

Truly Intelligent Circuit Design and Implementation

Zhiyao Xie

Dept. Electrical & Computer Engineering Duke University

### **Outline of My Talk**

• Part 1: My Ph.D. Works

Part 2: My Future Plan



### **Electronic Devices are Everywhere**





### **Designers Try to Deliver Generational Gains**



\*Source: TechInsights Inc.

### **Chip Design Challenges**

**Per-Core Performance Gain is Diminishing** 

Diminishing performance gain and increasing design cost



Partially collected by M. Horowitz et al. Plotted by Karl Rupp, 2020



**IBS** Design Cost is Skyrocketing

**International Business Strategies, 2020** 



### **Chip Design Challenges**

Not only costly, also long turn-around time



It took **several thousand** engineers **several** years to create, at an approximate development cost of **\$3 billion**. – Jensen Huang, CEO of Nvidia

Nvidia GPU Technology Conference (GTC), 2017



### This is Real Problem!

### **Challenges at advanced node**

- **Pressure** from IPC and frequency
- Peak power keeps increasing
- Power delivery technique is
- Increasing design rules to media
- Increasing wire parasitics, ca wire delay and noise

Intelligent design methodologies & solutions!

### Inefficient chip design methodologies

## For one Arm CPU core with ~3 million gates

es power simulation takes ~2 weeks ation in physical design take ~1 week repeatedly constructed from scratch rely on designer intuition





https://github.com/ageitgey/face recognition



https://towardsdatascience.com/using-tensorflow-objectdetection-to-do-pixel-wise-classification-702bf2605182

#### Self-driving Cars



8

Manufacturing





### Smart Grid



**Financial Service** 







HPC



Security





Health Monitor

http://matclinic.com/2017/05/18/the-teambehind-the-future-of-ai-in-healthcare/ Personal Assistant

## Why ML/Intelligence Helps Circuit Design?



Producing solutions repeatdly from scratch



## Why ML/Intelligence Helps Circuit Design?



- Producing solutions repeatdly from scratch
- Why not learn from prior solutions?



## Simple Plug-in and Use of ML Engines?



- 100s \* 100s pixels
- No extra information
- Any human can tell the label
- Data is everywhere





Circuits (Arm Neoverse N1 CPU core)

- Millions of connected components
- 100s GB of raw information
- Need simulations to get the label
- Data is hard to get

## Innovative Customized Solutions are Desired!

## **Many Excellent Exploration in Academia and Industry**



### What I Believe We Should Target

**Unified ML** for Both **Design & Runtime** Auto-ML for Chip Design Benefit the whole **ML** for Chip chip life cycle Higher-level of Design automation Well-studied in recent years

Traditional Chip Design



### **My Related Works**

| PPA | Power       | <b>Power &amp; Power Delivery Challenges</b><br>[ICCAD'20], [ASPDAC'20],<br>[MICRO'21] ( <b>Best Paper Award</b> ) |
|-----|-------------|--|
|     | Performance | <b>Timing &amp; Interconnect Challenges</b><br>[ICCAD'20], [ASPDAC'21],<br>[TCAD'21] (under review)                |
|     | Area        | Routability Challenges<br>[ICCAD'18], [DATE'18], [ICCAD'21]  |
|     |             | Overall Flow Tuning<br>[ASPDAC'20]   |

Covered in this talk

### **My Related Works**

|     | Power       | Power & Power Delivery Challenge<br>[ICCAD'20], [ASPDAC'20],<br>[MICRO'21] (Best Paper Award)       | es                   |
|-----|-------------|---|----------------------|
| PPA | Performance | <b>Timing &amp; Interconnect Challenges</b><br>[ICCAD'20], [ASPDAC'21],<br>[TCAD'21] (under review) |                      |
|     | Area        | Routability Challenges<br>[ICCAD'18], [DATE'18], [ICCAD'21]   |                      |
|     |             | Overall Flow Tuning<br>[ASPDAC'20]  | Covered in this talk |



## **Routability Challenges**



### **Routability Background**

- Design Rule Checking (DRC)
  - Meeting manufacturing requirements
  - Less DRC violations (DRV) -> better routability
- DRV mitigation at early stages
  - Requires routability prediction/estimation
- Previous routability (DRV) estimations
  - > ML model on small cropped regions
  - Limited receptive field and missing global information



DRC violations (white) on circuit layout



## **First Deep Learning Method for Routability Prediction**

• Task 1: which one will result in less DRV count?





Customized CNN methods

• Task 2: where are DRC violations?





Customized FCN methods



## **First Deep Learning Method for Routability Prediction**

• Task 1: which one will result in less DRV count?



 Requires global routing: Hours \* Number of Layouts
In seconds, with similar accuracy

• Task 2: where are DRC violations?



Requires detailed routing
More nours \* Iterations

In seconds, outperform previous works



### **Many Excellent Deep Learning Methods**



### What I Believe We Should Target



Chip Design



### **Automatic Estimator Development – Search Space**





## **Automatic Estimator Development – Searching Algorithm**



- **1**. Sample from the completely-ordered graph  $(G_i)$  to get  $(S_i)$
- 2. Evaluate the sampled model by training and testing
- 3. Update the sampling probability by evaluation result
- **Result**: **outperforms** previous works in both tasks; developed without human in **one day**



### **Auto-developed Model Structures**

- Human-designed models:
  - Highly hierarchical and organized architecture
  - Limited operation types
- Auto-developed model:
  - Construct parallel branches and flexible interactions
  - Supports different operators



### **Auto-developed Model Structures**

• Auto-developed model for DRC hotspot detection is significantly more complex



**Case Study 2:** 

### **Power & Power Delivery Challenges**



### What I Believe We Should Target



Traditional Chip Design



## **Challenge 1 – Design-time Power Introspection**



- Delivering generational performance gains adversely impacts CPU power
- Power-delivery resources **not keeping pace** with CPU power demands
- Increasing power-sensitivity drives the need for design-time introspection



APOLLO [Xie, et al., MICRO'21] (Best Paper Award)

## Challenge 2 – Run-time Power Introspection



### Measured di/dt event on Arm A72 SoC

- **Peak-Power mitigation** requires accurate power estimation to drive throttling ۲
  - Manually inferring proxies is very difficult in complex modern CPUs
- Abrupt changes in CPU current-demand (di/dt event) leading to deep voltage-droop



### **Challenge 3 - Workload Power Characterization**

- Need power-characterization of real-world workloads
  - Simple micro-benchmarks not longer sufficient
- Single SPEC simpoint can take weeks on the expensive emulator
  - Power measurement is expensive
- Only average power consumption available
  - Impossible to scale to di/dt event analysis



Industry-Standard Emulator-Driven Power Flow



## **Challenges from Both Design-time and Runtime**

A unified solution for both scenarios

### **Runtime Challenges Summary**

- Peak power mitigation
  - **Difficult to manually** infer proxies
- Voltage droop (Ldi/dt) mitigation
  - Require very **low** response latency

### **Design-time Challenges Summary**

- Simulation on realistic workloads
  - Expensive and slow
  - Limited temporal-resolution

### What is An "Ideal" Power Estimator?

- **1.** Accurate yet fast
- 2. Achieve high temporal resolution
- **3.** Low runtime on-chip overheads
- 4. Easily extensible to diverse designs





## **APOLLO: A Unified Power Modeling Framework**



- Fast, yet accurate design-time simulation
- Single-cycle temporal resolution
- Low-cost, yet accurate <u>runtime</u> monitoring
- Design-agnostic **automated** development



### **A Workload Execution Preview of APOLLO**

40K cycles of APOLLO Power Estimation out of a trace of 17M cycles



- ~2 weeks execution time reduced to few minutes on the emulator
- Unprecedented power-introspection due to single-cycle temporal resolution



### **APOLLO Feature Generation & Model Training**



### **Simple Key Ideas**

- Linear model can estimate power accurately
- **Small** portion of signals (proxies) can provide enough information



Linear model with *M* RTL signals

Linear model with Q selected proxies  $P = \sum_{i=1}^{Q} s_i * w_i$ 



### **ML-Based Power Proxies Selection**

Model construction in two steps

**M** Features





Minimax concave penalty (MCP) for pruning



# $y^T$ is the label of each window; $p^{\tau}[1], ..., p^{\tau}[\frac{T}{\tau}]$ are power predic

## Why MCP for Pruning?

- To make  $Q \ll M$ , penalty is set to be very large.
- Lasso degrades model accuracy under large penalty
- MCP protects large weights thus maintains model accuracy





## **Model Training and Testing**



- Experiments on 3GHz 7nm Arm commercial microprocessors Neoverse N1 and Cortex A77
- Automatically generate a "diverse" set of random micro-benchmarks for training
- Testing on **various** Arm power-indicative workloads



### **Prediction Accuracy as Design-Time Power Model**





### **Prediction Accuracy as Design-Time Power Model**



### **Accuracy on Multi-Cycle Power Estimation**



**128-cycle** prediction from APOLLO with **Q=70** proxies





## **Automated Low-Cost Runtime OPM Implementation**

APOLLO is designed to be hardware-friendly



### **Prediction Accuracy from Design-time Model & OPM**



Per-cycle prediction from APOLLO with Q=159 proxies

- MAE = 7.19%
- R<sup>2</sup> = 0.953

### **Prediction Accuracy from Design-time Model & OPM**

Per-cycle prediction from APOLLO with Q=159 proxies Label **APOLLO's Prediction** (scaled) 40 MAE = 7.19%30  $R^2 = 0.953$ Power 10 0 Negligible 2000 4000 6000 8000 10000 12000 14000 0 Negligible difference difference Prediction from runtime OPM with Q=159 proxies **APOLLO OPM Hardware** Label Power (scaled) MAE = 7.19%40  $R^2 = 0.953$ 30 20 10 W=11 bits after 0 **↓** 0 quantization 2000 6000 8000 10000 12000 14000 4000 Timing window index (unit: 1 clock cycle)

### **Overview of the OPM Hardware Design**



• No multipliers or dividers, only Q binary inputs and W-bit quantized weights



### Accuracy vs. Hardware Cost (Area Overhead) of the OPM

Runtime OPM implementation on Neoverse N1



- Trade-off accuracy and hardware cost
- Sweep proxy num Q and quantization bits W



### Accuracy vs. Hardware Cost (Area Overhead) of the OPM

Runtime OPM implementation on Neoverse N1



- Trade-off accuracy and hardware cost
- Sweep proxy num  $oldsymbol{Q}$  and quantization bits  $oldsymbol{W}$
- Strategy
  - Keep quantization W= 10 to 12 bits
  - Vary **Q** for different solutions
- For an OPM with *Q*=159, *W*=11
  - < 0.2% area overhead of Neoverse N1</li>
  - < 10% in the error</p>



### **Potential Application: Design-time Power Introspection**





Trained **only** with **more meaningful signals** as initial feature candidates

Distribution of power proxies on Neoverse N1

Better interpretability

### Identify power contributors for designers!

## **Potential Application: Runtime dl/dt Mitigation**



## Enable CPU-driven Proactive dI/dt Mitigation!

### What I Believe We Should Target



Traditional Chip Design



## **Summary and Takeaway**

- Problem: Increasing Challenges in Chip Design
  - Cost, time-to-market, reliance on designers, diminishing performance return, .....
- ML in chip design
  - Less simulation time, faster feedback, less designer effort
- AutoML in chip design
  - Reduces months of model development to hours, no developers
- Unified ML in both design & runtime
  - Benefit the entire chip life cycle





### **Future Research Plan**



### **Future Works: Collaborative Framework**

### **Collaborative ML in Chip Design**

- Model quality depends on data
- Circuit data from different companies
- Design data is highly confidential



Federated Learning: Train on local data Communicate weights

### **Example – Collaborative Training**

| C1<br>0.68<br>0.49<br>0.55<br>0.52<br>0.71 | C2<br>0.59<br>0.52<br>0.56<br>0.49   | C3<br>0.59<br>0.50<br>0.55<br>0.51  | C4<br>0.58<br>0.51<br>0.50<br>0.53   | C5<br>0.58<br>0.52<br>0.52  | C6<br>0.56<br>0.50<br>0.46   | C7<br>0.65<br>0.53<br>0.57  | C8<br>0.60<br>0.52<br>0.57  | C9<br>0.52<br>0.37   | Avg<br>0.59<br>0.50  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 0.68<br>0.49<br>0.55<br>0.52<br>0.71       | 0.59<br>0.52<br>0.56<br>0.49         | 0.59<br>0.50<br>0.55<br>0.51  | 0.58<br>0.51<br>0.50<br>0.53   | 0.58<br>0.52<br>0.52  | 0.56<br>0.50<br>0.46   | 0.65<br>0.53<br>0.57  | 0.60<br>0.52<br>0.57  | 0.52<br>0.37<br>0.49   | 0.59<br>0.50   |
| 0.49<br>0.55<br>0.52<br>0.71               | 0.52<br>0.56<br>0.49                 | 0.50<br>0.55<br>0.51  | 0.51<br>0.50<br>0.53   | 0.52<br>0.52  | 0.50<br>0.46   | 0.53<br>0.57  | 0.52<br>0.57  | 0.37   | 0.50   |
| 0.55<br>0.52<br>0.71                       | 0.56<br>0.49                         | 0.55<br>0.51  | 0.50<br>0.53   | 0.52  | 0.46   | 0.57  | 0.57  | 0.40   | 0.50   |
| 0.52<br>0.71                               | 0.49                                 | 0.51  | 0.53   | 0.51  |  |   |   | 0.45   | 0.53   |
| 0.71                                       |                                      |   |  | 0.51  | 0.53   | 0.52  | 0.52  | 0.46   | 0.51   |
|  | 0.53                                 | 0.59  | 0.55   | 0.55  | 0.61   | 0.60  | 0.47  | 0.80   | 0.60   |
| 0.71                                       | 0.51                                 | 0.57  | 0.51   | 0.52  | 0.58   | 0.68  | 0.60  | 0.78   | 0.61   |
| 0.73                                       | 0.54                                 | 0.62  | 0.56   | 0.47  | 0.52   | 0.72  | 0.61  | 0.72   | 0.61   |
| 0.76                                       | 0.60                                 | 0.65  | 0.60   | 0.55  | 0.55   | 0.71  | 0.64  | 0.57   | 0.63   |
| 0.73                                       | 0.54                                 | 0.65  | 0.59   | 0.50  | 0.61   | 0.73  | 0.61  | 0.91   | 0.65   |
| 0.68                                       | 0.52                                 | 0.55  | 0.53   | 0.55  | 0.58   | 0.72  | 0.64  | 0.91   | 0.63   |
| 0.63                                       | 0.83                                 | 0.71  | 0.72   | 0.66  | 0.67   | 0.63  | 0.57  | 0.42   | 0.65   |
| 0.83                                       | 0.86                                 | 0.76  | 0.75   | 0.74  | 0.75   | 0.81  | 0.72  | 0.90   | 0.79   |
|  | 0.76<br>0.73<br>0.68<br>0.63<br>0.83 | 0.76     0.60       0.73     0.54       0.68     0.52       0.63     0.83       0.83     0.86 | 0.76     0.60     0.65       0.73     0.54     0.65       0.68     0.52     0.55       0.63     0.83     0.71       0.83     0.86     0.76 | 0.76     0.60     0.65     0.60       0.73     0.54     0.65     0.59       0.68     0.52     0.55     0.53       0.63     0.83     0.71     0.72       0.83     0.86     0.76     0.75 | 0.76     0.60     0.65     0.60     0.55       0.73     0.54     0.65     0.59     0.50       0.68     0.52     0.55     0.53     0.55       0.63     0.83     0.71     0.72     0.66       0.83     0.86     0.76     0.75     0.74 | 0.76     0.60     0.65     0.60     0.55     0.57       0.73     0.54     0.65     0.59     0.50     0.61       0.68     0.52     0.55     0.53     0.55     0.58       0.63     0.83     0.71     0.72     0.66     0.67       0.83     0.86     0.76     0.75     0.74     0.75 | 0.76     0.60     0.65     0.60     0.55     0.71       0.73     0.54     0.65     0.59     0.50     0.61     0.73       0.68     0.52     0.55     0.53     0.55     0.58     0.72       0.63     0.83     0.71     0.72     0.66     0.67     0.63       0.83     0.86     0.76     0.75     0.74     0.75     0.81 | 0.76     0.60     0.65     0.60     0.55     0.71     0.64       0.73     0.54     0.65     0.59     0.50     0.61     0.73     0.61       0.68     0.52     0.55     0.53     0.55     0.58     0.72     0.64       0.63     0.83     0.71     0.72     0.66     0.67     0.63     0.57       0.83     0.86     0.76     0.75     0.74     0.75     0.81     0.72 | 0.760.600.650.600.550.550.710.640.570.730.540.650.590.500.610.730.610.910.680.520.550.530.550.580.720.640.910.630.830.710.720.660.670.630.570.420.830.860.760.750.740.750.810.720.90 |

One same model in a row

Nine different models in a row

Assuming data distributed to 9 clients (C1 to C9)



### **Future Research Plan**



Ph.D.

Short-term milestone



### Future Works: Fully-Automated & Reliable Framework

### **Fully-Auto ML in Chip Design**

- Automated feature selection
- Automated data selection
- Automated data augmentation



### **Example – Feature Selection**



| # Features  | ROC-AUC |
|-------------|---------|
| 2 ( 🔜 )     | 0.866   |
| 4 ( 🔜 + 🔜 ) | 0.867   |
| 24 (all)    | 0.867   |

### **Selected Features:**

- 0. Pin density
- 12. MST fly lines
- 22. DFF cell density
- 23. Clock tree cell density

### Future Works: Fully-Automated & <u>Reliable</u> Framework

### **Reliable ML in Chip Design**

- Designs very sparsely distributed
- Almost impossible to perform well on every test case
- How can we trust each prediction?



### **Example – Design Difference**



### **Future Research Plan**





## **Future Funding and Collaboration Opportunities**

- Agencies:
  - General Research Fund (GRF), Early Career Scheme, NSFC, ITF
- US companies:
  - Cadence, Synopsys, Nvidia, Arm, NXP
- Chinese companies:
  - Huawei, Alibaba T-head, Chinese EDA start-ups like UniVista



**China's New Semiconductor Policies: Issues for Congress** 

### US restricts software exports to Chinese chip companies



Semiconductor switching to Asia, including 'Greater Bay Area'



## A great chance to overtake leading EDA companies

Semiconductor manufacturing capacity (%)

### **Previous Collaborations and Grant Writing Experiences**

• Many thanks for my advisors and collaborators:

| Prof. <b>Yiran Chen</b>   | Prof. <b>Hai "Helen" Li</b> | Prof. <b>Jiang Hu</b>  | Dr. <b>Brucek Khailany</b> | Dr. Haoxing Ren      |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Duke University           | Duke                        | TAMU                   | Nvidia                     | Nvidia               |
| Dr. <b>Shidhartha Das</b> | Dr. Xiaoqing Xu             | Dr. <b>Brian Cline</b> | Dr. <b>Chand Kashyap</b>   | Dr. <b>Aiqun Cao</b> |
| Arm                       | Arm                         | Arm                    | Cadence                    | Synopsys             |

- My previous grant writing experiences (funded):
  - **NSF**: Revitalizing EDA from a Machine Learning Perspective
  - SRC: A Machine Learning Approach for Cross-Level Optimizations
  - SRC: A Collaborative Machine Learning Approach to Fast and High-Fidelity Design Prediction
  - Industry (Cadence): NAS-based Fully Automatic ML Estimator Development Flow in EDA
  - Industry (Cadence): A Machine-Learning based Pre-placement Wirelength Estimator

### **Courses I am Qualified to Teach**

- Circuit and Computer Engineering Courses
  - Digital VLSI design, digital integrated circuits (CAD admin at Duke)
  - Chip design methodologies
  - Digital logic & systems (TA of undergraduate course at Duke)
  - Computer organization and architecture
- Machine Learning Courses
  - Linear algebra for engineering (**TA of graduate course at Duke**)
  - Data mining, artificial intelligence, machine learning
  - Computer vision, deep learning



## **Thanks! Questions?**

If you have further questions, please contact me: zhiyao.xie@duke.edu

