COMS31700 Design Verification:

Block-level Case Study

(with demonstration of ABV and Formal Verification)

Kerstin Eder

University of BRISTOL

Department of COMPUTER SCIENCE

Case Study

Specification
Verification Plan
Directed Testing
(Code Coverage)
Functional Coverage
Assertion-based Verification
Formal Property Checking


Case Study: FIFO DUV

- **Remember that the FIFO DUV is part of a larger unit which in turn is part of a larger system.**
- The demo is focused on the verification of the FIFO at block level only.


3

Specification

Example DUV Specification - Inputs

data_in [7:0]
wr
rd
clear
clk

DUV

- Inputs:
  - wr indicates valid data is driven on the data_in bus
  - data_in is the data to be pushed into the DUV
  - rd pops the next data item from the DUV in the next cycle
  - clear resets the DUV

5

Example DUV Specification - Outputs

data_in [7:0]
wr
rd
clear
clk

DUV

data_out_valid
data_out [7:0]
empty
full

- Outputs:
  - data_out_valid indicates that valid data is driven on the data_out bus
  - data_out is the data item requested from the DUV
  - empty indicates that the DUV is empty
  - full indicates that the DUV is full

6

DUV Specification

- High-Level functional specification of DUV
  - The design is a FIFO.
  - Reading and writing can be done in the same cycle.
  - Data becomes valid for reading one cycle after it is written.
  - No data is returned for a read when the DUV is empty.
  - Clearing takes one cycle.
  - During clearing read and write are disabled.
  - Inputs arriving during a clear are ignored.
  - The FIFO is 8 entries deep.

7

Verification Plan

Those who fail to plan plan to fail.

The Verification Plan

- Functions to be verified:
  - For each level in the design [...] verified at that level.
  - In particular, identify corner [...]

  > Verification Plans are "live" documents. They change as our understanding of the DUV increases.

- Methods of verification:
  - Def [...] rected or ran [...]

  > The Verification Plan is the **Specification** for the Verification Process

- Comp [...]
  - Def [...] mplete.
  - In p [...]
- Resources required (people) and schedule details:
  - Integrate the verification plan into the overall design plan and estimate the cost of verification.
- Required tools:
  - List the software and hardware necessary to perform verification.

9

Test Scenarios Matrix - Basic

Test #	Description
1.1	Check the write functionality
1.2	Check the read functionality
1.3	Check the reset functionality
1.4	Check …

> **Develop a Test Scenarios Matrix for our Case Study DUV.**

NOTE: *"Check that X"* should be read as "Create a scenario that allows checking X".

- These generic tests should be broken to more specific tests
  - Test case 1.1.1: Check write when **empty**
  - Test case 1.1.2: Check write when **full**
  - Test case 1.1.3: Check write during **reset**
  - …

10

White Box View
DUV Implementation

Example DUV Implementation

- Implementation based on a circular buffer
  - nxt_wr and nxt_rd pointers indicate where the next entry will be written to or read from.
  - $data\_counter$ indicates the number of valid data items in the FIFO.
  - Complex control logic for pointers and counter.

nxt_wr

data_counter

nxt_rd

12

Functional Coverage

Cross-Product Functional Coverage

[O Lachish, E Marcus, S Ur and A Ziv. Hole Analysis for Functional Coverage Data. In proceedings of the 2002 Design Automation Conference (DAC), June 10-14, 2002, New Orleans, US.]

A cross-product coverage model is composed of the following parts:

1. A **semantic description** of the model (**story**)
2. A list of the **attributes** mentioned in the story
3. A set of all the **possible values** for each attribute (**the attribute value domains**)
4. A **list of restrictions** on the **legal combinations** in the cross-product of attribute values

14

FIFO Cross Product Coverage Model

- From a "White Box" verification perspective:
  - The FIFO is implemented using a circular buffer.
  - The circular buffer implementation is based on the following control signals:
    - nxt_rd, nxt_wr, data_counter
  - These signals are used to control the data flow and also the empty and full signals.
  - **Verification Plan:**
    - Interactions of read and write transactions can create complex and unexpected conditions. All combinations need to be verified to gain confidence in the correctness of the FIFO.
- This is the story.

15

FIFO Cross Product Coverage Model

- Attributes relevant to the coverage model:
  - nxt_rd, nxt_wr, data_counter, empty, full signals
- Attri
  - nxt
  - nxt
  - dat
  - emp
  - full ∈ {0,1}

Legal Coverage Tasks:
(0,0,0,1,0)
(2,2,8,0,1)
(3,7,4,0,0)

Illegal Coverage Tasks:
(0,0,0,1,1)
(1,1,4,0,0)
(1,5,0,1,1)

- Full coverage space:
  - 8*8*9*2*2 = **2304 coverage tasks**
  - Format: (nxt_rd, nxt_wr, data_counter, empty, full)
  - Find some legal and some illegal examples

16

FIFO Cross Product Coverage Model

- Restrictions
  - data_counter is only important when nxt_rd==nxt_wr so that one can tell the difference between empty and full
  - 64 combinations of nxt_rd and nxt_wr
  - 56 cases are for nxt_rd!=nxt_wr, so en
  - 8 cases are for nxt_rd==nxt_wr
  - one set of 8 is for data_counter==0, so
  - one set of 8 is for data_counter==8, so
  - empty and full are not both asserted at

  Defining meaningful functional coverage requires design understanding and engineering skill.

- Revised format of coverage model:
  - (nxt_rd, nxt_wr, empty, full)
  - total size of coverage space: 8*8*2*2 = 256 coverage tasks
  - Encode assumptions into properties
  - Only 56+8+8 = 72 coverage tasks are legal and meaningful.
- It is worth noting the close link of the above coverage model to the properties for formal verification.

17

Constraint Pseudo Random Test Generation

Advanced TB Architecture (Slide 19)

Constrained such that tests meet scenarios in the verification plan.

Scoreboard & Checkers

Monitor

Stimulus Generator

DUV

Slave

A ... captures what happens in the DUV during simulation. Often combined with checkers.

Captures complete interface protocols by combining several checkers.

- Constrained pseudo-random stimulus generation
- Self-checking TB
  - Monitors, Scoreboarding
- Coverage Collection and Analysis

Promote a Coverage-Driven Verification Methodology

19

Test Scenarios Matrix – Advanced (Slide 20)

Topic	Test #	Description
Data checking	2.1	Data is not modified
	2.2	
	2.3	
	2.4	

20

Test Scenarios Matrix – Advanced (Slide 21)

Basic scoreboard functionality.

Topic	Test #	Description
Data checking	2.1	Data is not modified
	2.2	Data is not lost
	2.3	Data is not duplicated
	2.4	Data order is maintained

21

Test Scenarios Matrix – Advanced (Slide 22)

Topic	Test #	Description
Data checking	2.1	Data is not modified
	2.2	Data is not lost
	2.3	Data is not duplicated
	2.4	Data order is maintained
Corner cases	2.3	Reading and writing at the same time
	2.3.1	
	2.3.2	
	…	
	…	
	…	

22

Test Scenarios Matrix – Advanced (Slide 23)

Topic	Test #	Description
Data checking	2.1	Data is not modified
	2.2	Data is not lost
	2.3	Data is not duplicated
	2.4	Data order is maintained
Corner cases	2.3	Reading and writing at the same time
	2.3.1	
	2.3.2	
	…	
	…	
	…	

23

Test Scenarios Matrix – Advanced (Slide 24)

These make interesting functional coverage scenarios.

Topic	Test #	Description
Data checking	2.1	Data is not modified
	2.2	Data is not lost
	2.3	Data is not duplica...
	2.4	Data order is maintained
Corner cases	2.3	Reading and writing at the same time
	2.3.1	Reading and writing at the same time when empty
	2.3.2	Reading and writing at the same time when full
	…	... at the same time as clearing
	…	
	…	

How?

Should we rely on random generation by constraining stimulus to make these rare events happen more often?

24

4

Bug Hunting

Given the following bug...

- **Concurrent reading from and writing to FIFO**
  - ok, the data counter should not change its value
  - unless reading from and writing to the same data slot
  - this only happens when the FIFO is
    - **empty:** When the FIFO is empty and there is a write at the same time as a read (from empty), then the read should be ignored.
    - **full:** When the FIFO is full and there is a read at the same time as a write, then the write (to full) should be ignored.
  - But the logic that controls the value of the data counter does not distinguish these special cases.
  - **What do we need to do to find these bugs?**

Read/Write when FIFO is empty

Read and Write when FIFO is full

Long test sequence to expose the bug.

ABV

Properties of the DUV

Black box view:

An invariant property.

- Empty and full are never asserted together.
- After clear the FIFO is empty.
- After writing 8 data items the FIFO is full.
- Data items are moving through the FIFO unchanged in terms of data content and in terms of data order.
- No data is duplicated.
- No data is lost.
- data_out_valid only for valid data, i.e. no x's in data.

Properties of the DUV

- White box view:
  - The value range of the read and write pointers is between 0 and 7.
  - The data_counter ranges from 0 to 8.
  - The data in the FIFO is not changed during a clear.
  - For each valid read the read pointer is incremented.
  - For each valid write the write pointer is incremented.
  - Data is written only to the slot indicated by nxt_wr.
  - Data is read only from the slot indicated by nxt_rd.
  - When reading and writing the data_counter remains unchanged.
    - What about a RW from an empty/full FIFO?

Property Formalization

Formalization of key DUV Assertions

- **System Verilog Assertions (SVA) for:**
  - Empty and full are never asserted together.
    ```
    property not_empty_and_full;
    @(posed                    ...ertions can be
    endprop                    ...nitored during
    assert                     ...simulation.
    ```
  - After c
    ```
    propert                    ...ertions can also
    @(posed                    ...used for formal
    endprop                    ...perty checking.
    assert property (empty_after_clear);
    ```

Challenge: There are many more interesting assertions.

  - On empty after one write the FIFO is no longer empty.
    ```
    property not_empty_after_write_on_empty;
    @ (posedge clk) (empty && wr |=> !empty);
    endproperty
    assert property (not_empty_after_write_on_empty);
    ```

Corner case properties

- **FIFO empty:** When the FIFO is empty and there is a write at the same time as a read (from empty), then the read should be ignored.
  ```
  property empty_write_ignore_read;
  @(posedge clk){empty && wr && rd |=>
                  data_counter == $past(data_counter)+1};
  endproperty
  assert property (empty_write_ignore_read);
  cover property (empty_write_ignore_read);
  ```
- **FIFO full:** When the FIFO is full and there is a read at the same time as a write, then the write (to full) should be ignored.
  ```
  property full_read_ignore_write;
  @ (posedge clk) {full && rd && wr |=>
                  data_counter == $past(data_counter)-1};
  endproperty
  assert property (full_read_ignore_write);
  cover property (full_read_ignore_write);
  ```


Formal Property Checking

Functional Verification Approaches

Formal Property Checking

Properties of a design are formally proven or disproved.
- Used to check for generic problems or violations of user-defined properties of the behaviour of the design.
- Usually employed at **higher levels** of abstractions.
- **Properties** are derived from the specification.
- **Properties** are expressed as formulae in some (temporal) logic.

under env_constraint if condition then expectation

Interpretation

Specification

Interpretation

Properties (Assertions)

RTL Coding

RTL

37


Formal Property Checking

**Properties of a design are formally proven or disproved.**
- Used to check for generic problems or violations of user-defined properties of the behaviour of the design.
- Usually employed at **higher levels** of abstractions.
- **Properties** are derived from the specification.
- **Properties** are expressed as formulae in some (temporal) logic.
- Checking is typically performed on a Finite State Machine model of the design.
  - This may be the RTL.

Interpretation

Specification

Interpretation

Properties (Assertions)

RTL Coding

RTL

Property Checking

Property checking can also be preformed on higher levels of abstraction.

38

Simulation vs Functional Formal Verification

Challenge 1: Specify properties to cover the entire design.

Challenge 2: Prove all these properties.

Only selected parts of the design can be covered during simulation.

Naïve interpretation of exhaustive formal verification:

In practice, completeness issues and capacity limits restrict formal verification to selected parts of the design.

Verify ALL properties.

[B. Wile , J.C. Goss and W. Roesner, "Comprehensive Functional Verification – The Complete Industry Cycle", Morgan Kaufman, 2005]

39

The Role of Formal Property Checking

- Property Checking is the most common form of high-level formal verification used in practice.
  - Property checking is fully automatic.
    - Requires the properties to be written.
  - It performs exhaustive verification of the design wrt the specified properties.
  - It provides proofs and can demonstrate the absence of bugs.
  - A counter example is presented for failed properties.
  - Used for critical well specified parts of the design
    - Cache coherence protocols, Bus protocols, Interrupt controllers
- Formal Methods can suffer from **capacity limits**
  - There are tried and trusted techniques to overcome these:
    - Restrict property checking to work over finite small time windows.
    - Limit environment behaviour by strengthening constraints.
   - Case splits over a set of properties, partitioning and black boxing

40

Outcomes of Formal Property Checking

Formulate Property

Invoke Property Checker

Property proven

Vacuity check

Property is trivially true

Property is non-trivially true

Bug in Property

DUV satisfies Property

Property fails

Counter example (CE)

Unreach-able

No reach-able other CE exists

Reach-able other CE exists

Bug in Property

DUV bug detected

Reach-able

DUV bug detected

41

Outcomes of Formal Property Checking

Formulate Property

Invoke Property Checker

Most common mistake, restrict input space so much that property becomes trivially true.

Under-constrained properties may lead to unreachable counter examples.

Specify environment constraints for proof.

Property fails

Counter example (CE)

Property is trivially true

Property is non-trivially true

Bug in Property

DUV satisfies Property

Correctness of proof relies on correctness of the environment constraints.

Unreach-able

Reach-able other exists

Reach-able

DUV bug detected

Bug in Property

DUV bug detected

42

7

How do you know you've encoded the property right?

- Keep properties and sequences simple.
  - Build complex properties from simple, short properties
    - **Peer review properties you write.**
    - **If the property fails,**
      you can investigate the counter example:
      - Is it reachable or not?
- **But if the property succeeds, how do you know whether you've encoded the property right?**

43

Formal Property Checking

- Property checking tools can formally verify assertions.
  - **Basic properties (visualize):**
    - Basic functionality
    - Range checks
  - **Re-use SV Assertions as properties (check):**
    - Empty and full are never asserted together.
    - After clear the FIFO is empty.
    - On empty after one write the FIFO is no longer empty.
  - Understanding counter examples:
    - Debug an assumption
    - Debug a design property

Note:
  - Closely related to functional coverage.
  - Link from env_constraints to simulation assertions.

44

Formal Property Checking

- Jasper DEMO
  - Formal verification of selected FIFO properties from ABV

45

How big is Exhaustive?

- Consider simulating a typical CPU design
  - 500k gates, 20k DFFs, 500 inputs
  - 70 billion sim cycles, running on 200 linux boxes for a week
  - **How big: 2^{36} cycles**
- Consider formally verifying this design
  - Input sequences: cycles $2^{(inputs+state)} = 2^{20500}$
  - What about X's: 2^{15000} (5,000 X-assignments + 10,000 non-reset DFFs)
  - **How big: 2^{20500} cycles** (2^{15000} combinations of X is not significant here!)
- That's a big number!
  - Cycles to simulate the 500k design: $\quad$ **2^{36}** $\quad$ (70 billion)
  - Cycles to formally verify a 32-bit adder: $\quad 2^{64}$ $\quad$ (18 billion billion)
  - Number of stars in universe: $\quad 2^{70}$ $\quad$ (10^{21})
  - Number of atoms in the universe: $\quad 2^{260}$ $\quad$ (10^{78})
  - Possible X combinations in 500k design: $\quad 2^{15000}$ $\quad$ (10^{4515} x 3)
  - Cycles to formally verify the 500k design: $\quad$ **2^{20500}** $\quad$ (10^{6171})

46

Summary

- Block-level Case Study
  - Specification
  - Verification Plan
  - Directed Testing
  - (Code Coverage)
  - Functional Coverage
  - Assertion-based Verification
  - Formal Property Checking

- **No single method is adequate to cover a whole design in practice.**
  - Carefully select the verification methods that maximize ROI.
  - Complement simulation with formal: Integrated approach

47

Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year

Why red wine is so important for Christmas

48