Asynchronous Inputs to Synchronous Systems

- Many synchronous systems need to interface to asynchronous input signals:
  - Consider a computer system running at some clock frequency, say 1GHz with:
    - Interrupts from I/O devices, keystrokes, etc.
    - Data transfers from devices with their own clocks
      - Ethernet has its own 100MHz clock
      - PCI bus transfers, 66MHz standard clock.
  - These signals could have no known timing relationship with the system clock of the CPU.
  - (On FPGAs we can use FIFOs - separate clocks for input and output - as the interface. In general, this is overkill - and too expensive).
“Synchronizer” Circuit

• For a single asynchronous input, we use a simple flip-flop to bring the external input signal into the timing domain of the system clock:

![Diagram of synchronizer circuit](image)

• The D flip-flop samples the asynchronous input at each cycle and produces a synchronous output that meets the setup time of the next stage.

“Synchronizer” Circuit

• It is essential for asynchronous inputs to be synchronized at only one place.

![Diagram of synchronizer circuit](image)

• Two flip-flops may not receive the clock and input signals at precisely the same time (clock and data skew).
• When the asynchronous changes near the clock edge, one flip-flop may sample input as 1 and the other as 0.
“Synchronizer” Circuit

- Single point of synchronization is even more important when input goes to a combinational logic block (ex. FSM)
- The CL block can accidentally hide the fact that the signal is synchronized at multiple points.
- The CL magnifies the chance of the multiple points of synchronization seeing different values.

Synchronizer Failure & Metastability

- We think of flip-flops having only two stable states - but all have a third metastable state halfway between 0 and 1.
- When the setup and hold times of a flip-flop are not met, the flip-flop could be put into the metastable state.
- Noise will be amplified and push the flip-flop one way or other.
- However, in theory, the time to transition to a legal state is unbounded.
- Does this really happen?
- The probability is low, but number of trials is high!
Synchronizer Failure & Metastability

• If the system uses a synchronizer output while the output is still in the metastable state ⇒ synchronizer failure.

• Initial versions of several commercial ICs have suffered from metastability problems - effectively synchronization failure:
  - AMD9513 system timing controller
  - AMD9519 interrupt controller
  - Zilog Z-80 Serial I/O interface
  - Intel 8048 microprocessor
  - AMD 29000 microprocessor

• To avoid synchronizer failure wait long enough before using a synchronizer's output. "Long enough", according to Wakerly, is so that the mean time between synchronizer failures is several orders of magnitude longer than the designer's expected length of employment!

• In practice all we can do is reduce the probability of failure to a vanishing small value.

Reliable Synchronizer Design

• The probability that a flip-flop stays in the metastable state decreases exponentially with time.

• Therefore, any scheme that delays using the signal can be used to decrease the probability of failure.

• In practice, delaying the signal by a cycle is usually sufficient:

• If the clock period is greater than metastability resolution time plus FF2 setup time, FF2 gets a synchronized version of ASYNCIN.

• Multi-cycle synchronizers (using counters or more cascaded flip-flops) are even better - but often overkill.
Purely Asynchronous Circuits

- Many researchers (and a few industrial designers) have proposed a variety of circuit design methodologies that **eliminate the need for a globally distributed clock**.
- They cite a variety of important potential advantages over synchronous systems.
- To date, these attempts have remained mainly in Universities.
- A few commercial asynchronous chips/systems have been build.
- Sometimes, asynchronous blocks sometimes appear inside otherwise synchronous systems.
  - Asynchronous techniques have long been employed in DRAM and other memory chips for generation internal control without external clocks.
    - (Precharge/sense-amplifier timing based on address line changes.

Now on to FSMs
Finite State Machines (FSMs)

- FSM circuits are a type of **sequential circuit**: 
  - output depends on present *and* past inputs
    - effect of past inputs is represented by the current *state*

- Behavior is represented by **State Transition Diagram**: 
  - traverse one edge per clock cycle.

**FSM Implementation**

- FFs form *state register*
- number of states $\leq 2^{\text{number of flip-flops}}$
- CL (combinational logic) calculates next state and output
- **Remember:** The FSM follows exactly one edge per cycle.

*So far we have learned how to implement in Verilog. Now we learn how to design “by hand” to the gate level.*
Parity Checker Example

A string of bits has “even parity” if the number of 1’s in the string is even.

- Design a circuit that accepts a bit-serial stream of bits and outputs a 0 if the parity thus far is even and outputs a 1 if odd:

```
bit stream  IN  Parity Checker  OUT
CLK        0 if even parity 1 if odd parity
```

```
example: 0 0 1 1 1 0 1
even  even  odd  even  odd  odd  even
```

Next we take this example through the “formal design process”. But first, can you guess a circuit that performs this function?

Formal Design Process

```
bit stream  IN  Parity Checker  OUT
CLK        0 if even parity 1 if odd parity
```

```
example: 0 0 1 1 1 0 1
even  even  odd  even  odd  odd  even
```

“State Transition Diagram”
- circuit is in one of two “states”.
- transition on each cycle with each new input, over exactly one arc (edge).
- Output depends on which state the circuit is in.
### Formal Design Process

#### State Transition Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present state</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>next state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EVEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>EVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVEN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ODD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>ODD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EVEN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invent a code to represent states:

Let 0 = EVEN state, 1 = ODD state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>present state (ps)</th>
<th>OUT</th>
<th>IN</th>
<th>next state (ns)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derive logic equations from table (how?):

- **OUT** = PS
- **NS** = PS \(\oplus\) IN

### Formal Design Process

Logic equations from table:

- **OUT** = PS
- **NS** = PS \(\oplus\) IN

#### Circuit Diagram:

- XOR gate for ns calculation
- DFF to hold present state
- no logic needed for output in this example.
Formal Design Process

Review of Design Steps:

1. Specify **circuit function** (English)
2. Draw **state transition diagram**
3. Write down **symbolic state transition table**
4. Write down **encoded state transition table**
5. Derive **logic equations**
6. Derive **circuit diagram**

   Register to hold state
   Combinational Logic for Next State and Outputs

Combination Lock Example

- Used to allow entry to a locked room:
  2-bit serial combination. Example 01,11:
  1. Set switches to 01, press ENTER
  2. Set switches to 11, press ENTER
  3. OPEN is asserted (OPEN=1).

    If wrong code, ERROR is asserted (after second combo word entry).
    Press Reset at anytime to try again.
Assume the ENTER button when pressed generates a pulse for only one clock cycle.

Symbolic State Transition Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESET</th>
<th>ENTER</th>
<th>COM1</th>
<th>COM2</th>
<th>Preset State</th>
<th>Next State</th>
<th>OPEN</th>
<th>ERROR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>START</td>
<td>START</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>START</td>
<td>BAD1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>START</td>
<td>OK1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK1</td>
<td>OK1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>OK1</td>
<td>BAD2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>OK1</td>
<td>OK2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>OK2</td>
<td>BAD1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>BAD1</td>
<td>BAD1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>BAD1</td>
<td>BAD2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>BAD2</td>
<td>BAD2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>START</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decoder logic for checking combination (01,11):

left switch  | right switch
-------------|-------------
   |    | COM1
         |    | COM2
### Encoded ST Table

- Assign states:
  - START=000, OK1=001, OK2=011
  - BAD1=100, BAD2=101
- Omit reset. Assume that primitive flip-flops has reset input.
- Rows not shown have *don't cares* in output. Correspond to invalid PS values.

### State Encoding

- In general:
  \[ \text{# of possible FSM state} = 2^{\text{# of FFs}} \]
  
  **Example:**
  
  \[
  \begin{align*}
  \text{state1} &= 01, \\
  \text{state2} &= 11, \\
  \text{state3} &= 10, \\
  \text{state4} &= 00
  \end{align*}
  \]
- However, often more than \( \log_2(\text{# of states}) \) FFs are used, to simplify logic at the cost of more FFs.
- Extreme example is one-hot state encoding.
State Encoding

- **One-hot encoding of states.**
  - One FF per state.

Ex: 3 States

STATE1: 001
STATE2: 010
STATE3: 100

- Why one-hot encoding?
  - Simple design procedure.
    - Circuit matches state transition diagram (example next page).
  - Often can lead to simpler and faster "next state" and output logic.

- Why not do this?
  - Can be costly in terms of FFs for FSMs with large number of states.
  - FPGAs are "FF rich", therefore one-hot state machine encoding is often a good approach.

One-hot encoded FSM

- **Even Parity Checker Circuit:**

  Even Parity Checker Circuit:

- In General:
  - FFs must be initialized for correct operation (only one 1)

Circuit generated through direct inspection of the STD.
FSM Implementation Notes

• General FSM form:

• All examples so far generate output based only on the present state:

• Commonly name *Moore Machine* (If output functions include both present state and input then called a *Mealy Machine*)
Finite State Machines

- **Example: Edge Detector**

  Bit are received one at a time (one per cycle), such as: \[000111010\] \[\text{time}\]

  Design a circuit that asserts its output for one cycle when the input bit stream changes from 0 to 1.

  Try two different solutions.

State Transition Diagram Solution A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Solution A, circuit derivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ZERO

CHANGE

ONE

Solution B

Output depends not only on PS but also on input, IN

Let ZERO=0, ONE=1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IN</th>
<th>PS</th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>OUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS = IN, OUT = IN PS'

What's the intuition about this solution?
Edge detector timing diagrams

Solution A: output follows the clock
Solution B: output changes with input rising edge and is asynchronous wrt the clock.

FSM Comparison

Solution A
Moore Machine
- output function only of PS
- maybe more states (why?)
- synchronous outputs
  - no glitches
  - one cycle “delay”
  - full cycle of stable output

Solution B
Mealy Machine
- output function of both PS & input
- maybe fewer states
- asynchronous outputs
  - if input glitches, so does output
  - output immediately available
  - output may not be stable long enough to be useful (below):

If output of Mealy FSM goes through combinational logic before being registered, the CL might delay the signal and it could be missed by the clock edge.
FSM Recap

Both machine types allow one-hot implementations.

Final Notes on Moore versus Mealy

1. A given state machine could have both Moore and Mealy style outputs. Nothing wrong with this, but you need to be aware of the timing differences between the two types.

2. The output timing behavior of the Moore machine can be achieved in a Mealy machine by “registering” the Mealy output values:
General FSM Design Process with Verilog

Design Steps:  
1. Specify **circuit function** (English)
2. Draw **state transition diagram**
3. Write down **symbolic state transition table**
4. Assign encodings (bit patterns) to symbolic states
5. Code as Verilog behavioral description
   - Use parameters to represent encoded states.
   - Use separate always blocks for register assignment and CL logic block.
   - Use case for CL block. Within each case section assign all outputs and next state value based on inputs. **Note:** For Moore style machine make outputs dependent only on state not dependent on inputs.

---

**FSMs in Verilog**

**Mealy Machine**

```verilog
always @(posedge clk)
  if (rst) ps <= ZERO;
  else ps <= ns;
  always @(ps in)
    case (ps)
      ZERO: if (in) begin
        out = 1'b1;
        ns = ONE;
      end
      else begin
        out = 1'b0;
        ns = ZERO;
      end
      ONE: if (in) begin
        out = 1'b0;
        ns = ONE;
      end
      else begin
        out = 1'b0;
        ns = ZERO;
      end
      default: begin
        out = 1'bx;
        ns = default;
      end
```

**Moore Machine**

```verilog
always @(posedge clk)
  if (rst) ps <= ZERO;
  else ps <= ns;
  always @(ps in)
    case (ps)
      ZERO: begin
        out = 1'b0;
        if (in) ns = CHANGE;
        else ns = ZERO;
      end
      CHANGE: begin
        out = 1'b1;
        if (in) ns = ONE;
        else ns = ZERO;
      end
      ONE: begin
        out = 1'b0;
        if (in) ns = ONE;
        else ns = ZERO;
      end
      default: begin
        out = 1'bx;
        ns = default;
      end
```

---