Determining Test Quality through Dynamic Runtime Monitoring of SystemVerilog Assertions

Kelly D. Larson

klarson@nvidia.com

# How do you know your tests are doing what they should?

- A complex SoC can have well over 10,000 tests.

- Making tests completely self-checking can be difficult.

> A test which 'passes' may simply mean that nothing "BAD" happened… And not necessarily that anything "GOOD" happened.

The cost of bad tests

- A 'broken' test steals valuable simulation cycles.
- A 'broken' test is not testing what it should, and introduces a coverage hole.
- Your coverage report may not be sufficient to expose these gaps.

Solution

- We need a way to tie the pass/fail condition of an individual test to the specific conditions or goals of the test.

- This needs to be a scalable solution.

- This needs to work with both constrained random tests, as well as processor-centric style directed testing.

Assertion Monitor!

Specific Test Requirements

- My test was supposed to hit a specific coverage point or fail. Did it?

- I know my test was supposed to make condition 'X' happen exactly five times or fail. Did it?

- Because of the way that I wrote my test, I should never see 'Y' happen, and if it does I want the test to fail even though 'Y' itself is not illegal. Will it?

Assertion Monitor

- Most standard use of SystemVerilog assertions is to target DESIGN QUALITY.

- Our Assertion Monitor solution will target TEST QUALITY.

Design Quality ≠ **Test Quality**

What about Assertion Coverage?

- Using dynamic assertion monitor is similar to analyzing assertion coverage reports, except:
  - Focus is on individual tests, not overall results.
  - Done while simulation is running.
  - Can fail test immediately upon detecting a problem with the test.
  - More flexible, can fail for condition hit or not hit, or hit within defined ranges.

Example Use Case: Arbiter


```
check_hi: assert property(@(posedge clk) disable iff (reset)
             req_hi |=> gnt_hi);


check_med: assert property(@(posedge clk) disable iff (reset)
             (req_med & !req_hi) |=> gnt_med);


check_low: assert property(@(posedge clk) disable iff (reset)
             (req_low & !req_med & !req_hi) |=> gnt_low);
```

Make it interesting…

```
check_arb: cover property(@(posedge clk) disable iff (reset)
                (req_hi & req_med & req_low));
```

- The assertions in this example will catch illegal activity, but they won't actually insure that any 'arbitration' actually occurred.

- In this case, we'll need add another cover point to observe an interesting condition.

Plusarg directives

- What we'd like now is to be able to run the simulation with an additional argument which requires our interesting condition to occur in order for the test to pass.

```
<sim command> +RequireAssert=check_arb
```

- How about a test where I know a particular condition should not occur?

```
<sim command> +ProhibitAssert=check_hi
```

Assertion Monitor Plusargs

Type	# Arg	Example & Description	When Checked
Require	0	**+RequireAssert=myassert**. Assertion must fire at least once during the test.	End of test
	1	**+RequireAssert=myassert:x**, Assertion must fire at least 'x' times during the test.	End of test
	2	**+RequireAssert=myassert:x:y**, Assertion must fire in the range greater than or equal to 'x', and less than or equal to 'y' times.	During (too many), End (too few)
Prohibit	0	**+ProhibitAssert=myassert**, Assertion must never fire during the simulation.	During Test
	1	**+ProhibitAssert=myassert:x**, Assertion must not fire 'x' or more times (less is OK).	During Test
	2	**+ProhibitAssert=myassert:x:y**, Assertions cannot fire in the range of [x:y] inclusive (less or more is OK).	End of test

Assertion Monitor Components

- Assertion Monitor has three main components

RTL Component

- RTL is instrumented with SVA assertions and coverpoints.

  - Ideally we can make use of existing assertions written for design quality.

- Assertion monitor treats assertions and coverpoints as the same.

  - From test quality perspective we don't really 'care' if the assertions passes or fails, only that the condition was tested.

UVM Component

- Before the test begins, parse command line directives and call DPI routine to instrument assertion tracking.

- At the end of the test, do final check for proper behavior.

- Provide utility functions that will allow the assertion monitor DPI routines to report UVM errors and warnings.

C DPI Component

- Provide a data structure to store runtime information about monitored assertions.

- Provide the mechanism to attach a callback routine to monitored assertions.

- Provide the callback routine which will be run every time a monitored assertion or cover point successfully passes.

- Provide an 'end of test' routine which will do a final check.

SystemVerilog Assertion API

Our assertion monitor makes use of two key features of the Assertion API:

1) The ability to iterate through a design to find specific assertions.

2) The ability to attach our own callback (subroutine) to an assertion which will get called whenever the assertion (or cover point) passes successfully.

Iterating through RTL Assertions

```
itr = vpi_iterate(vpiAssertion, NULL);
while (assertion = vpi_scan(itr)) {
        /* process assertion */
}
```

- Assertion API allows us to easily iterate through handles of all of the assertions and coverpoints in the design.

- Handle gives us access to the hierarchical path, and allows us to attach a callback.

Registering a Callback

```
vpiHandle vpi_register_assertion_cb(
  vpiHandle assertion, /* handle to assertion */
  PLI_INT32 reason,    /* reason for which callbacks needed */
  vpi_assertion_callback_func *cb_rtn,
  PLI_BYTE8 *user_data /* user data to be supplied to cb */
);
```

```
typedef PLI_INT32 (vpi_assertion_callback_func)(
  PLI_INT32 reason,         /* callback reason */
  p_vpi_time cb_time,       /* callback time */
  vpiHandle assertion,      /* handle to assertion */
  p_vpi_attempt_info info,  /* attempt related information */
  PLI_BYTE8 *user_data      /* registered user data */
);
```

Flow: Before Test

Flow: During Test

Flow: After Test

Don't like plusargs?

- Assertions can be monitored by calling DPI routines directly from the testbench.

- Can be called from within random testcases to provide dynamic feedback to help guide the progression of the testcase itself.

Constrained Random Testing

```
class bus_seq extends uvm_sequence #(bus_txn);
    <...>
    virtual task body();
        ahandle = register_assert("upper.overflow_detect",-1,-1,1);
        while (successes < 3) begin
            `uvm_do(tr);
            successes = num_assert_successes(ahandle);
        end
    endtask: body
endclass: bus_seq
```

- In this example, assertion is registered with the DPI directly from the UVM sequence.

- Sequence actively monitors the assertion until 3 successful passes are detected.

Summary

- It's more important than ever to make sure every simulation cycle is well spent.

- 'Broken' tests not only waste cycles, but add risk by exposing unwanted coverage holes.

- SystemVerilog has built-in facilities that allow us to dynamically track assertions and coverpoints during the test.

- Dynamically tracking coverage helps insure that a test continues to do what it's supposed to do throughout the project.

Thank You!

Kelly D. Larson
klarson@nvidia.com