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Context
The Design Process at 10,000 ft

Ideas
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Development of micro-architecture

Mapping of RTL to transistors

Development of mask that yield transistors and wires

Making Silicon + Stepping(s)
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Chip

This is the theory...

MAS: Micro-Architecture Specification
RTL: Register-Transfer Language
In Practice...

Original Product

~2-3 years

Test Engineer

Repainted to fit Reality

~1 year

Target

Repainted to fit Reality

In Practice...

Architect

Micro-Architect

Design Engineer

Mask Designer

~1 year
How to: 1) check we captured what we wanted
2) check that we did not make a mistake along the way
Evolution of a custom language
Stage One: Scripting & Implementation

- A generalized symbolic circuit simulator forms the core of our formal verification environment.
  - Symbolic Trajectory Evaluation engine
    - Combines partial order (lattice) modeling and symbolic expressions
  - Binary Decision Diagrams tightly integrated into language
  - An interpreted language is very helpful in driving such an engine
  - We choose a pure (and very simple) lazy functional language as scripting language
    - Called fl
Example of fl usage: I

```
: let a = variable "a";
a::bool
: let b = variable "b";
b::bool
: a AND b;
b&a::bool

: let c =variable "c";
c::bool
: (a AND (b XOR c)) OR (NOT a OR b AND NOT c);
c&b + c&!b + !a::bool

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) == NOT (a AND b);
P::bool

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) == (a AND b);
T::bool

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) <=> NOT (a AND b);
F::bool

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) <=> NOT (a XOR b);
a + b::bool
```
Example of fl usage: II

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) <=-> NOT (a AND b);
F::bool

: NOT (NOT a OR NOT b) <=-> NOT (a XOR b);
a + b::bool

:

: Quant_forall ["a","b"] (Quant_thereis ["c"] ((a = b) => c) <=-> (a XOR b XOR c));
F::bool

: Quant_forall ["a","b"] (Quant_thereis ["c"] ((a = b) => c) => (a XOR b XOR c));
F::bool

: Quant_forall ["a","b"] (Quant_thereis ["c"] ((a = b) => c) <= (a XOR b XOR c));
T::bool

:
Example of fl usage: III

Circuit to evaluate the Collatz conjecture.
Example of fl usage: IV

```fl
(reFlect)

let start = {'start::bit};
start::bit
let t0 = {'t0::word};
t0::word
let ckt = poxlif2fsm (get_poxlif_in_window);
ckt::fsm
let cycles n =
  [(T,"clk",F,2*i,2*i+1) | i in 0 upto (n-1)] @
  [(T,"clk",T,2*i+1,2*i+2) | i in 0 upto (n-1)];
cycles::int -> (bool * string * bool * int * int) list
let N = 150;
N::int
let ant = (cycles N) @
  (start isv '1 from 0 to 1)@
  (start isv '0 from 1 to (2*N))@
  (t0 isv '0 from 0 to 1)

ant::(bool # string # bool # int # int) list
STE "-s" ckt [] ant [] (map (\n.n,0,2*N) (nodes ckt));
Time: 0
  .Time: 1
  .Time: 2
  .Time: 3
```
Example of fl usage: V
Example of fl usage: VI

```plaintext
: let t0_var = 'a::word;
t0_var::word
: let t0_vars = word2bv t0_var;
t0_vars::bool list
: let ant = (cycles N) @
   (start isv '1 from 0 to 1)@
   (start isv '0 from 1 to (2^N))@
   (t0 isv t0_var from 0 to 1)
;
ant:(bool # string # bool # int # int) list
: STE "-s" ckt [] ant [] (map (\n.n,0,(2^N)) (nodes ckt));

Time: 0
  .Time: 1
  .Time: 2
  .Time: 3
  .Time: 4
  .Time: 5
  .Time: 6
  .Time: 7
  .Time: 8
  .Time: 9
  .Time: 10
  .Time: 11
  .GC: Marking, sweeping, done. Used=1683941(Shared=19564,Sat=1028) Freed:144802
  .Time: 12
```
Example of fl usage: VII

```plaintext
reflected

Time: 295
Time: 296
Time: 297
Time: 298
Time: 299
Time: 300
T::bool

let out_at_end = get_trace_val ckt "eq1" (2*N-1);
out_at_end::bool # Bool
let fail = out_at_end = (F,T);
fail::bool
pick_example F fail;
substitution list:

a[15:0]: 0000000000000000
::example

pick_example F (fail AND (t0_vars != (int2bv 0)));
substitution list:

a[15:0]: 0000001011111111
::example

pick_example F (fail
   AND (t0_vars != (int2bv 0))
   AND NOT (last t0_vars)
);
substitution list:

a[15:0]: 0000010111110110
::example
```
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Example of fl usage: VIII

```
lettype model = Model
  {rel::bool}
  {c_vars :: bool}
  {n_vars :: bool}
;
Model::bool -> bool -> bool -> model
load_model::string -> bool -> string -> model
save_model::string -> model -> bool -> model
: let cAX model set =
  let set = bdd_current_next set in
  quant_forall model::n_vars (model::rel == set)
;
cAX::model -> bool -> bool
: let cEG model set =
  letrec EGr cur =
    let new =
      let cur' = bdd_current_next cur in
      quant_forall model::n_vars (set OR (model::rel == cur'))
    in
    if new == cur then cur else EGr new
  in
  EGr F
;
cEG::model -> bool -> bool
```
Example of fl usage: IX

// Use symbolic simulation to extract next-state relation
let model16 = Model R c_vars n_vars;
model16::model
: let set0 = t_vars = (int2bv 1);
set0::bool
: let ok_set = cEG model16 set0;
ok_set::Bool
: ok_set:
Iteration 1
Iteration 2
Iteration 3
Iteration 4
Iteration 5
Iteration 6
Iteration 7
Iteration 8
Iteration 9
Iteration 10
Iteration 11
Iteration 12
Iteration 13
Iteration 14
Iteration 15
Iteration 16
Iteration 17
Iteration 18
Iteration 19
Iteration 20
Iteration 21
Iteration 22
Iteration 23
Example of fl usage: X

```lisp
: pick_example F ((NOT ok_set) AND (t_vars != int2bv 0));
substitution list:
  t[15:0]: 0011100011100011
:example
```
Stage Two: Property Specification

- fl with BDDs started to look like a very useful specification language as well.

- To make this even better, we extended the language by allowing conditionals to be symbolic:
  - Since we could only represent Boolean functions, the “then” and “else” sides must have the same “shape”

- The extended (evolved) fl now served as:
  - Property specification language
  - Implementation language for FPV & FEV tools
  - Scripting language for the end-user
Verification Challenge

TASK: Bridge the gap from the circuit to the ideal specification in the minimum amount of time & cost.
Initial Phases of Verification

- Sketch initial specification
- Get circuit to “wiggle” (respond to simple inputs)
Verification With Only Model Checking

- With industrial circuits: very quickly encounter model checking capacity limits
Verification With Only Model Checking

- Forced to bridge the gap with:
  - large collection of low-level specifications
  - informal checks/hand proofs against ideal specification
Verification With Only Model Checking

- Forced to bridge the gap with:
  - large collection of low-level specifications
  - informal checks/hand proofs against ideal specification
    - long tedious (uninteresting) hand proofs...
Verification With Only Model Checking

- Forced to bridge the gap with:
  - large collection of low-level specifications
  - informal checks/hand proofs against ideal specification
    - long tedious (uninteresting) hand proofs...
    ...usually wrong...
Verification with only Theorem Proving

Theorem proving (with significant manual effort) can establish correctness against abstract circuit models.

- Abstract model often significantly simpler than actual HW
- Abstract model is not verified/verifiable against actual HW
Verification with Combined MC & TP

Theorem proving provides formal link from model checking results to ideal specification.
Stage Three: Term Language

- **HOL-Voss** (separate theorem proving and model checking tools):
  - HOL provided TP, fl provided model checking capabilities
  - fl was used as an evaluation engine for HOL functions
  - Very difficult to use, common case slow, overkill

- **VossProver** (deep embedding of logic in fl)
  - Idiot-savant prover for combining model checking results
  - Easier to use, but still extra layer of interpretation
  - Very cumbersome to extend

- **Reflection**
  - Introduced reflection in fl so that fl programs can manipulate other fl programs.
  - No overhead for end user, trivial to extend, some “noise” in the theorem proving from fl (e.g., print statements etc.)
Stage Four: Modeling Language

- The most recent enhancement to fl has been the incorporation of more flexible syntax/semantics.
- The main purpose is to make it possible to provide a practical language for High-level modeling that has an “acceptable” syntax to end users.
  - Shallow embedding for efficiency
  - Reflection provides a deep embedding
  - Programmable syntax makes domain-specific language development easier
- The main challenge is error reporting!!!
Lessons Learned
Why was it successful?

- Forte provided a unified environment that made it easy to build, extend, and use FV tools in.
- There was a natural fit in the semantic model for specifications (functional)
- The performance of the interpreter was not on the critical path for most applications
- The system was easily and safely extensible by the (experienced) user.
- Forte provided a major new capability!
  - The cost of “swallowing” fl was paid back by the new capabilities.
A new language is successful only if it is part of a system that solves a previously unsolved problem.

New languages are needed regularly to solve previously unsolved problems...
Backup Slides
## Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Pro</th>
<th>Con</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Formal Verification     | • 100% coverage
• Proves absence of bugs                                        | • Requires special skills
• Constrained by complexity                                        |
| Directed Random Tests   | • Targets areas most likely to be of concern
• Greatly reduces cycle requirements
• Develops strong uArch knowledge                                    | • Requires strong uArch knowledge          |
| Generic Random Tests    | • After generator created, easy to write
• Requires little uArch knowledge
• Can create things no one would ever think of                        | • Requires almost ∞ cycles / time
• Difficult / impossible to avoid broken features                     |
| Directed Tests          | • Easy to write
• Easy to understand
• Easy to reuse                                                        | • Requires almost ∞ number of tests
• Difficult to hit uArch conditions                                    |

### Today’s focus

- **Formal Verification**:
  - 100% coverage
  - Proves absence of bugs

- **Directed Random Tests**:
  - Targets areas most likely to be of concern
  - Greatly reduces cycle requirements
  - Develops strong uArch knowledge

- **Generic Random Tests**:
  - After generator created, easy to write
  - Requires little uArch knowledge
  - Can create things no one would ever think of

- **Directed Tests**:
  - Easy to write
  - Easy to understand
  - Easy to reuse

- **Con**:
  - Requires special skills
  - Constrained by complexity
  - Requires strong uArch knowledge
  - Requires almost ∞ cycles / time
  - Difficult / impossible to avoid broken features
  - Requires almost ∞ number of tests
  - Difficult to hit uArch conditions

### Today’s focus:

- **Formal Verification**:
  - 100% coverage
  - Proves absence of bugs

- **Directed Random Tests**:
  - Targets areas most likely to be of concern
  - Greatly reduces cycle requirements
  - Develops strong uArch knowledge

- **Generic Random Tests**:
  - After generator created, easy to write
  - Requires little uArch knowledge
  - Can create things no one would ever think of

- **Directed Tests**:
  - Easy to write
  - Easy to understand
  - Easy to reuse

- **Con**:
  - Requires special skills
  - Constrained by complexity
  - Requires strong uArch knowledge
  - Requires almost ∞ cycles / time
  - Difficult / impossible to avoid broken features
  - Requires almost ∞ number of tests
  - Difficult to hit uArch conditions
Formal Verification

- Exhaustive simulation is infeasible.
  - cannot prove the absence of bugs
- Broad classification:
  - Formal equivalence verification: FEV
    - Prove two models are the same
    - Highly automated
    - In widespread use
  - Formal property verification: FPV
    - Prove model satisfy some property
    - User driven
    - Primarily used in high risk areas

Applications in Design Flow:

- High level FPV
- RTL FPV
- Equiv Check (FEV)
Ordered Binary Decision Diagrams: BDDs

- Canonical representation of Boolean functions
- Efficient algorithms for AND, OR, NOT, quantification, image computation, etc.
- Variable ordering critical
  - Static heuristics
  - Dynamic variable re-ordering
- Handles ~80% of all equivalence verification tasks.
- With major effort, can push to 90%
- Most modern FV tools use BDDs or a combination of BDDs and SAT solvers
// Feldman & Retter, Computer Architecture
// (McGraw-Hill, 94) pp. 489-491
let ADDmodel pc rc in1 in2 =
...

// Find the amount of shift needed
let diff = ex2 '-' ex1 in
let rsh = MINv diff (int2bv 68) in

// Do the shift
let sgf1' = srshift 68 rsh (sgf1@[F]) in
let sgf2' = sgf2@[F] in

// Perform the sum (or subtract)
let add = (sign fp1 = sign fp2) in
let sum = if add then (sgf2' '+' sgf1')
    else (sgf2' '-' sgf1')

// Now perform roundin
...

Pop Quiz

• Order the following in order of size (smallest first)

- Influenza A virus
- Transistor in high volume microprocessor in 2009
- Water molecule
- Grains of sand

Answers:
**Answer to Pop Quiz**

- Order the following in order of size (smallest first)

1. Water molecule (~0.3nm)
2. Transistor in high volume microprocessor in 2009 (~30nm)
3. Influenza A virus (~100nm)
4. Grains of sand (~100,000nm)