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About S3

- **The Connected Consumer Technology Company**
  - Enabling the delivery of next generation products and services to the consumer, at home and on the move

- **Founded in 1986**
  - 4 Design Centres (Ireland x 2, Czech Republic, Poland)
  - 300 Employees
  - Sales offices and representatives globally

- **Trusted by the world's leading technology companies**
  - Deliver cutting-edge design solutions on time
About S3

- **Global Leader in 90 and 65nm IC Design**
  - More than 30 Designs in 90nm
  - Mixed Analog / Digital SoC Focus
  - “First Production 65nm tapeout” - EETimes
  - On schedule, right-first-time silicon

- **Serving Top Tier Clients**
  - Including NXP, Texas Instruments
  - 4 of Top 5 IDMs and 3 of Top 5 Fabless

- **Teaming with Leading Technology Partners**
  - Including TSMC, IBM, Cadence, ARM, UMC
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With new mobile devices power consumption has become a hot topic.

New handsets are very complex devices and need high performance together with low power consumption.

Battery life represents an important feature in choosing a product in the market but has not been improved as expected by modern technologies.

That’s the reason why it is important to minimize device power consumption using new design techniques.
Different **low power techniques** can be **applied throughout the design cycle**, from architectural level down to physical implementation.

EDA vendors together with silicon vendors offer a wide range of design solutions and libraries targeted to low power.

Power consumption concurrently optimized together with Area and Timing.

**Principal Low Power Techniques** are:
- Clock Gating and Operand Isolation
- Leakage Optimization and use of Multi VT Libraries
- MSMV with automatic insertion of level shifters
• Power consumption is a sum of Dynamic + Static contributors

• Dynamic power consumption (power consumed during state changes)
  ▪ **Internal power** dissipation, which includes switching of the transistors inside the cell and the power dissipated when charging or discharging internal net capacitances
  ▪ **Net power** includes switching power consumed by charging and discharging the chip wires capacitance

• Static power consumption (power statically dissipated)
  ▪ **Leakage power** dissipation of the cell, With today’s technology shrinking down to 90 nm and below, the leakage power becomes more and more dominant.
• Even if data is loaded into registers very infrequently in most designs, *the clock signal continues to toggle at every clock cycle*

• Gating a group of flip-flops that are enabled by the same control signal *reduces unnecessary clock toggles*

• In the idle period *power is saved in the gated-clock circuitry* (typically portion of clock tree and registers)
• **Operand Isolation is a dynamic power optimization** technique that can reduce power dissipation in datath path blocks controlled by an enable signal.

• Its main purpose is to **shutdown (isolate) the function unit (operand)** when its results are not used.

---

**Example:** When the Enable is off, register C only uses the result of register B, but the multiplier continues its computations. Because the multiplier dissipates the most power, the total amount of power wasted is quite significant.
• Consist mainly in **using different libraries** with different voltage thresholds (typically LowVT and HighVT) in order to reduce leakage power consumption:

  • **LVT** cells are *faster but dissipate more leakage power*
  • **HVT** cells are *slower but dissipate less leakage power*

• Different **synthesis** approaches can be used

• **Physical implementation** is performed mostly using **HVT**, limiting **LVT cells** only where it is not possible to close timing

• After final routing, an usual IPO consists in **replacing LVT cells with HVT cells with same footprint**, so no re-routing is required
• It is possible to use in the same design **different voltage islands** that can be **switched on/off individually** or **supplied with different voltages**

• **Dynamically switching off entire modules** when not used has a bigger impact on power savings because **all leakage power consumption completely disappears**

• The need to accommodate multiple power domains and multiple voltage levels makes **low-power chip design much more complex**

• **MSMV capable tools are needed** to assist the designer at every step of the flow
A typical MSMV flow involves:

- Floorplanning and power domains definitions
- Insertion of level shifters (and isolation cells) at RTL or netlist level
- Placement of level shifters (and isolation cells) in correct power domain and additional followpin connections
- MSMV and power aware optimization
- Clock tree insertion that takes into account different domains and low power techniques
- Power analysis and Irdrop run on different grids
- DRC / LVS check and formal verification considering different voltage supplies
Low Power Techniques – MSMV Examples

- Level Shifters additional power pin connection
- Floor-planning and Power Domains creation
- Clock Tree insertion with MSMV
- Level Shifters placement
Test Case Introduction
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- Power Switch Handling
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- **Technology:**
  - 90nm
  - 6 metal layers
- **Target Die Area:**
  - 21sq.mm
  - ~1Mgates
- **Power Domains:**
  - Several gated PD
  - 1 always on
- **Target IR drop:**
  - 10% (5%vdd+5%vss)
- **Priority:**
  - Area
  - Power
  - Performance
Design Tasks

- **Synthesis (RC)**
  - High-Vt library only

- **Floorplanning (SoCE)**
  - IO planning
  - Power domains grid planning

- **P&R (SoCE)**
  - Isolation cell placement
  - Power domain aware CTS/opt.
  - Power domain crossing checks (S3 script)
  - Power domain aware filler insertion (H/L Leakage decap)
  - Allow standard-Vt library for manual fixes (not in AO PD)

- **STA/SI (F&I/PT-SI/CeltIC)**

- **PV/FV (Calibre/Conformal)**

- **Power/IRDrop Analysis (Powermeter/Vstorm)**
Power Domains

- Power management domain is ‘always on’ and is defined as default power domain

- Multiple independently power switchable domains

- High connectivity between ‘always on’ and other domains created high placement density near domains boundaries

- Choosing the domain shapes that minimize congestion took a considerable amount of time and resulted in very irregular shapes
Isolation Cells

- Isolation cells have been inserted on all nets crossing gated power domains to the ‘always-on’ domain (>1000)

```
# Specify Isolation Cells#
specifyIsolationCell -cell {ISO_OR2_8}
specifyIsolationCell -cell {ISO_NR2B_8}
specifyIsolationCell -cell {ISO_AN2_8}
```

- It has been checked that iso cells have been correctly recognized using:

```
reportIsolation -outfile isolationcells.rpt
```

- Then we placed them together with all the logic and then highlight them with:

```
reportIsolation -highlight
```
• Not really a good job!

• Encounter (5.2USR1) seems to place iso cells putting more effort in spreading them near the PD boundary rather than placing them based on connectivity.

• Isolation cells are placed one near each near to the PD border but it happens that some of them are placed far away from the driver.

• This could creates drv violations and bad timing.
Testcase - Isolation Cells Placement

- Cadence was contacted to solve this issue and with SoCE version 5.2USR2 isolation cell placement has been improved.

- In the meanwhile we used another approach as a workaround.

- Names of all nets crossing power domains were identified and given a weight (max value 512) before placement.

- A *set_dont_touch* assertion was also added to prevent buffer insertion on those nets.
• As a result isolation cells placement was more ‘connection’ driven

• Now length of all nets is minimized through placement of isolation cells as close as possible to the logic they talk to
• A bug was discovered during post placement optimization with SoCE version 5.2USR1

• During optimization isolation cells were moved without any reason and new placement often was not ‘legal’ because was inside one of the switchable power domains

• Only way to avoid this behaviour was to fix the placement before running optimization

• This was not the ideal solution because encounter was no longer free to move cells as needed in order to close timing
• Cadence was contacted in order to fix this bug and they discovered a problem with ‘refinePlacement’ (placement legalization) during optimization and fixed it.

• Cadence sent us a pre-release version of Encounter that solved the issue and let us tape out in time.

• Also this problem was definitely solved with SoCE version 5.2USR2.
- On-chip voltage regulator
- Power switches (nr)
  - 2ohm resistance (rs)
  - Max 5% IR drop (p)
  - nr >= (k * ng * c * f * rs)/ p

- Cascaded switching
  - switch_ready asserted 2us after switch enable to slowly turn on power switches minimizing voltage drop
Power switches layout guidelines

- Max 30mA output requirement
- Use of M3-M6 metal layers
- Power island grids
- Regulator – pads grid
- Power switches connection
- Core grid
  - Incl. always-on island
- IO ring
- RAMs grids / rings
- Analog macro hook-up
### Power Grid

- **Regulator – power pads**
  - 120mA requirement
  - Use of all metal layers
    - M6 1.5mA/um
    - M2-M5 1.0mA/um
    - M1 0.6mA/um
- IO, Rams and core grids
Power Measurement and Analysis

- **Power measurement**
  - Powermeter upgraded to cadence_anls 6.1
  - Now fully power aware
  - ~200mW consumption

- **Power analysis**
  - Vstorm updated to cadence_anls 6.1
  - Supports analysis through power switches
  - Multiple power-gate dependent runs
  - IR drop requirements met after iterations
Physical Verification

- **DRC - Max Density**
  - Trade-off between density and power ring-width requirements

- **LVS**
  - Text points for power domains
Conclusions

- Low power techniques permeate every step in implementation flow
- MSMV involves a more complex flow with additional resources required and possible impact on schedule
- ‘Young’ features, designer need to work closer to EDA vendor
- Routing congestion could get worse due to power islands
- Timing closure more difficult with level shifters
- New type of possible errors, new type of checks
- Better equipped for low power implementation
Thank you!

- QUESTION?