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Current Design Challenges

- Due to looming design complexity, more bugs escape pre-silicon verification
  - Post-silicon validation and debugging are responsible for 35% of a chip’s time to market

- High-profile bug escapes
  - Pentium – FDIV bug
  - AMD Phenom L3 cache bug

- Decreased time to market shortens verification time → more bugs in silicon
  - Post-silicon fix is growing in importance
Dramatic Increase in Mask Costs

- Mask cost is increasing dramatically
  - $3M/set at 65nm node

*Mask cost trends [ITRS’05]*

Current node: $3M/set
Dramatic Increase in Mask Costs

- Mask cost is increasing dramatically
  - $3M/set at 65nm node
- Transistor masks are most expensive
  ⇒ Reuse can reduce cost
  - Only metal layers can be changed ⇒ metal fix
- Metal fix can be accomplished by
  - Respin of the chip
  - Focused Ion Beam (FIB) modifications of wires
- No transistor can be changed in metal fix
Traditional Fix vs. Metal Fix

If an XOR gate is preplaced on the chip, it can be used to fix the error by reconnecting the wires.

Functional error:
Traditional techniques fix the problem by replacing the AND with XOR, but it requires remanufacturing of the whole chip.
Spare-Cell Insertion Problem

- To enable metal fix, *spare cells* need to be preplaced on the silicon die
  - Although spare-cell insertion is an important problem, no definitive solutions have been published
- Poor spare-cell selection requires long wires
- Good spare-cell selection replaces several cells
- High-quality fix with small perturbation to the silicon die
- Poor spare-cell placement requires long wires
Why is Spare-Cell Insertion Difficult?

- Predict post-silicon bugs is difficult
  - Given a known bug, determining the best cells for the fix is easy
  - However, post-silicon bugs cannot be known in advance

- Need to considering both logical and physical information
  - Can be challenging because spare cells are disconnected from the netlist
  - Most existing logic synthesis and physical design tools cannot be utilized
Our Contributions

- Connect cell-type selection problem to logic synthesis – SimSynth
  - Measures heterogeneity among signals
  - Addresses cell density problem
- Handle spare-cell placement using physical design methods
- A novel spare-cell insertion methodology
  - Considers both logical and physical aspects
  - Covers both cell selection and placement
- First empirical study for spare-cell insertion
Outline

- **Spare-cell selection: SymSynth**
  - Based on logic simulation – fast
  - Adaptive to the needs of different design regions

- **Spare-cell placement: UniSpare**
  - Reduces impact of spare cells on circuit performance
  - Provides better metal fix quality

- Our spare-cell insertion methodology
- Experimental results
- Conclusions
Spare-Cell Selection: SimSynth

- **Goal:** identify more useful cell types
- Based on the following observations
  - Bugs discovered post-silicon are often subtle bugs
  - To fix the bugs, the functionality of the circuit is only changed slightly

→ Cells that can generate signals *close* to existing ones are more useful
SimSynth Example

- Simulate input patterns to generate *signatures*
  - A bit in the signature is the simulation value of an input vector
  - It is the signal’s partial truth-table
- Try each cell type and measure the rate to successfully replicate a signature

Cell types with higher success rates are more useful
SimSynth Analysis

- Signatures are partial truth tables
  - Allows cells to generate different functions
  - More input patterns $\rightarrow$ more accurate truth tables
    - Used when smaller function changes are expected
  - Fewer patterns allows more significant changes

- Measures heterogeneity of the circuit
  - Low success rate $\rightarrow$ signal heterogeneity is high
  - Generating useful signals requires more spare cells
    - Needs higher spare-cell density
Spare-Cell Placement

- **PostSpare**
  - Spare cells scattered after placement

- **ClusterSpare**
  - Cell islands uniformly distributed before placement

- **UniSpare (new)**
  - Cells uniformly distributed before placement
Our Spare-Cell Insertion Methodology

Selection of spare cell types and density (SimSynth)

Spare-cell types and density

Cell insertion and placement

Spare-cell enriched layout

Trade-off among impact to circuit delay, wirelength and metal fix quality

Expected bug density, metal fix technique

Placement method selection

Placement method
### Previous Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year</th>
<th>Spare cell type</th>
<th>Placement and routing methods</th>
<th>Drawbacks/limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yee[20], 1997</td>
<td>Most commonly used cell in the design; one of the earliest works on spare-cell insertion</td>
<td>Spare cells scattered after placement</td>
<td>Designed for 2 metal layers only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee[11], 1997</td>
<td>NAND/NOR gates with many inputs, BUF, INV, DFF (new spare-cell selection)</td>
<td>Placed close to potentially buggy region</td>
<td>High-input gates may waste space, other cell types may be more useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payne[13], 1999</td>
<td>GAP (new design technique claimed)</td>
<td>Version not clear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong[19], 2001</td>
<td>Collection of various cells</td>
<td>Claimed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schad[16], 2002</td>
<td>Partial vtable (new routing technique)</td>
<td>Retained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaisemartin [5], 2003</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binger[3], 2003</td>
<td>GAP</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giles[9], 2003</td>
<td>New spare-cell selection within cell islands including INV, DFF, MUX, AND, NAND, NOR and BUF</td>
<td>Placed according to design hierarchy</td>
<td>Each module is allowed only one additional I/O; only fixed blocks supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or-Bach [12], 2004</td>
<td>New FPGA-like structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Uses 3 metal layers only; no placement technique claimed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vergnes[17], 2004</td>
<td>New structure with functional input bus and an equation input bus</td>
<td>Placed with potentially buggy modules by hardwiring inputs of spare cells to signals in those modules</td>
<td>Occupied routing tracks may create congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazell[4], 2006</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Whitespace allocated during floorplanning; cells inserted after placement</td>
<td>Spare cells occupy all remaining whitespace — impractical for modern layouts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: A summary of existing spare-cell insertion techniques described in US patents. Major contributions are marked in boldface.

For details please see the paper.
Empirical Evaluation

- **Benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cell count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alpha_IF</td>
<td>Instruction fetch unit of Alpha</td>
<td>1205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha_ID</td>
<td>Instruction decode unit of Alpha</td>
<td>11806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha_EX</td>
<td>Instruction execution unit of Alpha</td>
<td>20903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha_MEM</td>
<td>Memory stage of Alpha</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha</td>
<td>Alpha CPU full chip</td>
<td>30212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRISC</td>
<td>MiniRISC CPU</td>
<td>4359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold_logic</td>
<td>Part of picoJava IU control</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXE_ECL</td>
<td>Part of OpenSparc EXU control</td>
<td>2083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD5</td>
<td>MD5 encryption/decryption core</td>
<td>9181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES_perf</td>
<td>DES encryption/decryption core</td>
<td>100776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Alpha is from *Bug UnderGround* project in Michigan)
Cell-Type Selection

- Different circuit requires different types of cells
- INV, AND, OR, NAND, NOR are more useful
Spare-Cell Density

- Resynthesize subcircuits using spare cells
- Measure the number of cells used
- Lower success rate requires more spare cells
Cell-Type Selection

- Comparison to previous work
  - Ours has 23% and 4% smaller delay increase
  - Wirelength increase is approximately the same
Spare-Cell Placement

- Impact on delay and wirelength before metal fix

Bar charts showing the impact on delay and wirelength for different spare-cell placement methods:
- PostSpare
- ClusterSpare
- UniSpare (new)
Spare-Cell Placement

- Impact on delay and wirelength after metal fix

![Graph showing impact on delay and wirelength for different spare cell placements: PostSpare, ClusterSpare, UniSpare (new).]
Spare-Cell Placement

- Impact on number of metal segments affected

- PostSpare
- ClusterSpare
- UniSpare (new)

Metal segments affected

- PostSpare
- ClusterSpare
- UniSpare (new)
Summary

- **Spare cell selection**
  - Use SimSynth to determine cell types and density

- **Spare cell placement**
  - **PostSpare**
    - Minimal impact on circuit performance, worst metal fix quality
  - **ClusterSpare**
    - Minimal number of affected metal segments
    - Larger impact on circuit delay
  - **UniSpare**
    - Minimal delay increase
    - Balance between impact to the circuit and metal-fix quality
Insights and Contributions

- **Cell-type selection**: a logic synthesis problem
  - A new technique – SimSynth
    - Selects different spare cells for different designs
    - Can also estimate required spare-cell density

- **Cell placement**: a physical design problem
  - Trade-off among delay/wirelength increase, affected metal segments and circuit performance
  - UniSpare provides the best balance between impact to the circuit and metal-fix quality

- **A new spare-cell selection & insertion methodology**
  - Considers both logical and physical information

- **First empirical analysis of spare-cell insertion**
Backup Slides
Spare-Cell Placement

Number of metal segments affected vs. Number of cells used during metal fix
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Spare-Cell Placement

Change in routed wirelength

Number of cells used during metal fix
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Previous Work

- Spare-cell insertion method depends on expected bug rate and nature of bugs
  - May vary from design to design
  - Confidential – most work published as patents

Selection of spare-cell types

- Most-commonly used cell [Yee’97]
- Basic gates (NAND, NOR, INV…) [Lee’97, Giles’03]
- Configurable logic [Payne’99, Wong’01, Schadt’02, Bingert’03, Or-Bach’04]
- Complex structures [Chaisemartin’03, Vergnes’04]
Previous Work

- Insertion of spare cells
  - Scattered after design placement [Yee’97, Payne’99]
  - Scattered uniformly before design placement [Schadt’02]
  - Floorplanned with the design
    - Scattered uniformly before design placement [Bingert’03]
    - Scattered after design placement [Brazell’06]
  - Placed closer to potentially buggy region [Lee’97, Vergnes’04]

- Drawbacks
  - Lacks analytical and empirical evaluation
  - The same method is applied throughout the design
    - Cannot address different needs from different design regions