Introduction to Bluespec: A new methodology for designing Hardware

Arvind
Computer Science & Artificial Intelligence Lab.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

September 3, 2009

What is needed to make hardware design easier

- Extreme IP reuse
  - Multiple instantiations of a block for different performance and application requirements
  - Packaging of IP so that the blocks can be assembled easily to build a large system (black box model)
- Ability to do modular refinement
- Whole system simulation to enable concurrent hardware-software development

"Intellectual Property"

IP Reuse sounds wonderful until you try it ...

Example: Commercially available FIFO IP block



An error occurs if a push is attempted while the FIFO is full.

Thus, there is no conflict in a simultaneous push and pop when the FIFO is full. A simultaneous push and pop cannot occur when the FIFO is empty, since there is no pop data to prefetch. However, push data is captured in the FIFO.

A pop operation occurs when `pop_req_n` is asserted (LOW), as long as the FIFO is not empty. Asserting `pop_req_n` causes the internal read pointer to be incremented on the next rising edge of `clk`. Thus, the RAM read data must be captured on the `clk` following the assertion of `pop_req_n`.

These constraints are spread over many pages of the documentation...

Bluespec promotes composition through guarded interfaces

theModuleA

```
theFifo.enq(value1);

theFifo.deq();
value2 = theFifo.first();
```

theModuleB

```
theFifo.enq(value3);

theFifo.deq();
value4 = theFifo.first();
```



Bluespec: A new way of expressing behavior using Guarded Atomic Actions

- Formalizes composition
  - Modules with guarded interfaces
  - Compiler manages connectivity (muxing and associated control)
- Powerful static elaboration facility
  - Permits parameterization of designs at all levels
- Transaction level modeling
  - Allows C and Verilog codes to be encapsulated in Bluespec modules

➔ *Smaller, simpler, clearer, more correct code*

➔ *not just simulation, synthesis as well*

Bluespec: State and Rules organized into *modules*



All *state* (e.g., Registers, FIFOs, RAMs, ...) is explicit.

Behavior is expressed in terms of atomic actions on the state:

Rule: guard ➔ action

Rules can manipulate state in other modules only *via* their interfaces.

GCD: A simple example to explain hardware generation from Bluespec

Programming with rules: A simple example

Euclid's algorithm for computing the Greatest Common Divisor (GCD):

15 6

GCD in BSV


```
module mkGCD (I_GCD);
    Reg#(Int#(32)) x <- mkRegU;
    Reg#(Int#(32)) y <- mkReg(0);

    rule swap ((x > y) &&  (y != 0));
        x <= y;  y <= x;
    endrule
    rule subtract ((x <= y) && (y != 0));
        y <= y - x;
    endrule

    method Action start(Int#(32) a, Int#(32) b)
                                        if (y==0);
      x <= a;  y <= b;
    endmethod
    method Int#(32) result() if (y==0);
        return x;
    endmethod
endmodule
```

Assume a/=0

GCD Hardware Module




```
interface I_GCD;
    method Action start (Int#(32) a, Int#(32) b);
    method Int#(32) result();
endinterface
```

GCD: Another implementation

```
module mkGCD (I_GCD);
    Reg#(Int#(32)) x <- mkRegU;
    Reg#(Int#(32)) y <- mkReg(0);

    rule swapANDsub ((x > y) &&  (y != 0));
        x <= y;  y <= x - y;
    endrule
    rule subtract ((x<=y) && (y!=0));
        y <= y - x;
    endrule

    method Action start(Int#(32) a, Int#(32) b)
                                        if (y==0);
      x <= a;  y <= b;
    endmethod
    method Int#(32) result() if (y==0);
        return x;
    endmethod
endmodule
```

Combine swap and subtract rule

Does it compute faster ?

Does it take more resources ?

Bluespec Tool flow



Works in conjunction with exiting tool flows

Generated Verilog RTL: GCD

```
module mkGCD(CLK,RST_N,start_a,start_b,EN_start,RDY_start,
             result,RDY_result);
  input  CLK; input  RST_N;
// action method start
  input [31 : 0] start_a; input [31 : 0] start_b; input EN_start;
  output RDY_start;
// value method result
  output [31 : 0] result; output RDY_result;
// register x and y
  reg [31 : 0] x;
  wire [31 : 0] x$D_IN; wire x$EN;
  reg [31 : 0] y;
  wire [31 : 0] y$D_IN; wire y$EN;
...
// rule RL_subtract
  assign WILL_FIRE_RL_subtract = x_SLE_y___d3 && !y_EQ_0___d10 ;
// rule RL_swap
  assign WILL_FIRE_RL_swap = !x_SLE_y___d3 && !y_EQ_0___d10 ;
...
```


Generated Hardware



x_en =
y_en =

Generated Hardware Module



x_en = swap?

y_en = swap? OR subtract?

rdy =

GCD: A Simple Test Bench

```
module mkTest ();
  Reg#(Int#(32)) state <- mkReg(0);
  I_GCD     gcd   <- mkGCD();

  rule go (state == 0);
    gcd.start (423, 142);
    state <= 1;
  endrule

  rule finish (state == 1);
    $display ("GCD of 423 & 142 =%d",gcd.result());
    state <= 2;
  endrule
endmodule
```

Why do we need the state variable?

GCD: Test Bench

```
module mkTest ();
   Reg#(Int#(32))  state <- mkReg(0);
   Reg#(Int#(4)) c1 <- mkReg(1);
   Reg#(Int#(7)) c2 <- mkReg(1);
   I_GCD  gcd     <- mkGCD();

   rule req (state==0);
     gcd.start(signExtend(c1), signExtend(c2));
     state <= 1;
   endrule

   rule resp (state==1);
     $display ("GCD of %d & %d =%d", c1, c2, gcd.result());
     if (c1==7) begin c1 <= 1; c2 <= c2+1; end
                else  c1 <= c1+1;
     if (c1==7 && c2==63) state <= 2 else state <= 0;
   endrule
endmodule
```

Feeds all pairs (c1,c2)
1 < c1 < 7
1 < c2 < 63
to GCD

GCD: Synthesis results

- Original (16 bits)
  - Clock Period: 1.6 ns
  - Area: 4240 μm^2
- Unrolled (16 bits)
  - Clock Period: 1.65ns
  - Area: 5944 μm^2
- Unrolled takes 31% fewer cycles on the testbench

Rule scheduling and the synthesis of a scheduler

GAA Execution model

Repeatedly:

- Select a rule to execute
- Compute the state updates
- Make the state updates

Rule: As a State Transformer

A rule may be decomposed into two parts $\pi(s)$ and $\delta(s)$ such that

$$s_{next} = \textit{if } \pi(s) \textit{ then } \delta(s) \textit{ else } s$$

$\pi(s)$ is the condition (predicate) of the rule, a.k.a. the "CAN_FIRE" signal of the rule. π is a conjunction of explicit and implicit conditions

$\delta(s)$ is the "state transformation" function, i.e., computes the next-state values from the current state values

Compiling a Rule

```
rule r (f.first() > 0) ;
       x <= x + 1 ;   f.deq ();
endrule
```



Combining State Updates: *strawman*



Combining State Updates



Scheduler ensures that at most one ϕ_i is true

A compiler can determine if two rules can be executed in parallel without violating the one-rule-at-a-time semantics

James Hoe, Ph.D., 2000

Scheduling and control logic



Compiler synthesizes a scheduler such that at any given time ϕ's for only non-conflicting rules are true

The plan

- We will first revisit Simple MIPS architectures to understand them at the register transfer level (RTL)
- We will express these designs in Bluespec such that the whole design will consist of one rule (synchronous bluespec)
  - no scheduling issues
- After that we will get into designs involving multiple rules

We will not discuss Bluespec syntax in the lectures; you are suppose to learn that by yourself and in tutorials