Ensuring Correct Sequential Operation

- This means there is both a **minimum** and **maximum** delay between two flip-flops
  - CL **too fast** -> R2 t_{hold} violation
  - CL **too slow** -> R2 t_{setup} violation

Potential R2 t_{SETUP} VIOLATION!

CLK Q1 C L D2 CLK

(a) R1 R2

T_c

CLK
Q1
D2
(b) t_{HOLD} t_{SETUP}

Setup Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **maximum** delay from R1 to R2
- The input to R2 must be stable at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge.

Setup Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **maximum** delay from R1 to R2
- The input to R2 must be stable at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge.

$$T_c > t_{pcq}$$

Setup Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **maximum** delay from R1 to R2
- The input to R2 must be stable at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge.

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd}$$

Setup Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **maximum** delay from R1 to R2
- The input to R2 must be stable at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge.

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$$

Setup Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **maximum** delay from R1 to R2
- The input to R2 must be stable at least t_{setup} **before** the clock edge.

Wasted work

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$$

Useful work

Sequencing overhead: amount of time **wasted** each cycle due to sequencing element timing requirements

t$_{\text{setup}}$ Constraint and Design Performance

- **Critical path:** path with the longest **t$_{\text{pd}}$**

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$$

- Overall design performance is determined by the critical path **t$_{\text{pd}}$**
  - Determines the **minimum clock period** (i.e., **max operating frequency**)
  - If the critical path is too **long**, the design will run **slowly**
  - If critical path is too **short**, each cycle will do very **little useful work**
    - i.e., most of the cycle will be **wasted** in sequencing overhead

Hold Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **minimum** delay from R1 to R2
- **D2** (i.e., R2 input) must be stable for at least t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

Must not change until t_{hold} after the clock

t_{ccq}

Hold Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **minimum** delay from R1 to R2
- **D2** (i.e., R2 input) must be stable for at least t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

$$t_{ccq} + t_{cd}$$

Hold Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **minimum** delay from R1 to R2
- **D2** (i.e., R2 input) must be stable for at least t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

$$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$$

Hold Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **minimum** delay from R1 to R2
- **D2** (i.e., R2 input) must be stable for at least t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

$$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$$

$$t_{cd} > t_{hold} - t_{ccq}$$

We need to have a **minimum** combinational delay!

Hold Time Constraint

- **Safe timing** depends on the **minimum** delay from R1 to R2
- **D2** (i.e., R2 input) must be stable for at least t_{hold} **after** the clock edge

$$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$$

$$\boxed{t_{cd} > t_{hold} - t_{ccq}}$$

Does **NOT** depend on T_c!

↓

Very hard to fix t_{hold} violations after manufacturing- must modify circuits!

50

Sequential Timing Summary

t_{ccq} / t_{pcq}	**clock-to-q** delay (contamination/propagation)
t_{cd} / t_{pd}	**combinational logic** delay (contamination/propagation)
t_{setup}	time that **FF inputs** must be stable **before** next clock edge
t_{hold}	time that **FF inputs** must be stable **after** a clock edge
T_c	clock period

Example: Timing Analysis

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

per gate

$t_{pd} =$

$t_{cd} =$

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$

$f_{max} = 1/T_c =$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Timing Analysis

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

per gate

t_{pd} = **3 x 35 ps = 105 ps**

t_{cd} =

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$

$f_{max} = 1/T_c =$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Timing Analysis

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = **25 ps**

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

per gate

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$

$f_{max} = 1/T_c =$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Timing Analysis

t_{pcq}

t_{pd}

t_{setup}

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 25 ps

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate $\big[$ t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$ (50 + 105 + 60) ps = 215 ps

$f_{max} = 1/T_c =$ **4.65 GHz**

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Timing Analysis

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 25 ps

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c > (50 + 105 + 60)$ ps = 215 ps

$f_{max} = 1/T_c$ = 4.65 GHz

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

(30 + 25) ps > 70 ps ?

Example: Timing Analysis

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq} = 30 ps

t_{pcq} = 50 ps

t_{setup} = 60 ps

t_{hold} = 70 ps

per gate t_{pd} = 35 ps

t_{cd} = 25 ps

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c > (50 + 105 + 60)$ ps = 215 ps

$f_{max} = 1/T_c$ = 4.65 GHz

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

(30 + 25) ps > 70 ps ?

FAIL

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

CLK

A

B

CLK

C

X' X

D

Y' Y

$t_{pd} =$

$t_{cd} =$

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} t_{pd} \\ t_{cd} \end{array} \right.$	= 35 ps
	= 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$

$f_c =$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

Timing Characteristics

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = **2 x 25 ps = 50 ps**

t_{ccq}	**= 30 ps**
t_{pcq}	**= 50 ps**
t_{setup}	**= 60 ps**
t_{hold}	**= 70 ps**
per gate t_{pd}	**= 35 ps**
t_{cd}	**= 25 ps**

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c >$

$f_c =$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

t_{pcq}

CLK

A

B

t_{pd}

C

D

CLK

X' X

Y' Y

t_{setup}

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 2 x 25 ps = 50 ps

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

T_c > t$_{pcq}$ + t$_{pd}$ + t$_{setup}$

T_c > (50 + 105 + 60) ps = 215 ps

f_c = 1/T_c = 4.65 GHz

Check hold time constraints:

t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold} ?

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 2 x 25 ps = 50 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c > (50 + 105 + 60)$ ps = 215 ps

$f_c = 1/T_c =$ **4.65 GHz** **Note: no change to max frequency!**

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} t_{pd} \\ t_{cd} \end{array} \right.$	= 35 ps
	= 25 ps

t_{pd} = 3 x 35 ps = 105 ps

t_{cd} = 2 x 25 ps = 50 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

T_c > (50 + 105 + 60) ps = 215 ps

$f_c = 1/T_c$ = 4.65 GHz

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

(30 + 50) ps > 70 ps ?

62

Example: Fixing Hold Time Violation

Add buffers to the short paths:

CLK   CLK

A

B

C

X' X

D   Y' Y

$t_{pd} = 3 \times 35\ ps = 105\ ps$

$t_{cd} = 2 \times 25\ ps = 50\ ps$

Timing Characteristics

t_{ccq}	= 30 ps
t_{pcq}	= 50 ps
t_{setup}	= 60 ps
t_{hold}	= 70 ps
per gate t_{pd}	= 35 ps
t_{cd}	= 25 ps

Check setup time constraints:

$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup}$

$T_c > (50 + 105 + 60)\ ps = 215\ ps$

$f_c = 1/T_c = 4.65\ GHz$

Check hold time constraints:

$t_{ccq} + t_{cd} > t_{hold}$?

$(30 + 50)\ ps > 70\ ps$?

PASS

Clock Skew

- To make matters worse, **clocks have delay** too!
  - The clock does **not** reach all parts of the chip at the same time!
- **Clock skew:** time difference between two clock edges

CLOCK SOURCE

A

B

Long, slow clock path

Output Logic

Clock Source
Point **A**
Point **B**

clock skew

Clock Skew Example

- Example of the **Alpha 21264** clock skew spatial distribution

P. E. Gronowski+, "High-performance Microprocessor Design," JSSC'98.

Clock Skew: Setup Time Revisited

- **Safe timing** requires considering the **worst-case skew**
  - Clock arrives at **R2 *before* R1**
  - Leaves **as little time as possible** for the **combinational logic**

Signal must arrive at D2 *earlier*!

This effectively *increases* t_{setup}:

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup} + t_{skew}$$

$$T_c > t_{pcq} + t_{pd} + t_{setup, effective}$$

Clock Skew: Hold Time Revisited

- **Safe timing** requires considering the **worst-case skew**
  - Clock arrives at **R2** *after* **R1**
  - Increases the **minimum required delay** for the **combinational logic**

Signal must arrive at D2 *later*!

This effectively *increases* t_{hold}:

$$t_{cd} + t_{ccq} > t_{hold} + t_{skew}$$

$$t_{cd} + t_{ccq} > t_{hold, effective}$$

Clock Skew: Summary

- **Skew** effectively **increases** both t_{setup} and t_{hold}
  - Increased **sequencing overhead**
  - i.e., less useful work done per cycle

- Designers must keep skew to a **minimum**
  - Requires intelligent **"clock network"** across a chip
  - **Goal: clock** arrives at all locations at roughly the **same time**

Source: Abdelhadi, Ameer, et al. "Timing-driven variation-aware nonuniform clock mesh synthesis." GLSVLSI'10.

Part 3:
Circuit Verification

How Do You Know That A Circuit Works?

- You have designed a circuit
  - Is it **functionally** correct?
  - Even if it is logically correct, does the hardware meet all **timing** constraints?

- How can you **test** for:
  - Functionality?
  - Timing?

- Answer: **simulation tools**!
  - Formal verification tools (e.g., SAT solvers)
  - HDL timing simulation (e.g., Vivado)
  - Circuit simulation (e.g., SPICE)

Testing Large Digital Designs

- Testing can be the **most time consuming** design stage
  - Functional correctness of **all logic paths**
  - Timing, power, etc. of **all circuit elements**

- Unfortunately, **low-level** (e.g., circuit) simulation is **much slower** than **high-level** (e.g., HDL, C) simulation

- **Solution:** we split responsibilities:
  - 1) Check **only functionality** at a **high level** (e.g., C, HDL)
    - (Relatively) **fast** simulation time allows **high code coverage**
    - **Easy** to write and run tests
  - 2) Check **only timing, power**, etc. at **low level** (e.g., circuit)
    - **No functional testing** of low-level model
    - Instead, test *functional equivalence* to high-level model
      - **Hard**, but **easier** than testing logical functionality at this level

71

Testing Large Digital Designs

- We have **tools** to handle different levels of verification
  - *Logic synthesis tools* guarantee equivalence of high-level logic and synthesized circuit-level description
  - *Timing verification tools* check all **circuit timings**
  - *Design rule checks* ensure that **physical circuits** are buildable

- **The task of a logic designer** is to:
  - Provide **functional tests** for logical correctness of the design
  - Provide **timing constraints** (e.g., desired operating frequency)

- Tools and/or circuit engineers will decide if it can be built!

Part 4:
Functional Verification

Functional Verification

- Goal: check **logical correctness** of the design

- Physical circuit timing (e.g., t_{setup}/t_{hold}) is typically ignored
  - May implement simple checks to catch obvious bugs
  - We'll discuss timing verification later in this lecture

- There are two primary approaches
  - Logic simulation (e.g., C/C++/Verilog test routines)
  - Formal verification techniques

- In this course, we will use Verilog for functional verification

Testbench-Based Functional Testing

- **Testbench:** a module created specifically to test a design
  - Tested design is called the **"device under test (DUT)"**

- Testbench **provides inputs (test patterns)** to the DUT
  - Hand-crafted values
  - Automatically generated (e.g., sequential or random values)
- Testbench **checks outputs** of the DUT against:
  - Hand-crafted values
  - A "golden design" that is known to be bug-free

Testbench-Based Functional Testing

- A testbench can be:
  - **HDL code** written to test other HDL modules
  - **Circuit schematic** used to test other circuit designs

- The testbench is **not** designed for **hardware synthesis**!
  - Runs in **simulation** only
    - HDL simulator (e.g., Vivado simulator)
    - SPICE circuit simulation
  - Testbench uses **simulation-only** constructs
    - E.g., "wait 10ns"
    - E.g., ideal voltage/current source
    - Not suitable to be physically built!

Common Verilog Testbench Types

Testbench	Input/Output Generation	Error Checking
Simple	Manual	Manual
Self-Checking	Manual	Automatic
Automatic	Automatic	Automatic

Example DUT

- We will walk through different types of testbenches to test a module that implements the logic function:

$$y = (\overline{b} \cdot \overline{c}) + (a \cdot \overline{b})$$

```verilog
// performs y = ~b & ~c | a & ~b
module sillyfunction(input  a, b, c,
                     output y);
    wire b_n, c_n;
    wire m1, m2;

    not not_b(b_n, b);
    not not_c(c_n, c);

    and minterm1(m1, b_n, c_n);
    and minterm2(m2, a, b_n);
    or  out_func(y, m1, m2);
endmodule
```

Useful Verilog Syntax for Testbenching

```verilog
module example_syntax();
  reg  a;

  // like "always" block, but runs only once at sim start
  initial
  begin
      a = 0; // set value of reg: use blocking assignments
      #10;   // wait (do nothing) for 10 ns
      a = 1;
      $display("printf() style message!"); // print message
  end
endmodule
```

Simple Testbench

Simple Testbench

```verilog
module testbench1();   // No inputs, outputs
  reg  a, b, c;         // Manually assigned
  wire y;               // Manually checked

  // instantiate device under test
  sillyfunction dut (.a(a), .b(b), .c(c), .y(y) );

  // apply hardcoded inputs one at a time
  initial begin
    a = 0; b = 0; c = 0; #10;  // apply inputs, wait 10ns
    c = 1; #10;                 // apply inputs, wait 10ns
    b = 1; c = 0; #10;          // etc .. etc..
    c = 1; #10;
    a = 1; b = 0; c = 0; #10;
  end
endmodule
```

Simple Testbench: Output Checking

- Most common method is to look at **waveform diagrams**
  - *Thousands* of signals over *millions* of clock cycles
  - Too many to just printf()!

time

- **Manually check** that output is correct **at all times**

Simple Testbench

- **Pros:**
  - Easy to design
  - Can easily test a few, specific inputs (e.g., corner cases)

- **Cons:**
  - **Not scalable** to many test cases
  - Outputs must be checked **manually** outside of the simulation
    - E.g., inspecting dumped waveform signals
    - E.g., printf() style debugging

Self-Checking Testbench

Self-Checking Testbench

```verilog
module testbench2();
  reg   a, b, c;
  wire y;


  sillyfunction dut(.a(a), .b(b), .c(c), .y(y));


  initial begin
     a = 0; b = 0; c = 0; #10; // apply input, wait 10ns
     if (y !== 1) $display("000 failed."); // check result
     c = 1; #10;
     if (y !== 0) $display("001 failed.");
     b = 1; c = 0; #10;
     if (y !== 0) $display("010 failed.");
  end
endmodule
```

Self-Checking Testbench

- **Pros:**
  - Still easy to design
  - Still easy to test a few, specific inputs (e.g., corner cases)
  - **Simulator will print** whenever an error occurs

- **Cons:**
  - **Still not scalable** to millions of test cases
  - Easy to make an **error** in **hardcoded** values
    - You make just as many **errors** writing a testbench as actual code
    - **Hard to debug** whether an issue is in the testbench or in the DUT

Self-Checking Testbench using Testvectors

- Write ***testvector file***
  - List of inputs and expected outputs
  - Can create vectors **manually** *or* **automatically** using an already verified, simpler **"golden model"** (more on this later)
- Example file:

```
$ cat testvectors.tv
   000_1
   001_0
   010_0
   011_0
   100_1
   101_1
   110_0
   111_0
      …
```

Format:
input_output

Testbench with Testvectors Design

- Use a **"clock signal"** for assigning inputs, reading outputs
  - Test one **testvector** each **"clock cycle"**

Clock cycle

Apply input on rising edge **Check outputs on falling edge**

- Note: "clock signal" simply separates **inputs** from **outputs**
  - Allows us to *observe* the inputs/outputs in waveform diagrams
  - Not used for checking physical circuit timing (e.g., t_{setup}/t_{hold})
  - We'll discuss *circuit timing verification* later in this lecture

Testbench Example (1/5): Signal Declarations

- Declare signals to hold internal state

```verilog
module testbench3();
  reg         clk, reset;      // clock and reset are internal
  reg         a, b, c, yexpected;  // values from testvectors
  wire        y;                    // output of circuit
  reg  [31:0] vectornum, errors;    // bookkeeping variables
  reg  [3:0]  testvectors[10000:0];// array of testvectors

  // instantiate device under test
  sillyfunction dut(.a(a), .b(b), .c(c), .y(y) );
```

H&H Section 4.9, Example 4.39

Testbench Example (2/5): Clock Generation

```verilog
// generate clock
  always      // no sensitivity list, so it always executes
    begin
      clk = 1; #5; clk = 0; #5;      // 10ns period
    end
```

Testbench Example (3/5): Read Testvectors into Array

```verilog
// at start of test, load vectors and pulse reset
   initial    // Only executes once
   begin
       $readmemb("example.tv", testvectors); // Read vectors
       vectornum = 0; errors = 0;            // Initialize
       reset = 1; #27; reset = 0;        // Apply reset wait
   end


// Note: $readmemh reads testvector files written in
// hexadecimal
```

Testbench Example (4/5): Assign Inputs/Outputs

```
// apply test vectors on rising edge of clk
always @(posedge clk)
begin
    {a, b, c, yexpected} = testvectors[vectornum];
end
```

- Apply {**a, b, c**} inputs on the *rising edge* of the clock

- Get **yexpected** for checking the output on the *falling edge*

- Rising/falling edges are chosen only by convention
  - You can use any part of the clock signal
  - Your H+H textbook uses this convention

Testbench Example (5/5): Check Outputs

```verilog
   always @(negedge clk)
   begin
       if (~reset) // don't test during reset
       begin
           if (y !== yexpected)
           begin
               $display("Error: inputs = %b", {a, b, c});
               $display("  outputs = %b (%b exp)",y,yexpected);
               errors = errors + 1;
           end

           // increment array index and read next testvector
           vectornum = vectornum + 1;

           if (testvectors[vectornum] === 4'bx)
           begin
               $display("%d tests completed with %d errors",
                       vectornum, errors);
               $finish;                    // End simulation
           end
       end
   end
```

Self-Checking Testbench with Testvectors

- **Pros:**
  - Still easy to design
  - Still easy to test a few, specific inputs (e.g., corner cases)
  - Simulator will print whenever an error occurs
  - **No need** to change hardcoded values for **different tests**

- **Cons:**
  - May be **error-prone** depending on source of testvectors
  - More scalable, but still **limited** by reading a file
    - Might have many more combinational paths to test than will fit in memory

Automatic Testbench

Golden Models

- A **golden model** represents the ideal circuit behavior
  - Must be developed, and might be **difficult** to write
  - Can be done in C, Perl, Python, Matlab or even in Verilog

- For our example circuit:

```
module golden_model(input  a, b, c,
                    output y);
  assign y = ~b & ~c | a & ~b;// high-level abstraction
endmodule
```

- **Simpler** than our earlier gate-level description
  - Golden model is usually **easier to design and understand**
  - Golden model is much **easier to verify**

Automatic Testbench

- The DUT **output** is compared against the **golden model**

- **Challenge:** need to **generate inputs** to the designs
  - Sequential values to cover the entire input space?
  - Random values?

Automatic Testbench: Code

```verilog
module testbench1();
    ... // variable declarations, clock, etc.

    // instantiate device under test
    sillyfunction dut (a, b, c, y_dut);
    golden_model gold (a, b, c, y_gold);

    // instantiate test pattern generator
    test_pattern_generator tgen (a, b, c, clk);

    // check if y_dut is ever not equal to y_gold
    always @(negedge clk)
    begin
        if(y_dut !== y_gold)
            $display(...)
    end
endmodule
```

Automatic Testbench

- **Pros:**
  - Output checking is **fully automated**
  - Could even compare **timing** using a **golden timing model**
  - **Highly scalable** to as much simulation time as is feasible
    - Leads to **high coverage** of the input space
  - Better **separation of roles**
    - Separate designers can work on the DUT and the golden model
    - DUT testing engineer can focus on **important test cases** instead of output checking

- **Cons:**
  - Creating a correct golden model may be (very) **difficult**
  - Coming up with **good testing inputs** may be **difficult**

However, Even with Automatic Testing…

- How long would it take to test a **32-bit adder**?
    - In such an adder there are **64** inputs = **2^{64}** possible inputs
    - If you test **one input in 1ns**, you can test **10^9** inputs per second
        - or **8.64×10^{14}** inputs per day
        - or **3.15×10^{17}** inputs per year
    - we would still need **58.5 years** to test all possibilities

- Brute force testing is **not feasible** for most circuits!
    - Need to prune the overall testing space
    - E.g., formal verification methods, choosing 'important cases'

- **Verification is a hard problem**

Part 5:
Timing Verification

Timing Verification Approaches

- High-level simulation (e.g., C, Verilog)
    - Can **model timing** using "#x" statements in the DUT
    - Useful for hierarchical modeling
        - Insert delays in FF's, basic gates, memories, etc.
        - High level design will have some notion of timing
    - Usually **not as accurate** as real circuit timing

- Circuit-level timing verification
    - Need to first **synthesize** your design to actual circuits
        - No one general approach- very **design flow specific**
        - Your FPGA/ASIC/etc. technology has **special tool(s)** for this
            - E.g., Xilinx Vivado (what you're using in lab)
            - E.g., Synopsys/Cadence Tools (for VLSI design)

The Good News

- Tools will try to meet timing for you!
  - Setup times, hold times
  - Clock skews
  - ...

- They usually provide a **'timing report'** or **'timing summary'**
  - **Worst-case** delay paths
  - Maximum operation **frequency**
  - Any timing **errors** that were found

The Bad News

- The **tool can fail** to find a solution
  - Desired clock frequency is too **aggressive**
    - Can result in **setup time violation** on a particularly long path
  - **Too much logic** on clock paths
    - Introduces excessive **clock skew**
  - Timing issues with asynchronous logic

- The tool will provide (hopefully) **helpful errors**
  - Reports will contain paths that failed to meet timing
  - Gives a place from where to start debugging

- **Q:** How can we **fix timing errors**?

Meeting Timing Constraints

- Unfortunately, this is often a **manual**, **iterative** process
    - Meeting strict timing constraints (e.g., high performance designs) can be **tedious**

- Can try **synthesis/place-and-route** with different options
    - Different **random seeds**
    - Manually provided **hints** for place-and-route

- Can **manually optimize** the reported **problem paths**
    - Simplify **complicated logic**
    - Split up **long combinational logic paths**
    - Recall: fix hold time violations by adding *more* logic!

Meeting Timing Constraints: Principles

- Let's go back to the fundamentals

- Clock cycle time is determined by the maximum logic delay we can accommodate without violating timing constraints

- Good design principles
  - Critical path design: Minimize the maximum logic delay
    - → Maximizes performance
  - Balanced design: Balance maximum logic delays across different parts of a system (i.e., between different pairs of flip flops)
    - → No bottlenecks + minimizes wasted time
  - Bread and butter design: Optimize for the common case, but make sure non-common-cases do not overwhelm the design
    - → Maximizes performance for realistic cases

Lecture Summary

- Timing in **combinational circuits**
  - Propagation delay and contamination delay
  - Glitches

- Timing in **sequential circuits**
  - Setup time and hold time
  - Determining how fast a circuit can operate

- **Circuit Verification**
  - How to make sure a circuit works correctly
  - Functional verification
  - Timing verification