## A SMART GENERATION OF DESIGN ATTRIBUTES FOR VERIFICATION CLOSURE USING SPECMAN

Meirav Nitzan Xilinx Inc. meiravn@xilinx.com

Yael Kinderman Cadence Design Systems Inc yaelk@cadence.com Efrat Gavish Cadence Design Systems Inc efratg@cadence.com

#### The problem:

# Design attributes (parameters) affect the way the design behaves



- It is necessary to test the design with all relevant parameter values
- Need to make sure various combinations of parameters are checked, sometimes exhaustively

# WHY NOT TEST ALL COMBINATIONS?

#### Not scalable.

- E.g:
  - a design with 20-30 parameters
  - each parameter may have 2 to 10 values
  - the exhaustive permutation set could reach hundreds of thousands in size, or even more.
- A huge amount of simulation time
- Covering all permutations for a bit more complex designs may not be feasible

#### Efficiency - turnaround time for running a regression is too long

 If a bug fix takes a week to fully verify ->a lot of idle time for designers.

Functionally, there is no functional justification to cross all values of all parameters with each other.

# **SOLUTION REQUIREMENT**

- 1. Automated random generation of parameters sets, considering the following:
  - All parameters legal values and constraints
  - Dependencies between parameters
- 2. Avoiding repetitions of parameters sets
  - Each parameter set => re-run of the regression test suite
- 3. Flexibility to define either full parameters sets generation, as well as smaller parameters sets
  - Can be useful for defining nightly regressions, specific feature testing etc.
- 4. Proper coverage of the parameters space needs to be verified

Requirement 4 is solved by creating a config class in an OVM/UVM environment, with proper coverage model, accessible to all components

# **PARAMETERS GENERATION - OUTLINE**



© Copyright 2013 Xilinx

### CASE STUDY- A PARAMETERIZED DUAL PORT RAM DESIGN



## COMPARING SIMPLE SYSTEM-VERILOG RANDOMIZATION TO SPECMAN BASED SOLUTION

- Running SystemVerilog randomization until 100% coverage of the sub-regression requirements were reached, yielded a significantly varied number of parameter sets – from 7 to 26
- Running the Specman Based solution with the same coverage requirements yielded 4 to 6 parameter sets
- Why the difference?
  - The Specman based solution first exhaustively generates the first cross, while randomizing other parameters. The in only needs to generate values for the second cross not generated already
  - SV randomization cannot specially consider the combinations we care about, hence reaching them may take a varying number of cycles