

Further Reading

Alain J. Martin: *Synthesis of Asynchronous VLSI Circuits.* Tech report California Institute of Technology, 1991.

Alain J. Martin and Mika Nyström: *Asynchronous techniques for system-on-chip design.* Proceedings of the IEEE Volume 94, Issue 6:1089 - 1120, June 2006.

What we had...

- Production rules
- Gate, circuit
- A implements B
- B can simulate A

Remember...

Stable transition functions:

i can make a transition to c at time t &

i **cannot** make a transition to c at time t + 1

->

i made a transition at time t+1

(and thus is in c at time t+1)





Now...

Stable production rules:

Rule (i) can make a transition to c at time t &Rule (i) **cannot** make a transition to c at time t + 1

->

Rule (i) made a transition at time t+1





can be even simplified more from the last slide, since a rule (i) can make only a non-trivial transition to the same next state x-up, e.g.

enabled :<-> guard is true and the transition is non-trivial disabled :<-> not enabled



linearizable: intuitively: possible to transform into a purely sequential schedule which has the same final result.

what we want: all prefixes of distributed schedules linearizable.

this follows from the given definition. we simply apply the definition for each set of the distributed schedule and generate a purely sequential schedule with intermediate states.



Top-level Specifications

Communicating hardware processes

Communicating hardware processes

a la CSP [Hoare, 78] local variables x, y, ... ports A, B, ...

- assignment y := x

Communicating hardware processes

Composition:

- parallel c1 || c2
- serial c1; c2
- loop *[c1]



```
Communicating hardware processes

- selection

[P1 -> c1 || P2 -> c2 || ...]

[P1 -> skip] = [P1]
```

selection [...] blocks only until one of P1, P2, etc is true and then executes the respective actions c1, c2, etc.

```
Communicating hardware processes

- selection

[P1 -> c1 || P2 -> c2 || ...]

[P1 -> skip] = [P1]

- arbitrated selection = choice

[P1 -> c1 | P2 -> c2 | ...]
```

arbitrated selection: exactly one of the c1, c2, ... becomes executed.

Execution	
global state	
enabled rule	
execution	
constraints: fairness, partial order constraints, timed constraints	

defined analogously to PRs

Example: the C-Element

C1: CHP from production rules. *[$[(a \land b) \rightarrow z \uparrow || (\neg a \land \neg b) \rightarrow z \downarrow]$]

C2: sequential CHP. [hw] $*[[a \land b]; z \uparrow; [\neg a \land \neg b]; z \downarrow]$



one of the most fundamental problems







Sequencing

Problem. Implement a;b.

... almost all circuits

-> executions are just distorted in time

Sequencing

Problem. Implement a;b.

... almost all circuits

order + worst-case upper bounds.



here exact timing plays a crucial rule, not just ordering: FFT of a signal



Sequencing

Two fundamental solutions.

1. Externally triggered.

2. Trigger themselves.

Sequencing

Two fundamental solutions.

1. Externally triggered = synchronous model

2. Trigger themselves = clockless model











clockless can be heavily time dependent, not at all robust to delay variations.

Which one to choose...

... depends, e.g., on

- extent of delay variations
- allowed power consumption









The synchronous (left) data send fails if the delay of a is longer than the clock period.



doing this once. single line sufficient. how do it several time? -> multishot problem



multishot = solve several times, not just once -> add a link back from receiver to sender to signal when ready for the next shot.



different program parts for even and odd sequencing of a;b





black dot = active node. active = starts with send passive = starts with wait always match an active interface with a passive one. per sequencing -> 2 phases (req and ack phase: "2-phase handshake")



even and odd instances can be expressed by the same code.



4 phases per sequencing.



D = communication delay from sender module to recevier module or vice versa. Note that D differs in fact for all the above techniques -> depends which one is best.