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    - Has been using Verilog since 1988
    - Bachelors in Computer Science with Electronic Engineering minor
    - Master’s in Education with emphasis in e-learning
  - Involved in IEEE Verilog and SystemVerilog standards since 1993
    - Editor of IEEE 1364 Verilog and IEEE 1800 SystemVerilog Language Reference Manuals (LRMs)
    - Author of multiple books on Verilog and SystemVerilog

*You can follow up with the author at stuart@sutherland-hdl.com*
Presenting SystemVerilog to FPGA Designers...

- In 2004 I gave a paper on SystemVerilog to FPGA designers
  - Nobody cared, nobody listened, no one asked questions

- Has anything changed after 5 years?
- 3 months ago, I attended an FPGA conference...
  - Synopsys had several presentations about SystemVerilog
  - Almost nobody cared, listened, or asked questions
FPGA Design and Verification
Then and Now

- FPGA tools have changed since 2004, but...
  - Are FPGA designers still using obsolete languages?

巧, grep, sed...

THEN (2004 AD)

NOW (2009 AD)

Adapted from a cartoon strip, circa 1987
Asking the Right Question

- Do FPGA designers use advanced ASIC methodologies?
  
  **Which chart is correct?**

- Verify in Lab “burn-and-learn”
- Verify in Simulation “learn-and-burn”
- Verify in Lab “burn-and-learn”
- Verify in Simulation “learn-and-burn”

- This paper does not answer this question!!!
  
  The real question is…
  
  "Is SystemVerilog useful for FPGA design and Verification"
The purpose of this paper is to understand the obstacles

- Are SystemVerilog features useful for FPGA design/verification?
- Are there deficiencies with tools that limit its usefulness?
- Are there deficiencies in the language that limit its usefulness?

What needs to change to enable using SystemVerilog???
Finding the Answers

To determine what FPGA designers think about SystemVerilog:

- A survey was sent to companies involved in designing FPGAs
  - More than 35 companies from over 11 countries responded
- One-on-one interviews were conducted with several engineers

Note: The engineers involved already use VHDL or Verilog

- Responses are from engineers who understand using HDLs for FPGA design and verification
Participants were asked which HDL they use to design and verify FPGAs:

- **For Synthesis**
  - Verilog (45%)
  - SystemVerilog (24%)
  - VHDL (26%)
  - Other (5%)

- **For Verification**
  - Verilog (42%)
  - SystemVerilog (35%)
  - VHDL (18%)
  - Other (5%)

What this data shows…
- There are companies using SystemVerilog to create FPGAs!

What this data does *not* show…
- What types of FPGAs are being created using SystemVerilog (e.g. end products versus ASIC prototyping)
SystemVerilog cross coverage was used to determine which HDLs were most often used for which types of FPGA

- (Not really – the correlation of data was done by hand)

This data indicates that:

- SystemVerilog is used more to verify FPGAs than for synthesis
- SystemVerilog is used more for prototyping than for end products
Features of SystemVerilog Being Used for FPGAs

- Respondents who *do use* SystemVerilog were asked what constructs they use:

  **Synthesis**
  - enumerated types
  - structures
  - unique case priority case
  - always_ff
  - always_comb
  - packages
  - interfaces

  **Verification**
  - program blocks
  - clocking blocks
  - Object Oriented testbenches
  - assertions
  - constrained random tests
  - coverage

- This data indicates that:
  - Engineers who are using SystemVerilog are taking advantage of all aspects of the language
Reasons SystemVerilog Is Not Being Used

- Respondents who do not use SystemVerilog were asked, "Why not?"

- The additional comments made by engineers explain the obstacles for why SystemVerilog was not used.
Several hundred comments provide the answers as to what obstacles might be preventing the usage of SystemVerilog.

The comments were analyzed to identify specific themes.

Five themes appeared frequently.

Presented on the next few slides, in order of least frequently to most frequently occurring theme.
Synthesis Support

- Nearly every engineer who had tried using SystemVerilog for synthesis commented that:
  - Synthesis compilers from FPGA vendors (e.g. Xilinx, Altera, Actel) did not support SystemVerilog at all

From an engineer designing FPGAs for consumer products:

"[We need] better support in [our] vendor’s synthesis tool ([FPGA vendor name omitted] is noteworthy in not supporting it at all in their synthesis tool)."

- Synthesis compilers from EDA vendors (e.g. Synopsys, Synplicity) had very limited support for SystemVerilog

From an engineer using FPGAs to prototype ASICs (paraphrased from interview):

In order to emulate the ASIC in FPGAs, we have to make substantial changes to the RTL code to manually re-write SystemVerilog constructs as Verilog.

- Are these statements valid?
  - That question is addressed later in this presentation
Other Common Themes

- Many of the comments from participants indicated a lack of awareness of SystemVerilog capabilities
  
  "Seems like it [SystemVerilog] is just as useful as Verilog since it is a superset of Verilog....We can 'get by' without learning something new."

  "SV inherits too much of the low level nature of Verilog and does not allow as high-level design as VHDL."

- **Cost** came up a number of times

  "Support [for SystemVerilog] would have to come through the simulation tools we now own. And don't...bump up my maintenance costs to cover that capability."

- **Learning SystemVerilog** was a concern

  "We considered SystemVerilog, but did not have adequate training and did not want a disruption."
Fact or Fiction? FPGAs Don’t Need SystemVerilog

- Some survey respondents indicated that SystemVerilog is too complex for FPGA design and verification

  “Some of our Verilog users have been reluctant to move away from Verilog 95.”

- Is this a valid concern?
  - FPGAs can be as complex as ASICs
  - SystemVerilog can be adopted in phases
    - Can benefit from many features without learning OO programming or other advanced features

- Recommendations:
  - Synopsys needs to improve the marketing of SystemVerilog for FPGA design and verification
Fact or Fiction? FPGA Synthesis Doesn’t Support SystemVerilog

- Almost every survey and interview respondent said that synthesis is the biggest obstacle to using SystemVerilog
  - Yet almost all vendors claim to support SystemVerilog synthesis
  - Who is right?
- Two reasons engineers perceive synthesis is an obstacle are:
  1. A older version of the synthesis compiler was evaluated
     "Our last assessment [of SystemVerilog synthesis] was done 2-1/2 years ago. We have not re-assessed since that time."
  2. ASIC and FPGA synthesis tools support different SV subsets
     "The [RTL code] must be done differently for each...synthesis compiler...because the...support for SystemVerilog is quite different for each compiler."

Recommendation for Synopsys:
- DC & Synplify-Pro need to support the same SV constructs!!!
Fact or Fiction? SystemVerilog

Tools Cost Too Much

- Some FPGA designers stated that they need low-cost tools
  
  "[SystemVerilog needs] support from a free open source simulator. I use [simulator name omitted], which presently only supports Verilog 95."

  "I can't see many teams taking up [SystemVerilog for verification]....A simulation seat is easily more expensive than all other...FPGA design software combined."

- Is this a valid concern?
  
  - Historically, FPGA tools have cost less than ASIC tools
  
  - Advanced verification tools are expensive to create & maintain

- Recommendations:
  
  - Project managers needs to recognize that …
    The more complex the FPGA, the more expensive the tools
  
  - EDA/FPGA vendors can reduce cost with "lite" versions of tools
Fact or Fiction? SystemVerilog
Is Too Difficult to Learn

Several comments indicated that the cost or time required to learn SystemVerilog is an obstacle to adopting SystemVerilog

“We considered SystemVerilog, but did not have adequate training and did not want a disruption.”

Is this a valid concern?

- Mastering every aspect of SystemVerilog requires a lot of learning
- Do not need to be an expert OO programmer to gain huge benefits from SystemVerilog

Recommendations:

- Engineers can learn SystemVerilog incrementally
  - E.g.: First learn synthesis constructs or assertions
  - As needs increase, learn more advanced language features
Conclusions

- **SystemVerilog is useful for FPGA design and verification**
  - Many FPGA engineers are already using SystemVerilog
  - ASIC prototyping is where SystemVerilog is most often used

- **There are valid barriers that have slowed the adoption of SV**
  - Synthesis/simulation support was an obstacle, but not any more
  - Lack of awareness about SystemVerilog is the real obstacle!

- **The paper conclusions are based on grounded data**
  - Survey and interviews were used to determine the facts
    - 66 engineers at more than 35 companies in 11+ countries
    - Quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis

- **The paper includes all comments received**
  - Both positive and negative comments – only names are removed
Thank You!

- FPGA tools have changed since 2004, AND...
  - You're no longer using obsolete languages, right?

**THEN** (2004 AD)

Awk, grep, sed...

**NOW** (2009 AD)

unique, assert, inherits, constraint