



# A bottom-up approach to top-down VMM

Xavier Caron Design Flow Engineer Atmel Rousset



# The big idea behind IP verification



- An IP is a *reusable* chip *cornerstone* We therefore *must* have confidence in it
- Confidence is built from *passed* tests

   Since only tests actually exercise the IP
- Tests do not prove the code *is* right

   Tests are simulated & *incomplete* stimuli sequences
- Tests just prove when the code is wrong
   But they are usually very good at it
- Bottomline: prove RTL code matches *intent* 
  - For and alas only for the use cases we exercise



## The big idea behind IP verification (cont'd)



- We cannot possibly think about all cornercases
   This is too daunting a task for our brain
- Besides, writing tests rapidly becomes...
   Tedious, repetitive, boring and... irritating!
- We need a framework / methodology
  - To let the simulator "push" an IP in any possible way
  - While retaining enough control on the "any" concept





## (Smart quote)



• Insight from a *real* code guru

"Debugging is twice as hard as writing the code in the first place. Therefore, if you write the code as cleverly as possible, you are, by definition, not smart enough to debug it."

-- Brian Kernighan

One more challenge

– Verifier & RTL coder are *supposedly* different persons

- How to accommodate for this neuronic deficit?
  - The brute-force way (~ target all possible combos)
  - The abstracted way (~ use a *strict* methodology)



#### Our VMM experiment



- Main goal: pipe-clean a SVTB+VMM+VIP flow
   We already had a promising Vera+RVM+VIP one
- Side goal: assert for RTL designer acceptance
   Or bootstrap a dedicated (proto)verification group
- We picked up a not-too-complex IP
  - Our proprietary AHB-Lite "HMATRIX1" bus matrix





# Testbench at a glance



- TB building blocks
  - DUT
  - Interfaces
  - Test program
     (within an "env" object)
- TB roles
  - Define system clock
  - Instance ad'hoc interfaces
  - Instance DUT and connect its signals to interfaces
  - Instance test program and connect it to interfaces





#### Interfaces



- 3 kinds to be used (a bit of wishful thinking)
  - TB, clocked & reversed DUT-wise
  - DUT, unclocked & I/O as is
  - Monitor, unclocked & all-in
- Avoid the async. all-inout wiring scheme
  - Use clocking blocks / modports to constrain further
- Clocking blocks
  - For timing & synchronization requirements purposes
- Modports
  - To enforce correct I/O wiring
- Consistent glue to '95 style verilog IPs



#### Test program

- Transactors
  - Xaction to "bus" transcoders
- Channels
  - P2P communication media
- Generators
  - Object (~ xaction) factories
- Monitors
  - Bus *spies*
- Scoreboard
  - The *focal* point



8

Xavier Caron









#### Transactors



- Mediators between 2 kinds of *representations* 
  - Abstract, borne by xactions (queued class instances)
  - Physical, borne by wires (AHB "bus" pin wiggling)
- We needed 3 kinds of xactors
  - Namely master, slave and monitor (cf interfaces)
- Master
  - *Transcodes* instance properties into pin wiggling
- Slave
  - *Reacts* to pin wiggling and updates its own state
- Monitor
  - *Spies* pin wiggling to decipher xactions for the SB



#### Transactors (cont'd)



- VIP was not usable with VCS 2005.06-SP1
  - SystemVerilog / OpenVera interoperability is missing
  - Required VIPs are mainly coded in OpenVera
- We had to code our own makeshift xactors
  - With much less features than their VIP counterparts
  - We devised them as transient pieces of code anyway
- The hardest one is by far the monitor
   Real-time on-the-fly xaction decoding is a tough job
- Our monitor has thus one big limitation
  - It only reports beat-wise xactions
  - Beat-to-burst aggregation delegated to SB instead









Constrained Random Testing paradigm



- A generator is an instance factory
  - Restlessly constructs, populates & queues xactions











#### Scoreboard



- Performs a "mere" quantitative 1-to-1 match
  - A posteriori treatment (no RT feedback loop)
  - On aggregated (master) vs atomic (slave) xactions
- Still does a "first stage" check only
  - Beat-wise integrity (~ atomic)
  - Only reflects correct *wiring* implementation
  - Does not take "beat pertains to burst" into account
- Will eventually need a "second stage" check
  - Burst-wise consistency (~ aggregated)
  - Should reflect higher-level arbitration features
  - Like broken bursts, latency, etc.



# Scoreboard (cont'd)



• Dataflow diagram











#### Functional coverage



- CRT paradigm is coverage-driven
  - To avoid "blind" tests
  - To close the "run-cover-tweak" verification loop
- Coverage is a *qualitative* study of xactions
  - Used as a metrics
  - Gives a statistical summary of a simulation run
- To actually augment *functional* coverage
  - Run longer simulation (if possible)
  - Relax constraints (within allowed legal frame)
  - Beware of potential memory issues!
  - Since a posteriori SB processing implies accumulation



#### Current status



- Yet to be done
  - Switch to VCS 2006.06-B (features SV/OV interop.)
  - Some changes needed but not structural ones:
     Replace our makeshift xactors by VIP instances
     Replace our own xaction by VIP one
  - Implement missing / gated features (INCR, etc.)
  - Use assertions to formalize assumptions SB relies on
- Eventually
  - Hand out the whole TB to a "lucky" RTL win<sup>+</sup>Hcoder
  - For usability review (cf "minimal code modifications")
  - And... Acceptance!



#### Conclusions (albeit partial ones)



- VMM
  - Sensible, but has a very steep learning curve
  - You do not want to start by  $\mathbf{1}^{st}$  reading VMM book
  - Use RVM tutorial & one day training instead
- VIP
  - Has desired aggregated xaction reporting features
  - But was not designed to handle P2P AHB connections
  - Yet works if HTRANS is gated by HSEL (workaround)
- SVTB
  - Support via VCS 2005.06-SP1 was more than decent
  - Rich enough, allows for not-so-inelegant workarounds





#