# Identifying and Overcoming Multi-Die System Verification Challenges

Varun Agrawal Product Manager Synopsys







# For the last 50 years the semiconductor industry has been driven by Moore's Law

#### The number of transistors in a dense IC doubles about every two years







### Reaching the End of Economic Viability





### The Drive to Multi-Die Systems



#### **Motivation for Multi-Die Systems**



Accelerated scaling of system functionality at a cost-effective price (>2X reticle limits)



Reduced risk & time-to-market by re-using proven designs/die



Lower system power while increasing throughput (up to 30%)



Rapid creation of new product variants for flexible portfolio management





#### Multi-Design System Challenges

Transformation from Monolithic SoC to Multi-Die Systems







#### From Moore's Law to SysMoore

**Evolving Trend** 

- 2.5D: Interposer-mounted chiplets
- 3D stack(s) regular structures (memory, FPGA, ...)
- Heterogeneous stacks mounted on interposers / bridges
- Recursive composition formulation ... stacks of stacks
  - Ever larger memory and computation
  - Partition system to balance throughput and energy (EDP)
  - Tackle "Memory Wall" Time and energy moving data to/from large off-chip memory
    - New Mantra: Move the computation, not the data  $\rightarrow$  then hide the latency

#### Fundamental challenge = Size, allows building designs (already) extreme large!











#### Is Multi-Die System Verification Harder?

Still Need to Verify the Functionality of the Overall System



- Mostly impacts physical layer (dies, routing, power dissipation, packaging, ...)

• Increased scale and complexity exacerbates verification

accellera

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

• Fundamentally alters the incremental refinement design flow



### A System-Approach is Required

- Many organizations become possible
- Must be modeled, laid-out & verified in the context of the system
  - Design aspects and optimizations become architectural decisions
    - Tiling and placement, die-to-die communication, power, thermal, ...
  - A lot of work must be done early on: Shift Left
- Need a framework for end-to-end co-exploration and co-optimization of technologies, architectures, and algorithms
  - Architectural exploration to quickly estimate PPA for a range of workloads
- Flow:
  - − Full system spec  $\rightarrow$  Design (& verify) individual blocks  $\rightarrow$  Assemble system  $\rightarrow$  Verify as a whole
  - Modularized approach Akin to board-level verification







**Synopsys Platform Architect** 



#### From Monolithic To Multi-Die System

System-Level Disaggregation



## Multi-Die System Verification Challenges

- System verification must validate assumptions made during architecture design
  - Must consider die-to-die communication: delay, jitter, coherency, power, guaranteed delivery and errors
    - Monolithic SoCs only consider delay
- Design size and complexity exacerbate Verification
  - Need adequate levels of capacity and performance
    - Hybrid models and traffic generators to focus on a few dies at a time
    - Very large memories bottlenecks
  - Scalability of simulation/emulation models
    - Include analog components

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

- Scalable system integration methodology (system aggregation)
- Knowing when Verification is complete
  - Exhaustive verification of individual dies Complete functional coverage (UVM)
    - Die-level bugs cannot be fixed at the system level
  - System level verification focus on scenarios Explicit coverage model (PSS) plus SW/FW





### Functional Verification of Multi-Die Systems

- A Multi-Die system is not one design, it is a combination of independently manufactured designs (dies) interconnected through communication fabric(s)
- Multi-Die system-level verification needs to target
  - Complex functions spanning multiple dies
  - Performance that is a function of multi-die functionality
  - Closer to system validation of multi-chip solutions Verify functional scenarios
- Basic functional test: Assemble and simulate the RTL of all the dies
  - How does one assemble "independent" designs into one simulation environment
    - Compile Issues: How to avoid name clashes
    - Capacity implications: Does compute server have enough memory to build and execute the simulation
  - Can the die-level testbenches be re-used and/or synchronized?
  - Can the simulation be distributed over multiple servers?





### Assembling Multi-Die System for Simulation

Single Executable to Simulate System Aggregation



- Analyze each die into a separate library
  - Same names (e.g., module) may be used in multiple dies No name clash
  - Top-level assembly and configuration files
    - No changes to per-die code

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

The multi-die system's name scope is strictly hierarchical





### Single Executable Multi-Die System Simulation with Synopsys VCS Functional Verification Solution



### Distributed Simulation of Multi-Die Systems

Addressing Verification Capacity and Scalability

![](_page_13_Picture_2.jpeg)

- Separate compilation No clashes
- Concurrent execution
- Client Server architecture (-distsim)
  - Exploits cloud elasticity & scalability
- Communication & synchronization APIs
- accellera

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

- Asynchronous distributed execution
  - Kept in lock step with infrequent synch-points
    - Die-to-die communication uses SerDes
  - Breaks Von Nuemann bottleneck

![](_page_13_Figure_13.jpeg)

• Multiple testbench modes

![](_page_13_Figure_15.jpeg)

#### Software Development & System Validation

Hybrid Solutions, Approximate Models, and Traffic Generators

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

### **Die-to-Die Communication Verification**

- Need to consider delay, jitter, coherency, power, guaranteed delivery and errors
  - Generally, very difficult: Depends technologies (bumps, TSV, wires) plus system routing
- Standard die-to-die interfaces can help

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

- AIB, BoW, OHBI, UCIe, XSR supporting a variety of use cases and speeds of 6-32 Gbps/pin

![](_page_15_Figure_5.jpeg)

• Pick the right protocol (use-case) & verify with VIP using Synopsys VCS or ZeBu

![](_page_15_Picture_7.jpeg)

#### Summary of 5 Main D2D Standards Substrate

Organic

Interpose

\$\$\$

Key Figures of Merit: Technical (Bandwidth, Power, Latency) & Cost

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Why is UCIe a Preferred D2D Interface?

Technical Merits, Comprehensive Spec & Broad Eco-System

- Technical Merits (Most compelling PPAs)
  - Energy efficiency <0.3pJ/Bit</li>
  - Edge efficiency >5Tbps/mm
  - Latency ~2ns from FDI to FDI
- Comprehensive & Futureproof
  - All use cases
  - All package types
  - Chip to Chip use case with retimer
  - Complete protocol stack
  - Future proof with support up to 32Gbps data rate per pin
- Broad Ecosystem
  - Wide range of promoters & contributors spanning all industry

![](_page_17_Picture_14.jpeg)

segments

<b>Universal Chiplet</b> Interconnect Express
Google Cloud intel. Microsoft
NUDIA.       Qualconm       SAMSUNG         Achronix       ADVANTEST.       故羅解 AkroStar       without and the second and the se
このでは、   このでは、   Stillion to Software   このでは、   このでは、 <p< th=""></p<>
> 110 members (June 2023)

### UCIe Built to Enable Common and New Use Models

UCIe Retimer Enables Extension of Reach Beyond Rack (with Optical IO)

#### Server or AI Scaling (Homogeneous) (NoC-to-NoC with low latency & coherency)

![](_page_18_Figure_3.jpeg)

#### **UCle Streaming**

- CXS or AXI bridge
- User Defined / Proprietary

#### **Heterogeneous Computing (Accelerator)** (Interoperability with low latency & coherency)

![](_page_18_Figure_8.jpeg)

#### UCIe CXL or PCIe

- For interoperability **UCle Streaming**
- CXS or AXI bridge

#### IO or Memory Split

(Interoperability with low latency)

**Resource Aggregation (Pooling) w/Retimer** (Rack-to-Rack with low latency)

![](_page_18_Figure_15.jpeg)

#### UCIe CXL or PCIe6

- Coherency for Memory **UCle Streaming**
- AXI bridge for Ethernet •

![](_page_18_Picture_20.jpeg)

UCIe CXL or PCIe6 For Aggregation **UCle Streaming** For CPO / Eth.

![](_page_18_Picture_22.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_23.jpeg)

#### **Broad Protocol Solution Across Verification Use Cases**

PCIe 6.0, CXL 3.0, USB 4, HBM3, UCIe, ...

#### Industry-first protocol solutions leverage Synopsys IP

![](_page_19_Picture_3.jpeg)

Protocol Validation using Physical and Virtual testers

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_8.jpeg)

### Synopsys VIP for UCIe

#### Architecture and Key Features

#### **Verification IP Features**

- Native SV/UVM Architecture
- Specification Version UCle v1.0, v1.1
- Interfaces: FDI/RDI/Logical PHY link
- Supports all topologies for various DUT types
- Operation Modes Active, Passive
- Streaming testbench interfaces for easy traffic generation
- RDI Shim layer at D2D adapter for early test development
- APIs for traffic generation and sideband service requests
- Protocol checks and functional coverage at each layer
- Exceptions, Callback and Analysis ports for Scoreboard
- Configurable interpacket delays for mainband and sideband packets
- Reference example illustrating API usage and representative protocol scenarios

![](_page_20_Figure_15.jpeg)

Close Collaboration with UCIe Consortium, Industry leading Synopsys IP and Key market leaders

![](_page_20_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_18.jpeg)

0000

![](_page_21_Figure_0.jpeg)

- Supports 11+ Verification Topologies for various Design types
- Supported Use-cases
  - D2D / PHY / Protocol Layer DUT
  - D2D-PHY Interoperability
  - Protocol-layer-D2D-Controller
     Interoperability
  - UCIe Subsystem
  - UCIe Full Stack
- Support hooks for Software Discovery and Device Enumeration
- APIs for Configuration Space Testing
- Single and Multi-node Setups
- Developed alongside Synopsys IPs and with leading customers

### Synopsys SoC Verification Kit (SVK)

Accelerating SoC Verification with Synopsys IP, VIP and VCS

- Challenges
  - Expertise for UVM-based, scalable testbenches
  - Verification resource limitations
- Key Benefits
  - Out-of-the-box verification solution for complex protocols, tailor made for specific IP configuration
  - Accelerates the SoC testbench development for design and verification engineers
  - Enables rapid integration and testing of Synopsys IPs in Subsystem/SoC environment
  - Mitigates integration risk by providing industry-proven verification methodology by protocol experts

![](_page_22_Figure_10.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Picture_11.jpeg)

### **Multi-Die System Power Intent Verification**

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

- UPF allows to overlay power intent over functional intent
- What about a Multi-Die system?
- Power Domain 1
- Power Domain 2
- Power Domain 3
- Isolation
- Retention
- That is not possible pre-manufactured die!
- Power intent is part of the architecture : shift-left
  - Dies implement power intent voltages & signaling ports
  - Power intent disaggregation (top-down  $\rightarrow$  bottom-up flow)
- Assemble & connect power ports
  - Static verification (VC LP) can verify such connections
- System-level PST is challenging
  - Per-Die predefined "power modes" (off, standby, ...)

![](_page_23_Picture_17.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_18.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_19.jpeg)

### Multi-Die System Power Verification Challenges

![](_page_24_Picture_1.jpeg)

SYSTEMS INITIATIVE

Power Domain 1
Power Domain 2
Power Domain 3
Isolation
Retention

![](_page_24_Picture_3.jpeg)

- Verification tools will honor UPF targeting dies. No "set die"!
- Logical and physical hierarchies are not the same!

![](_page_24_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### Synopsys Multi-Die System Solutions

A Comprehensive Solution for Heterogeneous Integration

![](_page_25_Figure_2.jpeg)

NFERENCE AND EXHIBITION

![](_page_25_Picture_3.jpeg)

### **QUESTIONS?**

![](_page_26_Picture_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_0.jpeg)

# Thank You