Main Functional Verification Activities Today



Memory Macrocells Validation

VHDL model Vs functionality specifications Vs RTL implementation



Abstraction of modes and operations



IP Model Checking

Verilog functional description Vs SPICE netlist Vs functionality specifications



Abstraction of electrical and timing parameters into constraints and coverage points

Specman-based functional validation with NCSim/HSIM/Yogitech

AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

Memory Macrocells Validation - Today Workflow



Memory Macrocell Validation Workflow

Interpret the device specifications Capture the team intention in terms of WHAT the design will do

Agree with editing and revise must-have, should-have and nice-to-have verification items

Abstract the IP modes and operations into an e-language model

Constrain the random-generated stimuli to legal values

Write monitors and scoreboards to enable observability Keep track of the memory status

Work out stimuli patterns to deliberately inject errors

Lay out the coverage model and define metrics to answer the "Are we done ?" question

Thoroughly take care of error and message reporting to secure quick spot of any exceptions

AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

Memory Macrocells Validation – In-House Contributions



- Automatic random generation of latency and duration times to test also timing violations in RTL models
 - Written systematic 'e' routines called to generate *random-constrained timed events* to shape the signal waveforms
 - Setup/hold violations can be issued and monitored so to test also any functional misbehaviors caused by untimely signal assertion/de-assertion in VHDL descriptions
- Benefiting from structuring hierarchical tests sequences
 - A testbench automation feature that makes available upfront *enablers* to add *flow flexibility*
 - Reduce in/out manual commenting of chunks of code
 - This layered organization of 'e' sequences can promote reuse due to its coding modularity and regularity

Memory Macrocells Validation – Testing Time Violations



Incisive Enterprise S	pecman Simulator	<u>- • ×</u>
<u>E</u> ile <u>E</u> dit <u>V</u> iew <u>T</u> est	Debug Tools User Help	📇 eRM 🦓 Help 🙆 Support
(drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (drive_read_parallel() (5167700] MACROCELL_eV (read_parallel_re()> (cread_paralle	<pre>> NEW TRANSACTION ITEM: > [access_kind = READ_PARALLEL] > [honesty = CORRECT]. > [address (Hex) = 0x5f (Dec) 95]. > [enable_violation_setup 1= TRUE]. > [enable_violation_hold_1= TRUE]. C: - MACROCELL_eVC_MSG: STARTED READ - instr=NONE, honesty=CORRECC [itm.re_violation_hold= TRUE]. [VIOLATING_hold_time= 1 (Valid >= 2)]. violation_hold_ev: 'RE' signal took in 0 [@5167856] generatir _MIN=2ns. C: MACROCELL_eVC_MSG, re_violation_hold_ev: 'RE' signal took ; minimum time of T_CHRX_MIN=2ns.</pre>	Run some sequences with time violations generation turned on Here's one occurring!
Specman > NVM_160BFSC_H NVM_160BFSC_H NUM_160BFSC_H	<pre> (drive_read_parallel()> NEW TRANSACTION ITEM: (drive_read_parallel()> [access_kind = READ_PARALLEL]. (drive_read_parallel()> [access_kind = READ_PARALLEL]. (drive_read_parallel()> [address (Hex)= 0x5f (Dec) 95]. (drive_read_parallel()> [enable_violation_setup 1= TRUE]. (drive_read_parallel()> [enable_violation_hold_I= TRUE]. (drive_read_parallel)> [enable_violation_hold_I= TRUE]. (drive_read_parallel)> [enable_violation_hold_I= TRUE]. (sitemeread_parallel)> [itm.re_violation_hold=TRUE]. (read_parallel)> [itm.re_violation_hold=TRUE]. (read_parallel)> [itm.re_violation_hold=TRUE]. (read_parallel_re()> [itm.re_violation_hold=true]. (read_parallel_re()> [itm.re_violation_hold=v: 'RE' signal took in 0 [@S167856] generation [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC MACROCELL_eVC MSG, re_violation_hold ev: 'RE' signal took in 0 [@S167856] generation [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: MACROCELL_eVC MSG, re_violation_hold ev: 'RE' signal took in 0 [@S167856] generation [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: MACROCELL_eVC MSG, re_violation_hold ev: 'RE' signal took in 0 [@S167856] [S168165] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC: Read_Done: READ_DOUT (Hex)=0xd7; (decimal: 215) @ ADD=95 ITH [S167856] MACROCELL_eVC</pre>	Here's how the DUT responded to the hold violation: g a HOLD violation against minimum time of T_CHRX in 0 [@5167856] generating a HOLD violation again 4 DATA=215 , COMPL=40 (DIN Hex now is=0x99)).

AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

Memory Macrocells Validation – Hierarchical Sequences



extend MAIN NVM_160BFSC_HCM0S9A_ENV1_sequence {

// Boolean enabler for the chunks of tests initial_reset_enabler: bool: // **keep soft** initial_reset_enabler = TRUE; // initial_powerdown_enabler: bool: // keep soft initial_powerdown_enabler == TRUE; // initial_memory_program_with_dir_n_compl: bool; // keep soft initial_memory_program_with_dir_n_compl == TRUE; // initial_memory_programming: bool; // **keep soft** initial_memory_programming == FALSE; // parallel_reading_after_the_initial_memory_program : bool; // keep soft parallel_reading_after_the_initial_memory_program == TRUE; // initial_block_sector_erase : bool: // **keep soft** initial_block_sector_erase = TRUE; // parallel_reading_the_erased_addresses : bool: // **keep soft** parallel_reading_the_erased_addresses = TRUE; // first_direct_programming_following_initial_erase : bool; // keep soft first_direct_programming_following_initial_erase == TRUE; // special_erase___involved_s03_and_s04_special_sectors : bool; // keep soft special_erase___involved_s03_and_s04_special_sectors = TRUE: / clear_of_fail_after_the_erase_of_the_special_sectors : bool; // keep soft clear_of_fail_after_the_erase_of_the_special_sectors = TRUE; // parallel_reading_after_clearing_of_fail : bool: // keep soft parallel_reading_after_clearing_of_fail = TRUE; // further_memory_programming : bool; // keep soft further_memory_programming = TRUE; // parallel_reading_after_further_memory_programming : bool; // keep soft parallel_reading_after_further_memory_programming = TRUE; // parallel reading stirring setup violation on re * hool*

At the top user section lie the *boolean enablers*

Written *parameterized routine* for each operational mode:

- initial_reset
- power_down
- parallel_reading

- ...

Different sequences can call the same routine with different parameters:

- enablers
- textual messages

-...

Main Functional Verification Activities Today



Memory Macrocells Validation

VHDL model Vs functionality specifications Vs RTL implementation



Abstraction of modes and operations



IP Model Checking

Verilog functional description Vs SPICE netlist Vs functionality specifications



Abstraction of electrical and timing parameters into constraints and coverage points

Specman-based functional validation with NCSim/HSIM/Yogitech

AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

IP Model Checking – Today Implementation



IP Model Checking – Terminals Synchronization



Specs vs Analog IP vs Model

Yogitech AMS Kit and Probe Library

Oscillator features

- RC ladder technique
- RC subdue to change upon process variation
- Back-trimming compensation
- Voltage setup: Okln rises
- Stop rises: out freq = 0

Environment features

- Thresholds and PVTs as verification parameters
- Random-generated stimuli
- Constrained and direct tests



AMS Center of Competence

IP Model Checking - Verification Reports

			-							
Simul. time	SETUP Time	Res	FREQ BEFORE STOP	Res	FREQ AFTER STOP	Res	GLITCH Rise	GLITCH Fall	CK IDLE	Res
22100	1200	ОК	13647 KHz	NONE	0 Hz	ERROR	NO	NO	18207 pV	OK
42630	1189	ОК	NONE	NONE	0 Hz	ERROR	YES	YES	18207 pV	OK
57580	1189	ОК	13630 KHz	NONE	0 Hz	ERROR	NO	NO	18207 pV	OK
75450	1189	ОК	NONE	NONE	0 Hz	ERROR	NO	NO	18207 pV	OK
83070	1189	OK	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	NO	NONE	18207 pV	OK
105410	1189	OK	NONE	NONE	0 Hz	ERROR	NO	NO	18208 pV	OK
115900	1189	ОК	NONE	NONE	NONE	NONE	YES	NONE	18208 pV	OK

Flow benefits

 Outcome on tables speeding up final checks
 Test progress status with functional coverage stats

Flow Automation

- AMSvKit GUI assistance for:
 - > Work directory setup
 - CoSim scripts generation
 - >HDL wrappers generation

AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

IP Model Checking – Possible Scenarios





AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

IP Model Checking - Requirements

- Support full co-simulation engine for AMS designs
- Broad stimuli generation strategies for coverage
- Lead to a viable formal model property checking
 - From Assertion Based Verification to Analog Formal Verification
- Design property distillation techniques
 - ✓ Derive directly from specifications all the assertions in an efficient and effective way
- Advanced logging mechanisms

Current AMS Verification Flows Deployment



Looking for *reliable solutions* addressing:

1. AMS Model Checking

2. Digital IP Validation

3. Analog IP Validation

4. Real Mixed-Signal Applications Validation

Issues in Testbench Automation



- Quite *limited resources* are exploring the advanced verification arena
 - An activity often perceived as "Always Costly And Never Completed" (J.Bergeron - Synopsys)
- The Analog/Digital *mixed expertise is rare* in design engineers and the specific know-how needed for verification often clash with required analog insights
 - ✓ Aspect Oriented Programming (AOP) Specman
 - ✓ Object Oriented Programming System Verilog
 - ✓ Specific languages
- Adoption of *Formal* Model Checking tools still felt awkward today
- Managers and senior designers are still reluctant to invest in novel tools
 - ✓ New paradigms can call for *different mindset* to reach higher tops

Main Goals To Attain



Driving factors leading to more advanced solutions to secure design robustness and high quality results



AMS Center of Competence

Marco Carlini – Pierluigi Daglio

AMS Model Checking – Leveraging Methodologies



Can any available advanced methodologies be viably **extended** to take on the AMS verification challenges today ?

Specman 'e' can still be used to:

- Abstract specs into drivers and Bus Fuctional Models (BFM)
- Describe *reusable* verification components
- CRV: random constrained inputs/outputs to ranges and legal values

ABV should bring in:

- Annotated assumptions on inputs in a concise form
- Express declarative descriptions as "active comments for" HDL/tests
- Capture design intents and foster early validation by spotting bugs
- Eventually leading to a rapid adoption of *formal* techniques

Topics to Address for AMS Verification



- Within the activity aimed at defining a test-bench automated flow and a verification methodology suitable to implement our AMS Model Checking tasks here are the topics to address
 - Ease of adoption and usability
 - Analog measurements enabled through digital-like mechanisms with system tasks, functions, checker libraries
 - Assertion Based Verification principles extended to detect flaws upon analog signals properties
 - The migration issue from 'e' to System Verilog
 - Parameterization and configuration of the environment
 - Example of a Frequency Check meter

Adoption and Ease of Use

• The common adoption issue has to be addressed early in order to pave the way for a wider usability

- Smart GUIs and code encapsulation could increase the degree of acceptance within the AMS designer community
- The layered organization underlying the chosen solution should enable the verification team and the designers to configure and reuse the developed environments and already constructed test-benches

Digital Paradigm



- Analog measurements should be instantiated through digital-like mechanisms
- The confinement of the pure analog aspects could be achieved with callbacks asserted as properties
- An extra effort could be undertaken to port this benefits for the Real Access too
- As we envisage things to date, system tasks and functions sound to be the efficient method to implement observability of voltage/current nodes
- The availability of novel features and techniques in D-AMS are also appreciated
- Library of assertion checkers

Analog Assertions



- Design and coverage analog properties abstracted from specifications is the base technique we like to see enabled in a AMS verification ecosystem
- The directives on *continuous signals* should thus be monitored and checked through assertion statements in order to track down the source of the flaws as the assertion is fired upon a property or sequence that did not hold



- The migration issue is not considered a real plus since our current verification environments are coded in 'e' language
- System Verilog language should be preferred against PSL due to its standardization and wider support
- Nevertheless we are currently aware about a few assets that PSL can boast like more expressive timed expressions and cross-language usage

Parameterization and Configuration



- We are also after a full parameterization and configuration of the available analog probes. This goal could be investigated by looking at the support of the **bind** mechanism
- A bind-like construct could provide a suitable argument-passing mechanism to either specify the node pathname or pass in terminal parameters
- The externally configured probe must be configured at its invocation with value ranges, thresholds and tolerances to undercover possible out-of-range and non-compliances
- The list of analog measurements observed through monitors and checkers should at least comprise the following early detecting functions
 - Period or frequency consistency of continuous signals over a given monitored time interval
 - Possible presence of clipped signals
 - Average voltage and current
 - Peak power consumption

Example of Frequency Check Probe



endproperty

period_prop: assert property (CHECK_FREQ_IS_IN_RANGE(<trig_sig>, period, min_period, max_period)) \$display("\nFreq in range (Min Req period='%t', Max Req Period='%t').", min_period, max_period); else begin \$error(0, "\n %m Freq out of range! Min Req period='%t', Max Req Period='%t'\nCaptured period='%t'\ntrigger_sig=%d; top_in1=%d, top_in2=%d.\n", min_period, max_period, period, xor_out, top_in1, top_in2); // end

Example of Frequency Check Probe



// sig_get_freq made available either as system task or function or module
function time sig_get_freq(input <HIER_ANALOG_node>, input
real thMin, input real thMax); // Add more config arguments...
 <IMPLEMENTED BY EDA VENDOR>
 endfunction

task grab_freq;// Calling the System Task/Function
 output time generatedFreq; input an_sig; input real thMin,
thMax; // Add more config arguments...
 begin
 generatedFreq = sig_get_freq(an_sig, thMin, thMax); //
 end
 endtask

```
always @(<trig_sig>) // whenever the signal changes
    begin
    grab_freq(period, <hier_an_sig>, <thres_min>,
    <thres_max>); // Add more config arguments...
    end
```