

### End-to-End Automated Hardware/Software Co-Design for Reconfigurable SoC



### Guy Bois<sup>1,2</sup>, Laurent Moss<sup>1</sup>, Gary Dare<sup>1</sup>, Hubert Guérard<sup>1</sup> 1. Space Codesign Systems

2. École Polytechnique de Montreal











- Problem
- Our solution
- Details about the Flow
- Case Study
- Conclusion

# **Problem**

- FPGA design is dealing with larger, more complex Hardware and Software systems
- System Architects must perform rapid decisionmaking on functions to be realized in HW or SW to meet specific application requirements
- HW and SW engineers must refine for optimal HW/SW partitioning to fit system requirements in implementation.
- The last two points (namely HW/SW codesign and HW/SW cosynthesis) are not well established in FPGA design flow.

# **Problem (cont'd)**

### Today's FPGA workflow may take many iterations And many hours per iteration



### EDPS 2013

#### 4

# **Problem (cont'd)**

Today's FPGA workflow may take many iterations And many days per iteration



# **Our Solution**

- Rapid decisions at <u>front end</u> of design process
  - Electronic System Level (ESL)
  - Create Large Complex Systems at Higher Level  $\rightarrow$  reduce complexity of details ...
  - Co-design of Software AND Hardware <u>together</u> (Software content is *increasing*)

According to Gary Smith EDA, Space Studio tool suite can be classified as part of the "architect's workbench" category, one of two "killer apps" for ESL and one of the most important.







### **Our Solution (cont'd))**

- <u>Level 1</u> Algorithm/Functional Specification
- Level 2 Architectural Design Exploration



 Level 3 – Implementation Manager (IP Mapping, HLS) Programmable right now – ASIC tbd

### **Our Solution (Cont'd)**



### 1) Application (Algorithm)

- Multi-task application specification at a high level of abstraction using C/C++ blocks
- Supported communication semantics
  - > FIFO-based message passing
  - Shared memory
  - » Memory-mapped I/O

### 2) Architecture Design (Virtual Platform)

- Library of TLM-2.0 models for:
  - Processors
  - OS (BareMetal, uC, Linux, etc.), AMP, SMP
  - Busses and interconnects
  - Memories
  - I/O peripherals
- Extensions for third-party or user-defined IPs
  - User IP Import
    - C/C++ model import w/SystemC + TLM-2.0
    - IP-XACT description for parameters and interfaces of the component

### 3) Function Mapping and Partitioning

### Drag and Drop Mechanism Supports Design Iteration



### 4) Performance Analysis and Evaluation





### **Another example: Resource and Power**

#### **Estimation GR** FPGA Estimation Results From Simulation ... FPGA Estimation Results ... to FPGA Device Resource Power Voltage Total (A) Source Computer Aided Design (CAD) Tools Zyna-7000 1.000 0.139 XC7Z045 CLOCK 0.016 1.000 0.003 EDA: Xilinx - EDK 14.1 FBG676 Package LOGIC 0.034 BRAM 0.030 0.010 1.800 Board Industrial Femp Grade DSP 3.300 0.001 Typical Board: Zynq\_Z-7010 Process PH 0.000 2.500 1.800 MMCM. 0.000 0 Vendor: Xilinx Characterization Advance, v0.7, 2012-04-23 PHASER 1.500 0.000 0 PCIE Family: zyng 0.000 1.350 Environment 10 0.000 0 1.200 xc7z010 Device: 🗆 User Override GTX 1.800 0.000 Package: cla400 1.000 25.0 °C User Override PS Dynami PS 0.829 1.200 77 Speed grade: -1 250 LFM 0.048 1.000 0.585 4 Medium Profile 0.134 12 1.800 0.078 Platform Resource Usage 1.500 0.102 Board Selection Medium (10"x10") Summary bonded IOBs : 0.00 % 0 of 100 bonded IOBs Junction Temperature # of Board Layers 12 to 15 27.0 °C 0.000W 0% Transcelver Slice LUTs : 52.40 % 9,223 of 17,600 Slice LUTs 0% 0.000W 10 **Total On-Chip Power** 1.072 W 83% 0.890W Slice Registers : 17.13 % 6.029 of 35,200 Slice Register Thermal Margin 73.0°C 37.2W 17% 0.182W Device Static **FPGA** Implementation 1.9 °C/W Power supplied to off-chip devices 0.000W BUFG/BUFGCTRLs : 18.75 % 6 of 32 BUFG/BUFGCTRLs Power Optimization sage/Optimization Block RAM/FIFO : 18.33 % 11 of 60 Block RAM/FIFO Messages DSP48E1s : 3.75 % 3 of 80 DSP48E1s Comments XILINX Power Advantage (check for updates) XPower Estimator User Guide File Support Request (WebCase) Whitepaper - 7 Steps for Worst Case Power Estimation Copyright @ 1994-2012 Xilinx, Inc. All Rights Reserved Calculated Value User Entry Summary Value User Override Warning Error Power estimates obtained through Xilinx's XPower Estimator < <u>B</u>ack Next >Finish Cancel

### 5) Co-synthesis (From ESL 2 RTL)

- Export RTL implementation of Architecture
  - » RTL platform IP's, Glue Logic
  - > Embedded Firmware and Software
  - Project for downstream tools (e.g., ISE, Vivado, Quartus, Fusion, etc.)
  - Support for High Level Synthesis flows for HW accelerators

# 5) Co-synthesis (cont'd)



Level 2: Approximately Timed

Level 3: Implementation (in Vivado) <sup>16</sup>

Zyng Bus Interfaces | Ports | Addresses

Cortes"-All MPCore"" CPU

Eystem Level Control Regs

Help Smpon Expent Summ

### In summary



### **Benefits**

**Extensive automation:** 

- Iterations within minutes for all mapping changes
  - HW→HW, SW→SW,
    HW→SW, SW→HW
- OS as an IP block
- Fully transparent nonintrusive monitoring for performance analysis

- No manual recoding to RTL
- Firmware and adapters are automatically generated

### **Case Study: M-JPEG Video Decoder**



QoR Constraint Set	Performance (FPS)	Area (Largest Device)	Power (W)
1	24	Zynq-7010	1.10
2	30	Zynq-7020	0.75
3	60	Zynq-7020	0.90

Requirements (Performance, Power, Resources)

### **Design Space Exploration (Part 1)**

- Rapid spec. & evaluation of 26 different architectures over 2.5 days
  - 1 using 1 ARM Cortex-A9 core
  - 5 using 2 ARM Cortex-A9 cores
  - 7 using 2 ARM Cortex-A9 cores + 1 MicroBlaze soft-core
  - 3 using 2 ARM Cortex-A9 cores + 2 MicroBlaze soft-cores
  - 1 using 1 ARM Cortex-A9 core + HW accelerators
  - 5 using 2 ARM Cortex-A9 cores + HW accelerators
  - 4 using mix of MicroBlaze soft-cores + HW accelerators
- Architecture has significant impact on QoR
  - Performance goes from 10 FPS to 200+ FPS
  - Power goes from 1.15 W to 1.75 W
  - Number of HW resources used goes from 1X to 6.3X

### **Design Space Exploration (Part 2)**

- Several architectures met FPS but used too much power
- Selected 3 architectures for power/perf. trade-off
  - 1. LIBU  $\rightarrow$  MicroBlaze, VLD  $\rightarrow$  ARM core 1, others  $\rightarrow$  ARM core 2
  - 2. DEMUX, LIBU  $\rightarrow$  ARM core 1, others  $\rightarrow$  HW accelerators
  - 3. DEMUX  $\rightarrow$  ARM core 1, LIBU  $\rightarrow$  ARM core 2, others  $\rightarrow$  HW

Arch.	FPGA Freq. (MHz)	ARM Freq. (MHz)	Perf. (FPS)	Power (W)	Area (Smallest Device)
1	100	500	24	1.072	Zynq-7010
2	50	333	54	0.727	Zynq-7020
3	50	333	72	0.861	Zynq-7020

- No. Cores, Mapping, HW/SW Part., Freq. Scal.⇔ OoR
- Total manpower: 1 System Engineer over 25 hours

### Conclusions

• From the B. Bailey's Blog: "FPGA companies would be some of the first to implement true ESL flows"

Xilinx Builds Vivado Into Full ESL Solution, <u>4/3/2013</u>

- We agree with this (e.g., for HW/SW integration, HLS and IP's), but a complete HW/SW Co-design flow is still missing
- As a design creation front end for Xilinx Vivado, we have shown that SpaceStudio fills this gap.