Formally Verifying Many RISC-V Implementations with One Page of Code (seriously, we did!)

Steve Hoover Redwood EDA

Agenda

- WARP-V
 - Design Methodology
 - Comparison
- Formal Verification
 - Methodology
 - Analysis
- Wrap-Up

WARP-V

Goal: To showcase the flexibility of "transaction-level design"

IP needs to be flexible, but:

- Small conceptual variation requires extensive RTL parameterization of:
 - staging (flip flops)
 - stitching through hierarchy
 - clock gating/enabling
 - o etc.
- SystemC+HLS is not ideal for CPUs, with tight cycle-level interactions



Low-Power 1-Stage FPGA



Mid-Range 7-Stage ASIC

Approach

Macro Preprocessor (<u>M4</u>) provides:

- parameterization (incl. staging)
- component selection
- code generation

Transaction-Level Verilog (<u>TL-X.org</u>) implies from context:

- staging (flip flops)
- stitching through hierarchy
- clock gating/enabling
- ⇒ No need to parameterize details (or code them at all)



Verilog

TL-Verilog



Developed Online (makerchip.com)



ρ

 \bigcirc

WARP-V

 \sim



O

WARP-V

 \cap



 \bigcirc

O



Logic comparison of main CPU pipeline (as apples-to-apples as possible)

	picorv32	Rocket	WARP-V
Language	Verilog	Chisel	TL-Verilog
Construct. Language	Verilog preproc.	Scala	M4 (plus Perl)
Core pipeline	~5 stages (unpipelined)	5 stages	1-7 stages
Lines of code	~983	~944	~811

- All three express RTL detail
- WARP-V in TL-Verilog is slightly smaller and much more flexible

Verification Methodology

- First demonstration of TL-Verilog for verification modeling.
- WARP-V brought to life in 1.5 wks. using an 11-instruction test program w/ assembler and test program also in M4+TL-Verilog. (Jan 2018)
- Remaining verification done by Ákos Hadnagy in Google Summer of Code 2018
- Uses open-source formal verification tools: RISCV-Formal by Clifford Wolf

Verification Modeling



Ó

As Promised, 1 Page

m4_ifelse_block(M4_FORMAL, ['1'], ['

\$pc[M4_PC_RANGE] = \$Pc[M4_PC_RANGE]; // A version of PC we can pull through \$ANYs. // This scope is a copy of /instr or /instr/original_ld if \$returning_ld. /original \$ANY = /instr\$returning_ld ? /instr/original_ld\$ANY : /instr\$ANY; /src[2:1] \$ANY = /instr\$returning_ld ? /instr/original_ld/src\$ANY : /instr/src\$ANY; // RVFI interface for formal verification. \$trap = \$aborting_trap || \$non_aborting_trap; \$rvfi_trap = ! \$reset && >>m4_eval(-M4_MAX_REDIRECT_BUBBLES + 1)\$next_rvfi_good_path_mask[M4_MAX_REDIRECT_BUBBLES] && \$trap && ! \$replay && ! \$returning_ld; // Good-path trap, not aborted for other reasons. // Order for the instruction/trap for RVFI check. (For 1d, this is associated with the 1d itself, not the returning_1d.) \$rvfi order[63:0] = \$reset ? 64'b0 : (\$commit || \$rvfi_trap) ? >>1\$rvfi_order + 64'b1 : SRETAIN; Srvfi valid = ! <<m4_eval(M4_REG_WR_STAGE - (M4_NEXT_PC_STAGE - 1))\$reset && // Avoid asserting before \$reset propagates ((\$commit && ! \$ld) || \$rvfi_trap || \$returning_ld); *rvfi_valid = \$rvfi_valid; *rvfi insn = /original\$raw; *rvfi halt = \$rvfi trap: *rvfi_trap = \$rvfi_trap: *rvfi_order = /original\$rvfi_order; *rvfi intr = 1'b0; *rvfi_rs1_addr = /original/src[1]\$is_reg ? /original\$raw_rs1 : 5'b0: *rvfi_rs2_addr = /original/src[2]\$is_reg ? /original\$raw_rs2 : 5'b0; *rvfi_rs1_rdata = /original/src[1]\$is_reg ? /original/src[1]\$reg_value : M4_WORD_CNT'b0; *rvfi_rs2_rdata = /original/src[2]\$is_reg ? /original/src[2]\$reg_value : M4_WORD_CNT'b0; *rvfi rd addr = (/original\$dest_reg_valid && ! \$abort) ? /original\$raw_rd : 5'b0; = *rvfi_rd_addr ? \$rslt : 32'b0; *rvfi rd wdata *rvfi pc rdata = {/original\$pc[31:2], 2'b00}; *rvfi_pc_wdata = {\$reset ? M4_PC_CNT'b0 : \$returning_ld ? /original_ld\$pc + 1'b1 : **\$trap** ? Strap_target : ? \$jump_target : \$jump \$mispred_branch ? (\$taken ? \$branch_target[M4_PC_RANGE] : \$pc + M4_PC_CNT'b1) : m4_ifelse(M4_BRANCH_PRED, ['fallthrough'], [''], ['\$pred_taken_branch ? \$branch_target[M4_PC_RANGE] :']) \$indirect_jump ? \$indirect_jump_target : \$pc[31:2] +1'b1, 2'b00}: = (/original\$ld || \$valid_st) ? {/original\$addr[M4_ADDR_MAX:2], 2'b0} : 0; *rvfi mem addr *rvfi mem rmask = /original\$ld ? /original ld\$ld mask : 0: *rvfi_mem_wmask = \$valid_st ? \$st_mask : 0: *rvfi_mem_rdata = /original\$ld ? /original_ld\$ld_value : 0; *rvfi_mem_wdata = \$valid_st ? \$st_value : 0;

9/11/2018

11

Code Size Comparison



Wrap-Up

- Methodology implications
 - Single, small codebase provides logic and verification of <u>flexible</u> IP
 - We focused on verifying the 5-stage version, others just worked (mostly)
- Futures
 - Many-core
 - Opportunities again in Google Summer of Code 2019 (ask me)

Other Things I Love to Discuss Lately

- Why open-source hardware is poised to explode
- Cloud FPGAs and hardware-accelerated web applications
- Start-up life
- Internship/co-op opportunities