A Complete Approach to Unreachable State Diagnosability via Property Directed Reachability

Ryan Berryhill

Andreas Veneris





- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Motivation

- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Motivation

- Functional verification can take up to 70% of the design effort, 60% of which is debugging
- Many errors manifest themselves with an error trace
- Traditional SAT-based debugging can be applied to accelerate the debugging process

Motivation

- Safety properties
 - The design can never reach a bad state
 - On failure, an error trace is returned
- Liveness properties
 - The design is capable of reaching a state
 - On failure, no error trace can possibly exist
- Without an error trace, traditional automated debugging cannot be applied

Motivation

- Techniques for debugging this type of liveness property exist
 - Approximation-based and incomplete
- We propose a PDR-based debugging technique for this type of liveness property
 - Complete and exact: returns every solution
- Possible to efficiently answer the question:

How do I make the design reach this state?

- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

• SAT-based debugging [Smith et. al TCAD '05]

- Using an error-trace, finds all locations that can be changed to correct the circuit's behavior
- Unroll the circuit as an ILA, insert MUXes at the output of each gate
- E.g. for the following circuit and two-cycle counter-example





• SAT-based debugging [Smith et. al TCAD '05]

- Using an error-trace, finds all locations that can be changed to correct the circuit's behavior
- Unroll the circuit as an ILA, insert MUXes at the output of each gate
- E.g. for the following circuit and two-cycle counter-example





- Property-Directed Reachability [Bradley, VMCAII'11]
 - Determines if a state is reachable or not
 - Compute an over-approximation of the set of reachable states in each clock cycle
 - Terminate when the over-approximation converges to an *inductive invariant*
 - Inductive invariant: a set of states closed under the circuit's transition relation
- We propose a technique leveraging PDR to debug unreachability without an error trace

- Approximation-based approach [Berryhill and Veneris, DATE'15]
 - User sets a parameter K
 - Use PDR to over-approximate the set of states reachable in *K* or fewer cycles
 - Debug a state transition from the overapproximation to the target state



- Solution set is not necessarily complete
- Finds all solutions that reach the target state:
 - within (*K*+1) cycles; and
 - one cycle after an already-reachable state
- We propose a technique based on PDR that is complete by nature
 - No parameters to set
 - Higher runtime (roughly 4-5x)



- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

- Key idea: create a new transition relation in which the target is reachable if solutions exist
 - Use a novel error model construction to perform the role of the debugging MUX
 - Use PDR to determine the if the target is reachable
 - The counter-example returned by PDR indicates a solution
- Result: All solutions are found, but runtime is typically higher than the approximation-based approach

- Construct the enhanced transition relation
 - Insert the error model at each suspect location
 - If $e_i = 0$ the circuit's behavior is unaffected
 - If $e_i = 1$ the location is replaced by free variable w_i
 - The register output feeds back to its input
 - The register assumes a value as part of the initial state assignment and maintains it forever



- Construct initial state constraints
 - Valid initial state of the circuit
 - Exactly *N* active error-select registers
 - Find solutions where *N* locations are simultaneously changed to correct the error
 - *N* is the error cardinality
 - For simplicity, we only consider N = 1



- Execute PDR, using the target state as the unsafe state set
- If reachable, the active error-select register in the counter-example is a solution
 - Update the initial state constraint to block the solution, run PDR again
- If unreachable, no solutions exist
 - Terminate

• From the initial state $(s_1 = 0)$ it is impossible to reach the target state $(s_1 = 1)$



- From the initial state $(s_1 = 0)$ it is impossible to reach the target state $(s_1 = 1)$
- Setting $e_2 = 1$ makes it reachable
 - The AND gate is a solution
 - Changing the AND to an OR indeed makes the target state reachable



- From the initial state $(s_1 = 0)$ it is impossible to reach the target state $(s_1 = 1)$
- Setting $e_1 = 1$ does not make the target state reachable
 - The OR gate is not a solution



- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Incremental Application of PDR

- PDR is called once for each solution found
- Each time, PDR is solving a very similar problem
 - Same transition relation, same property
 - One error-select register forced to 0
- Strictly fewer states are reachable
 - Those in which $e_i = 1$ are all unreachable
 - All others are unaffected



Incremental Application of PDR

- The reachable set after blocking is a subset of the reachable set before blocking
 - The over-approximations remain valid
- Re-use the over-approximations of PDR from the previous run
 - Gives an average 5.1x speedup



- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Exp	Incremen	Acremental and initial Results								
	same (cor solutions App	me (complete) set of plutions in every case Approach (K = 50)				Approximate approach often is able to find all of the solutions			nental Approach	
Design	#sol	%sol	Time		#SOI	lime	#SOI	Time	Speedup	
mrisc_cor	e 10	100	15.9		Approximate approach struggles to find many solutions on highly- pipelined designs			111	3.9x	
deisgn1	4	29	/16					21.7	5.9x	
divider	1	1.94	11.5					1.2	1.8x	
spi	40	100	19.0		40	598	40	76.6	7.8x	
wb	247	95	38.7		261	9983	261	211	47.3x	
usb_core	4	100	/ 17.5		4	1065	4	492	2.2x	
ac97_ctrl	10	56	1.4		Approximate approach finds 43% of the			16.8	2.7x	
rsdecoder	40	100	371	-				951	-	
GEOMEAN		434						5.1x		

Experimental Results



- On pipelined designs, the approximate approach may find a small subset of the solutions
 - Finds solutions in the stage closest to error's observation point_niversity of Toronto

Experimental Results



- Both take the same amount of time to find one solution
- The optimized approach finds subsequent solutions much more quickly

- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Future Work

- Efficient Suspect Selection [ISAIM'16]
- Key Idea: A location being a non-solution may imply other locations are also non-solutions
 - Not a register defining the target state (e.g. locations other than s₁); and
 - Has only one fanout (e.g. I_3 , I_2 , I_1); and
 - Single fanout is a non-solution
 - e.g. If I_2 is not a solution, I_1 is not either



Future Work

- Apply unreachability debugging iteratively
- Start with a suspect set including
 - Registers that define the target state (s_1)
 - Locations with multiple fanout
- Debug, "push back" through solutions
 - Add fanins of solutions to the suspect set



Future Work





- Motivation
- Background
- Unreachability Debugging
- Incremental Application of PDR
- Experimental Results
- Future Work
- Conclusion

Conclusion

- Debugging unreachable states without an error trace
 - Construct an enhanced model of the circuit
 - Target state reachable if and only if solutions exist
 - Use PDR to find traces that reach the target state thereby indicating solutions
- Complete and exact by nature
 - Returns every solution in the design
- Future Work: Efficient suspect selection