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Outline

• Recap: intro to simulation, Verilog to drive and test DUT
• High Level Design Overview
  - divide and conquer
  - data path/controller partition
  - organization: e.g. serial vs parallel, pipeline, …
Introduction

• High-level Design Specifies:
  – How data is moved around and operated on.
  – The architecture (sometimes called micro-architecture):
    • The organization of state elements and combinational logic blocks
    • Functional specification of combinational logic blocks
• Optimization
  – Deals with the task of modifying an architecture and data movement procedure to meet some particular design requirement:
    • performance, cost, power, or some combination.
• high-level organization and optimization
  – modern CAD tools help fill in the low-level details and optimization
    • gate-level minimization, state-assignment, etc.
  – A great deal of the leverage on effecting performance, cost, and power comes at the high-level.

One Standard High-level Template

• Controller
  – accepts external and control input, generates control and external output and sequences the movement of data in the datapath. (puppeteer)
• Datapath
  – is responsible for data manipulation. Usually includes a limited amount of storage. (puppet)
• Memory
  – optional block used for long term storage of data structures.

Standard model for CPUs, micro-controllers, many other digital sub-systems.
• Usually not nested.
• Sometimes cascaded:
Register Transfer Language

- At the high-level we view these systems as a collection of state elements and CL blocks.
- “RTL” is a commonly used acronym for “Register Transfer Level” description.
- It follows from the fact that all synchronous digital system can be described as a set of state elements connected by combinational logic blocks.
- Though not strictly correct, some also use “RTL” to mean the Verilog or VHDL code that describes such systems.

Register Transfer “Language” Descriptions

- We introduce a language for describing the behavior of systems at the register transfer level.
- Can view the operation of digital synchronous systems as a set of data transfers between registers with combinational logic operations happening during the transfer.
- We will avoid using “RTL” to mean “register transfer language.”

- RT Language comprises a set of register transfers with optional operators as part of the transfer.
- Example:
  
  ```
  regA ← regB
  regC ← regA + regB
  if (start==1) regA ← regC
  ```

- My personal style:
  - use “;” to separate transfers that occur on separate cycles.
  - Use “,” to separate transfers that occur on the same cycle.
- Example (2 cycles):
  
  ```
  regA ← regB, regB ← 0;
  regC ← regA;
  ```
Example of Using RT Language

In this case: RT Language description is used to sequence the operations on the datapath (dp).

It becomes the high-level specification for the controller.

Design of the FSM controller follows directly from the RT Language sequence. FSM controls movement of data by controlling the multiplexor control signals.

important to add clock to show which elements have state!

Example of Using RT Language

Sometimes RT Language is used as a starting point for designing both the datapath and the control:

• example:
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{regA} & \leftarrow \text{IN}; \\
  \text{regB} & \leftarrow \text{IN}; \\
  \text{regC} & \leftarrow \text{regA} + \text{regB}; \\
  \text{regB} & \leftarrow \text{regC};
  \end{align*}
  \]

• From this we can deduce:
  
  - IN must fanout to both regA and regB
  - regA and regB must output to an adder
  - the adder must output to regC
  - regB must take its input from a mux that selects between IN and regC

What does the datapath look like:

\[ \text{WB} \]

The controller:

\[ \text{WB} \]
List Processor Example

- RT Language gives us a framework for making high-level optimizations.

- General design procedure outline:
  1. Problem, Constraints, and Component Library Spec.
  2. “Algorithm” Selection
  3. Micro-architecture Specification
  4. Analysis of Cost, Performance, Power
  5. Optimizations, Variations
  6. Detailed Design

1. Problem Specification

- Design a circuit that forms the sum of all the 2’s complement integers stored in a linked-list structure starting at memory address 0:

```
0  X0  X1  X2  ...  Xn-1
```

- All integers and pointers are 8-bit. The link-list is stored in a memory block with an 8-bit address port and 8-bit data port, as shown below. The pointer from the last element in the list is 0. At least one node in list.

I/Os:
- START resets to head of list and starts addition process.
- DONE signals completion
- R holds the final result

Note: We don’t assume nodes are aligned on 2 Byte boundaries.
1. Other Specifications

- Design Constraints:
  - Usually the design specification puts a restriction on cost, performance, power or all. We will leave this unspecified for now and return to it later.

- Component Library:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>component</th>
<th>delay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>simple logic gates</td>
<td>0.5ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-bit register</td>
<td>clk-to-Q=0.5ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>setup=0.5ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-bit 2-1 multiplexor</td>
<td>1ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n-bit adder</td>
<td>(2 log(n) + 2)ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory</td>
<td>10ns read (asynchronous read)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zero compare</td>
<td>0.5 log(n)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(single ported memory)*

Are these reasonable?

Review of Register with “Clock Enable”

- Register with Clock Enable:

  Functional description only. Transistor level circuit has lower input delay.

- Allows register to be either be loaded on selected clock posedge or to retain its previous value.

- Assume both data and CE require setup time = 0.5ns.

- Assume no reset input.
2. Algorithm Specification

- In this case the memory only allows one access per cycle, so the algorithm is limited to sequential execution. If in another case more input data is available at once, then a more parallel solution may be possible.

- Assume datapath state registers NEXT and SUM.
  - NEXT holds a pointer to the node in memory.
  - SUM holds the result of adding the node values to this point.

```plaintext
If (START==1) NEXT←0, SUM←0, DONE←0;
repeat { 
    SUM←SUM + Memory[NEXT+1];
    NEXT←Memory[NEXT];
} until (NEXT==0);
R←SUM, DONE←1;
```

This RT Language “pseudo code” becomes the basis for DP and controller.

RT language data/control mixing (?)

```plaintext
while (START == 0);
(1) while (START==1) NEXT←0, SUM←0, DONE←0;
begin
    repeat {
        SUM←SUM + Memory[NEXT+1];
        NEXT←Memory[NEXT];
    } until (NEXT==0);
    R←SUM, DONE←1;
end
while (START==0) DONE←1;
goto (1)
```

- sequential?
- interrupted flow?
- parallel operations?
- good for data flow, control better in Verilog…
- state diagram will explain control better!
3. Architecture #1

Direct implementation of RTL description:

Datapath

Controller

If (START==1) NEXT←0, SUM←0;
repeat {
    SUM←SUM + Memory[NEXT+1];
    NEXT←Memory[NEXT];
} until (NEXT==0);
R←SUM, DONE←1;

4. Analysis of Cost, Performance, and Power

- Skip Power for now.
- Cost:
  - How do we measure it? # of transistors? # of gates? # of CLBs?
  - Depends on implementation technology. Often we are just interested in comparing the relative cost of two competing implementations. (Save this for later)
- Performance:
  - 2 clock cycles per number added.
  - What is the minimum clock period?
  - The controller might be on the critical path. Therefore we need to know the implementation, and controller input and output delay.
Possible Controller Implementation

- Based on this, what is the controller input and output delay?

One hot

Operational timing diagram for list processor

```
Clock
MemAddress
MemData
LD_SUM
SUM
LD_NEXT
NEXT

GET_NEXT
COMPUTE_SUM
GET_NEXT

x_0+x_1
x_0+x_1+x_2

NEXT ← Memory[NEXT];
SUM ← SUM + Memory[NEXT+1];
```
4. Analysis of Performance

- Detailed timing:
  
  \[ \text{clock period (T)} = \max \text{ (clock period for each state)} \]
  
  \[ T > 31\text{ns}, F < 32 \text{ MHz} \]

- Observation:
  
  COMPUTE_SUM state does most of the work. Most of the components are inactive in GET_NEXT state.

  GET_NEXT does: Memory access + …

  COMPUTE_SUM does: 8-bit add, memory access, 15-bit add + …

- Conclusion:
  
  **Move one of the adds to** GET_NEXT.
5. Optimization

• **Add new register named NUMA, for address of number to add.**

• Update code to reflect our change (note still 2 cycles per iteration):

```c
If (START==1) NEXT ← 0, SUM ← 0, NUMA ← 1;
repeat {
    SUM ← SUM + Memory[NUMA];
    NUMA ← Memory[NEXT] + 1,
    NEXT ← Memory[NEXT];
} until (NEXT == 0);
R ← SUM, DONE ← 1;
```

5. Optimization

• **Architecture #2:**

```c
If (START==1) NEXT ← 0, SUM ← 0, NUMA ← 1;
repeat {
    SUM ← SUM + Memory[NUMA];
    NUMA ← Memory[NEXT] + 1,
    NEXT ← Memory[NEXT];
} until (NEXT == 0);
R ← SUM, DONE ← 1;
```

• **Incremental cost: addition of another register and mux.**
5. Optimization, Architecture #2

• New timing:
  Clock Period (T) = max (clock period for each state)

  \[ T > 23 \text{ns}, \ F < 43 \text{Mhz} \]

• Is this worth the extra cost?
• Can we lower the cost?

Notice that the circuit now only performs one add operation per cycle, but have two adders. Why not share 1 adder for both cycles?

5. Optimization, Architecture #3

• Incremental cost:
  – Addition of another mux and control (ADD_SEL). Removal of an 8-bit adder.

• Performance:
  – No change.

• Change is definitely worth it.

[Except wiring is more limit than computation…]
Summary

- RTL = register transfer level
- FSM is controller
- Load/Enable on register directly corresponds to transfer command, e.g. A $\leftrightarrow$ B; (e.g. EnableB, LoadA)
- timing critical for understanding when operations occur
- speed limited by slowest state settling