

LSI LOGIC®

Engagement Model Dependent Sign-Off

Dan Deisz

Agenda

- ✦ *Traditional signoff points*
- ✦ *Determination of signoff points*
- ✦ *Conclusion*

LSI LOGIC®

April 2002
KMS

2

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ★ *What is a signoff point?*
The point at which the silicon provider accepts a design. From that point, the customer expects significantly less involvement, and working prototypes yesterday.

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ★ *GDSII*
- ★ *Netlist*
- ★ *Placement*
- ★ *RTL*
- ★ *Specification*

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ♦ *GDSII*
 - ♦ *In use for over 20 years*
 - ♦ *Customer assumes significant liability*
 - ♦ *Technology complexity (signal integrity) means fewer customers will be able to handle this engagement model*
 - ♦ *Design complexity (M's of gates, >100 memories, Hi-performance system, Hi-speed I/O, complex packaging, thermal issues, multiple on-chip processors) means fewer customers can handle this engagement model*
 - ♦ *Up to .11um, this was a more viable sign-off point than it is now*

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ♦ *Netlist*
 - ♦ *In use for over 20 years*
 - ♦ *Majority of designs today*
 - ♦ *No longer "golden netlist" with physical resynthesis, test, buffering & signal integrity modifications*
 - ♦ *Recognizable with original netlist only through formal verification*
 - ♦ *Both RTL coding & synthesis mistakes have accumulated up to this point*
 - ♦ *Congestion & Timing problems start with RTL & are made worse through synthesis*

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ✦ *Placement*
 - ✦ *Reduces problem of delivering incomplete constraints, poor quality netlist, inaccurate wireload models*
 - ✦ *Avoids iterations between customer & silicon provider*
 - ✦ *Becoming too approximate a signoff point to be final placement, while mostly ignoring: power, clock, I/O critical logic, package, xtalk, test, global route, congestion analysis*
 - ✦ *Next generation synthesis might be needed*
 - ✦ *This model is likely to remain "seed placement" signoff as it is today*

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ✦ *RTL*
 - ✦ *Functionally correct & physically incorrect most of time*
 - ✦ *More than 30 designs evaluated*
 - ✦ *Many designs are signed off at this point, with a more variable cost engagement model*
 - ✦ *Typically customer resource constraint & expertise driven*
 - ✦ *This engagement model has been influenced the most by more recent EDA developments*
 - ✦ *Key is the ability to evaluate timing, constraints, and area*

Traditional Sign-off Points

- ✦ *Specification*
 - ✦ *Provides the most room for optimization*
 - ✦ *Can partition into multiple designs*
 - ✦ *RTL coding for both testbench & silicon followed by gate-level synthesis*
 - ✦ *A few designs are signed off at this point, with only a variable cost engagement model*
 - ✦ *Specification must be very clear or engagement quickly becomes cost prohibitive*

Determination of Sign-off Points

- ✦ *Whoever is responsible for the silicon working should own the signoff model*
 - ✦ *This flexible & variable model should be jointly agreed upon by whoever owns silicon responsibility & whoever is paying for the first silicon development*
- ✦ *It's not about what tools are used; it's about matching customer expertise & bandwidth with silicon supplier expertise & bandwidth*

Conclusion

- ✦ *Many sign-off models exist & will continue to exist*
- ✦ *Netlist & RTL sign-off will remain the most common signoff points due to technology and design complexity at .11um and below*
- ✦ *Tool development will influence, but not determine, sign-off models*
- ✦ *Sign-off is dependent on the customer engagement model -- the right model for the right customer*