ECE382M.20: System-on-Chip (SoC) Design

Lecture 16 – SoC Verification

Sources:
Jacob A. Abraham

Andreas Gerstlauer
Electrical and Computer Engineering
University of Texas at Austin
gerstl@ece.utexas.edu

Outline

- **Introduction**
  - Verification flow
- **Verification methods**
  - Simulation-based techniques
  - Formal analysis
  - Semi-formal approaches
- **Formal verification**
  - Dealing with state explosion
  - Property checking
  - Equivalence checking
  - Software verification

Verification versus Test



Verification Effort

- **Verification** portion of design increases to anywhere from **50 to 80%** of total **development effort** for the design.



Verification methodology manual, 2000-TransEDA

Percentage of Total Flaws

- About 50% of flaws are functional flaws
  - Need verification method to fix logical & functional flaws



From Mentor presentation material, 2003

"Bug" Introduction and Detection



HW/SW Co-Design

- Concurrent design of HW/SW components
- Evaluate the effect of a design decision at early stage by "virtual prototyping"
- Co-verification



Top-Down SoC Verification



Bottom-Up SoC Verification



Platform Based SoC Verification



Derivative Design

Interconnect Verification between:

- **SoC Platform**
- **Newly added IPs**

Interface-Driven SoC Verification



**Besides Design-Under-Test,
all others are interface models**

Traditional Simulation

- **Problems of traditional testbench**
  - Real-World Stimuli
  - System-Level Modeling
  - High-Level Algorithmic Modeling
  - Test Automation
  - Source Coverage

Outline

- ✓ Introduction
  - ✓ Verification flow
- **Verification methods**
  - Simulation-based techniques
  - Formal analysis
  - Semi-formal approaches
- Formal verification
  - Dealing with state explosion
  - Property checking
  - Equivalence checking
  - Software verification

Design Verification Methods

- **Simulation based methods**
  - Specify input test vector, output test vector pair
  - Run simulation and compare output against expected output
- **Formal Methods**
  - Check equivalence of design models or parts of models
  - Check specified properties on models
- **Semi-formal Methods**
  - Specify inputs and outputs as symbolic expressions
  - Check simulation output against expected expression

Verification Approaches



Simulation

- **Create test vectors and simulate model**
  - Simulation, debugging and visualization tools [Synopsys VCS, Mentor ModelSim, Cadence NC-Sim]



- **Inputs**
  - Specification
    - Used to create interesting stimuli and monitors
  - Model of DUT
    - Typically written in HDL or C or both
- **Output**
  - Failed test vectors
    - Pointed out in different design representations by debugging tools

Simulation Technologies

- **Different techniques at varying levels of abstraction**
  - Numerical Simulation (MATLAB)
  - AMS Simulation
  - Transaction-based Simulators
  - HW/SW co-simulation
  - Cycle-based Simulators
  - Event-based Simulators
  - Emulation Systems
  - Rapid Prototyping Systems
  - Hardware Accelerators

Static Technologies

- **"Lint" Checking**
  - Syntactic correctness
  - Identifies simple errors
- **Static Timing Verification**
  - Setup, hold, delay timing requirements
  - Challenging: multiple sources

Formal Techniques

- **Theorem Proving Techniques**
  - Proof-based
  - Not fully automatic
- **Formal Model Checking**
  - Model-based
  - Automatic
- **Formal Equivalence Checking**
  - Reference design ↔ modified design
  - RTL-RTL, RTL-Gate, Gate-Gate implementations
  - No timing verification

Equivalence Checking

- **LEC uses boolean algebra to check for logic equivalence**



- **SEC uses FSMs to check for sequential equivalence**



Model Checking

- **Model *M* satisfies property *P*? [Clarke, Emerson '81]**
- **Inputs**
  - State transition system representation of *M*
  - Temporal property *P* as formula of state properties
- **Output**
  - True (property holds)
  - False + counter-example (property does not hold)



Semi-Formal Methods

- **Executable specification for behavioral modeling**
  - Design Productivity
    - Easy to model complex algorithm
    - Fast execution
    - Simple Testbench
  - Tools
    - Native C/C++ through PLI/FLI
    - Extended C/C++ : SpecC, SystemC

➢ **Verify it on the fly!**
  - Test vector generation
  - Compare RTL Code with Behavioral Model
  - Coverage Test

Assertion-Based Verification

- ***Property Detection*: To decide whether a simulation run (trace) of a design satisfies a given property (assertion)**



e.g., violation of mutual exclusion, $critical_1$ Æ $critical_2$

- **Temporal logic**
  - Example: Properties written in PSL/Sugar

Specifying Properties (Assertions)

- **Open Vera Assertions Language (Synopsys)**
- **Property Specification Language (PSL) (IBM, based on *Sugar*)**
  - Accelera driving consortium
  - IEEE Std. 1850-2005
- **Accelera Open Verification Library (OVL) provides ready to use assertion functions in the form of VHDL and Verilog HDL libraries**
- **SystemVerilog is a next generation language, added to the core Verilog HDL**
  - IEEE Std. 1800-2005

Outline

- ✓ Verification
  - ✓ Verification flow
- ✓ Verification methods
  - ✓ Simulation-based techniques
  - ✓ Formal analysis
  - ✓ Semi-formal approaches
- **Formal verification**
  - Dealing with state explosion
  - Property checking
  - Equivalence checking
  - Software verification

Formal Verification of SoCs



State Explosion!



Abstractions to Deal with Large State Spaces

- **Model checking models need to be made smaller**
- **Problem: State-Space Explosion**
- **Smaller or "reduced" models must retain information**
  - Property being checked should yield same result

➢ **Balancing solution: Abstractions**

Program Transformation Based Abstractions

- **Abstractions on Kripke structures**
  - Cone of Influence (COI), Symmetry, Partial Order, etc.
  - State transition graphs for even small programs can be very large to build
- **Abstractions on program text**
  - Scale well with program size
  - High economic interest
  - ➢ Static program transformation

Types of Abstractions

- **Sound**
  - Property holds in abstraction implies property holds in the original program
- **Complete**
  - Algorithm always finds an abstract program if it exists
- **Exact**
  - Property holds in the abstraction iff property holds in the main program

Abstraction Landscape



Program Slicing

- **Program transformation involving statement deletion**
- **"Relevant statements" determined according to *slicing criterion***
- **Slice construction is completely *automatic***
- **Correctness is *property specific***
  - Loss of generality
- **Abstractions are sound and complete**

Specialized Slicing Techniques

- **Static slicing produces large slices**
  - Has been used for verification
  - Semantically equivalent to COI reductions
- **Slicing criterion can be enhanced to produce other types of slices**
  - Amorphous Slicing
  - Conditioned Slicing

Example Program

```
begin

1:              read(N);
2:              A = 1;
3:              if (N < 0) {
4:                      B = f(A);
5:                      C = g(A);
6:              } else if (N > 0) {
7:                      B = f'(A);
8:                      C = g'(A);
                } else {
9:                      B = f''(A);
10:                     C = g''(A);
                }
11:                     print(B);
12:                     print(C);

end
```

Static Slicing wrt <11, B>

```
begin

1:          read(N);
2:          A = 1;
3:          if (N < 0) {
4:                  B = f(A);
5:                  C = g(A);
6:          } else if (N > 0) {
7:                  B = f'(A);
8:                  C = g'(A);
            } else {
9:                  B = f''(A);
10:                 C = g''(A);
            }
11:                 print(B);
12:                 print(C);

end
```


Conditioned Slicing wrt <(N<0),11, B>

```
begin

1:          read(N);
2:          A = 1;
3:          if (N < 0) {
4:                  B = f(A);
5:                  C = g(A);
6:          } else if (N > 0) {
7:                  B = f'(A);
8:                  C = g'(A);
            } else {
9:                  B = f''(A);
10:                 C = g''(A);
            }
11:                 print(B);
12:                 print(C);

end
```

Verification Using Conditioned Slicing

- **Slicing part of design irrelevant to property being verified**
- **Safety Properties of the form**
  - G (antecedent => consequent)
- **Use *antecedent* to specify states we are interested in**
  - We do not need to preserve program executions where the antecedent is false

Antecedent Conditioned Slicing



Example

```
always @ (clk)      begin
      case(insn)
        f_add:   dec = d_add;
        f_sub:   dec = d_sub;
        f_and:   dec = d_and;
        f_or:    dec = d_or;
      endcase
end
```

```
always @ (clk)      begin
      case(dec)
        d_add:   ex = e_add;
        d_sub:   ex = e_sub;
        d_and:   ex = e_and;
        d_or:    ex = e_or;
      endcase
end

always @ (clk)      begin
      case(ex)
        e_add:   res = a+b;
        e_sub:   res = a-b;
        e_and:   res = a&b;
        e_or:    res = a|b;
      endcase
end
```

$$h = [G((insn == f\_add) \Rightarrow XX(res == a+b))]$$

Example

```
always @ (clk)      begin
      case(insn)
        f_add:   dec = d_add;


      endcase
end
```

```
always @ (clk)      begin
      case(dec)
        d_add:   ex = e_add;


      endcase
end

always @ (clk)      begin
      case(ex)
        e_add:   res = a+b;


      endcase
end
```

Single instruction behavior for f_add instruction

$$h = [G((insn == f\_add) \Rightarrow XX(res == a+b))]$$

Experimental Results

- **Verilog RTL implementation of USB 2.0 function core**
  - USB has many interacting state machines
    - Approximately 10^{33} states
  - Properties taken from specification document
    - Mostly control based, state machine related
- **Temporal property verification**
  - Safety properties of the form (in LTL)
    - G(a => Xc)
    - G(a => a U_s c)
  - Liveness Properties
    - G(a => Fc)
- **Used Cadence SMV-BMC**
  - Circuit too big for SMV
  - Used a bound of 24

Example Properties of the USB

- **G((crc5err) V ¬(match) => ¬(send_token))**
  - If a packet with a bad CRC5 is received, or there is an endpoint field mismatch, the token is ignored
- **G((state == SPEED_NEG_FS) => X((mode_hs) ^ (T1_gt_3_0ms) => (next_state == RES_SUSPEND))**
  - If the machine is in the speed negotiation state, then in the next clock cycle, if it is in high speed mode for more than 3 ms, it will go to the suspend state
- **G((state == RESUME_WAIT) ^ ¬(idle_cnt_clr) =>F(state == NORMAL))**
  - If the machine is waiting to resume operation and a counter is set, eventually (after 100 mS) it will return to normal operation

Results on USB G(a=>c)Properties



Results on Temporal USB Properties



Amorphous Slicing

- Static slicing preserves syntax of program
- Amorphous Slicing does not follow syntax preservation
- Semantic property of the slice is retained
- Uses rewriting rules for program transformation

Example of Amorphous Slicing

```
begin
   i = start;
   while (i <= (start + num))
        {
        result = K + f(i);
        sum = sum + result;
        i = i + 1;
        }
end
```

LTL Property: G sum > K
Slicing Criterion: (end, {sum, K})

Example of Amorphous Slicing

Amorphous Slice:

```
begin
   sum = sum + K + f(start);
   sum = sum + K + f(start + num);
end
```

Program Transformation rules applied

- Induction variable elimination
- Dependent assignment removal
- ➢ Amorphous slice takes a fraction of the time as the real slice

Counterexample Guided Refinement

- **Approximation on set of states**
  - Initial state to bad path
- **Successive refinement of approximation**
  - Forward or backward passes
- **Process repeated until fixpoint is reached**
  - Empty resulting set of states implies property proved
  - Otherwise, counterexample is found
- ***Counterexample can be spurious because of over-approximations***
  - Heuristics used to determine spuriousness of counterexamples

Counterexample Guided Refinement

- CEGAR tool



Equivalence Checking

- Sequential equivalence checking
  - Verifying two models with different state encodings
- System specifications as system-level model (SLM)
  - Higher level of abstraction
  - Timing-aware models
- Design concept in RTL needs checking
  - Retiming, power, area modifications
  - Every change requires verification against SLM
- Simulation of SLM & RTL
  - Tedious to develop
  - Inordinately long running times

Sequential Equivalence Checking

- **Variables of interest (observables) obtained from user/block diagram**
  - Primary outputs / relevant intermediate variables
- **Symbolic expressions obtained for observables assigned in a given cycle (high level symbolic simulation)**
  - High-level symbolic simulation of RTL implementation
  - High-level symbolic simulation of system-level spec
- **Introduce notion of *sequential compare points***
  - Identification with respect to relative position in time
  - Identification with respect to space (data or variables)
- **Symbolic expressions compared at compare points**
  - Using a SAT solver or other Boolean level engines

Sequential Compare Points Algorithm



Verifying Embedded Software

- **Software Testing**
  - Execute software for test cases
  - Analogous to simulation in hardware
- **Testing Criteria**
  - Coverage measures
- **Formal analysis of software**
  - Model Checking
  - Theorem Proving

Software Path Testing

- **Assumption: bugs affect the control flow**
- **Execute all possible control flow paths through the program**
  - Attempt 100% path coverage
- **Execute all statements in program at least once**
  - 100% statement coverage
- **Exercise every branch alternative during test**
  - Attempt 100% branch coverage

Software Verification

- **Formal analysis of code**
- **Result, if obtained, is guaranteed for all possible inputs and all possible states**
- **Example of software model checker: SPIN**
- **Problem: applicable only to small modules**
  - State Explosion

➢ **Data abstractions**
➢ **Abstract interpretation**

Data Abstractions

- **Abstract data information**
  - Typically manual abstractions
- **Infinite behavior of system abstracted**
  - Each variable replaced by abstract domain variable
  - Each operation replaced by abstract domain operation
- **Data independent systems**
  - Data values do not affect computation
  - Datapath entirely abstracted

Data Abstractions: Examples

- **Arithmetic operations**
  - Congruence modulo an integer
    - *k replaced by k mod m*
- **High orders of magnitude**
  - Logarithmic values instead of actual data value
- **Bitwise logical operations**
  - Large bit vector to single bit value
    - *Parity generator*
- **Cumbersome enumeration of data values**
  - Symbolic values of data

Abstract Interpretation

- **Abstraction function mapping concrete domain values to abstract domain values**
- **Over-approximation of program behavior**
  - Every execution corresponds to abstract execution
- **Abstract semantics constructed once, manually**

Abstract Interpretation: Examples

- **Sign abstraction**
  - Replace integers by their sign
    - *Each integer K replaced by* one of {> 0, < 0, =0}
- **Interval abstraction**
  - Approximates integers by maximal and minimal values
    - *Counter variable i replaced by lower and upper limits of loop*
- **Relational abstraction**
  - Retain relationship between sets of data values
    - *Set of integers replaced by their convex hull*

Summary

- **Simulation-based validation**
  - Assertion-based verification
  - ➢ Limited by stimuli
- **Formal verification**
  - Model checking
  - Equivalence checking
  - ➢ State explosion
  - ➢ Abstractions