



Cairo University

DESIGN FOR YIELD FOR SUB-22nm FinFET-BASED FPGA

By

Mohamed Mohie El-Din Mohamed Aly Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Electronics and Communications Engineering

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

DESIGN FOR YIELD FOR SUB-22nm FinFET-BASED FPGA

By

Mohamed Mohie El-Din Mohamed Aly Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Electronics and Communications Engineering

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Hossam A. H. Fahmy

Professor

Electronics and Communication
Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

Dr. Hassan Mostafa

Assistant Professor

Electronics and Communication
Engineering Department
Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

DESIGN FOR YIELD FOR SUB-22nm FinFET-BASED FPGA

By

Mohamed Mohie El-Din Mohamed Aly Hassan

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
in
Electronics and Communications Engineering

Approved by the
Examining Committee

Prof. Dr. Hossam A. H. Fahmy, Thesis Main Advisor

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Fathy, Internal Examiner

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Amin Ebrahim Dessouky, External Examiner
(Electronics and Communications Engineering, Ain Shams University)

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2017

Engineer's Name: Mohamed Mohie El-Din Mohamed
Date of Birth: 08/03/1990
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: Mohamed.mohie.hassan@gmail.com
Phone: +201068663016
Address: Electronics and Communications
Engineering Department,
Cairo University, Giza 12613, Egypt
Registration Date: 01/10/2011
Awarding Date: --/--/2017
Degree: Master of Science
Department: Electronics and Communications Engineering



Supervisors:

Prof. Dr. Hossam A. H. Fahmy
Dr. Hassan Mostafa

Examiners:

Prof. Dr. Hossam A. H. Fahmy (Thesis main advisor)
Prof. Dr. Mohamed Fathy (Internal examiner)
Prof. Dr. Mohamed Dessouky (External examiner)
(Electronics and Communication Engineering, Ain
Shams University)

Title of Thesis:

Design For Yield For Sub-22nm FinFET-Based FPGA

Key Words:

Design for Yield; Process Variations; FPGA; Leakage Power

Summary:

In this thesis, a performance evaluation study for a FinFET-Based FPGA cluster under threshold voltage variation, representing the Die-to-Die variations, is launched with technology scaling starting from 20nm down to 7nm nodes showing the scaling trends of various performance metrics including the average power, delay, and power-delay product. Also some design insights and recommendations are proposed for the designers to achieve yield percentage of 99.87%. The leakage power is also studied for 14nm technology node under threshold voltage and temperature variations. Some solutions are implemented for leakage power control under threshold voltage variations including transistor stacking, minimum leakage vector, and gate sizing.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my utmost gratitude to Allah for giving me the strength to complete the work.

I would also like to sincerely thank my supervisors, Prof. Dr. Hossam Fahmy and Dr. Hassan Mostafa, for their continuous support and guidance throughout my work.

Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	II
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
LIST OF FIGURES.....	V
NOMENCLATURE	VII
ABSTRACT	VIII
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. MOTIVATION.....	1
1.2. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS	1
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. VARIABILITY	3
2.1.1. Classification of variations	3
2.1.1.1. Die-to-Die (D2D) Variations	3
2.1.1.2. Within-Die (WID) Variations	3
2.1.2. Sources of variability	4
2.1.2.1. Process Variations (Static Variations)	4
2.1.2.2. Environmental Variations (Dynamic Variations)	9
2.1.3. Impact of Variability on the Frequency and Power.....	9
2.1.4. State-of-Art Variations Mitigation Techniques	11
2.1.4.1. CAD Tool and Statistical Design.....	11
2.1.4.2. Variations Mitigation at the Architecture Level.....	12
CHAPTER 3 : FPGA UNDER STUDY.....	14
3.1. FPGAs.....	14
3.1.1. FPGA Logic Resources Architecture	16
3.1.2. FPGA Under Study	16
3.1.2.1. Inverter	18
3.1.2.2. 2-By-1 Multiplexer	20
3.1.2.3. Transmission Gate Flip Flop (TG-FF)	21
3.1.2.4. SRAM	22
3.1.2.5. FPGA 4-bit Lookup Table (LUT)	24
3.1.2.6. FPGA Cluster	25
CHAPTER 4 : PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF FINFET-BASED FPGA CLUSTER UNDER V_{TH} VARIATION	28
4.1. INTRODUCTION	28
4.1.1. FinFET Classification.....	33
4.1.2. Process Variations for FinFET	36
4.2. SIMULATION METHODOLOGY	38
4.3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	39
4.3.1. Average Power.....	39

4.3.2.	Delay.....	42
4.3.3.	Power-Delay Product.....	42
4.4.	DESIGN INSIGHTS	43
4.5.	CONCLUSION.....	43
CHAPTER 5 : LEAKAGE POWER EVALUATION OF FINFET-BASED FPGA CLUSTER UNDER V_{TH} VARIATION		46
5.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	46
5.1.1.	Leakage Current Sources	46
5.1.1.1.	Sub-threshold Leakage Current	47
5.1.1.2.	Gate Leakage	48
5.1.2.	Standby Leakage Reduction Techniques	48
5.1.2.1.	Multi-Threshold CMOS (MTCMOS).....	49
5.1.2.2.	Dual-Threshold Voltage.....	49
5.1.2.3.	Reverse Body Biasing	50
5.2.	SIMULATION METHODOLOGY	51
5.3.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS	53
5.3.1.	Leakage Power Segmentation and Loading Effect	53
5.3.2.	Leakage Power Variation with V_{th} and Temperature	55
5.4.	PROPOSED LEAKAGE POWER CONTROL TECHNIQUES	55
5.4.1.	Transistor Stacking.....	56
5.4.2.	Minimum Leakage Vector (MLV)	57
5.4.3.	Gate Sizing	57
5.5.	CONCLUSION.....	61
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....		63
REFERENCES		64
APPENDIX A: PTM MODELS		73

List of Tables

Table 3.1: Architecture decisions for the FPGA	18
Table 3.2: Inverter simulation measurements	19
Table 3.3: 2-to-1 simulation measurements	20
Table 3.4: TG-FF simulation measurements	22
Table 3.5: SRAM simulation measurements	23
Table 3.6: Lookup Table simulation measurements	25
Table 3.7: Cluster 2-bit adder simulation measurements	27
Table 4.1: Simulated Device Parameters	38
Table 4.2: Threshold Voltage Variations	39
Table 5.1: Simulated Device Parameters	51
Table 5.2: Threshold Voltage Variations	52
Table 5.3: Leakage Power Values upon Stacking NFET and PFET	56
Table 5.4: T _{fin} Optimized Values for Inverter	60
Table 5.5: T _{fin} Optimized Values for 2-to-1 Multiplexer	60
Table 5.6: T _{fin} Optimized Values for 6T SRAM	61
Table 5.7: Maximum Improvements and Delay Overhead for the Three Solutions	62
Table A.1: Key Technology Parameters	73
Table A.2: PTM-MG Verification	74

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Atomistic process simulation incorporating RDF and LER as the sources of intrinsic fluctuations. The green dots indicate the dopant atoms which determine the device's threshold voltage, while the blue dots indicate the drain/source doping [1].....	5
Figure 2.2: Number of dopant atoms in the depletion layer of a MOSFET versus channel length L_{eff} [7]	5
Figure 2.4: Measured V_{th} versus channel length L for a 90nm CMOS technology with shows strong short channel effects causing sharp roll-off for V_{th} for shorter L [15].....	7
Figure 2.5: Predicted σV_{th} including RDF and LER versus technology nodes for the smallest transistor. The inset shows the technological parameters used [8]	8
Figure 2.6: Thermal profile showing WID temperature variation for a microprocessor. Hot spots with temperatures as high as 120°C are shown [25].....	9
Figure 2.7: Dynamic (switching) and static (leakage) power versus technology scaling, showing the exponential increase in leakage power [26]	10
Figure 2.8: Leakage and frequency variations for IBM processor in 65nm technology [30]	11
Figure 2.9: The WID maximum critical path delay distribution for different values of independent critical paths N_{cp} . As N_{cp} increases, the mean of maximum critical path delay increases [40]	12
Figure 3.1: Basic FPGA structure	15
Figure 3.2: Modern FPGA fabric	15
Figure 3.3: SRAM Programmer for logic and routing resources	16
Figure 3.4: A closer look at the tile of Island-Style FPGA	17
Figure 3.5: Structure of (a) Basic Logic Element (BLE) and (b) Logic cluster	17
Figure 3.6: Sneak-path design in FPGA cluster	18
Figure 3.7: Inverter schematic	19
Figure 3.8: Inverter simulation results.....	19
Figure 3.9: 2-to-1 MUX schematic	20
Figure 3.10: 2-to-1 MUX simulation results	20
Figure 3.11: Transmission Gate Flip-Flop schematic	21
Figure 3.12: TG-FF simulation results	21
Figure 3.13: SRAM structure and sizing.....	22
Figure 3.14: SRAM simulation results (read operation)	23
Figure 3.15: SRAM simulation results (write operation).....	23
Figure 3.16: Lookup table with 4 inputs and 16 SRAM cells	24
Figure 3.17: Lookup table simulation results	24
Figure 3.18: FinFET-based FPGA cluster with 3 BLEs and 12 16-to-1 multiplexers ...	26
Figure 3.19: CLB inputs	27
Figure 3.20: CLB outputs	27
Figure 4.1: Structural comparison between (a) planar MOSFET and (b) FinFET	29
Figure 4.2: DIBL and sub-threshold swing (S) versus effective channel length for double-gate (DG) and bulk-silicon nFETs. The DG device is designed with an undoped body and a near-mid-gap gate material [59].....	30
Figure 4.3: Structural comparison between (a) bulk and (b) SOI FinFETs	31
Figure 4.4: Structural comparison between (a) FinFET and (b) Trigate FET	32
Figure 4.5: Structural comparison between (a) SG and (b) IG FinFET	34

Figure 4.6: Drain current (I_{DS}) versus front-gate voltage (VGFS) for three nFinFETs [80]	35
Figure 4.7: Drain current (I_{DS}) versus front-gate voltage (VGFS) for three pFinFETs [80]	35
Figure 4.8: Distribution of leakage current (I_{OFF}) for different process parameters, each varying independently [84].....	36
Figure 4.9: I_{OFF} versus temperature for three nFinFETs [80].....	37
Figure 4.10: Distribution of I_{OFF} under process variations for three nFinFETs [80]	38
Figure 4.11: Average power variation percentages with V_{th} variation for various technology nodes [90]	40
Figure 4.12: Average power variation percentages with temperature variation for various technology nodes	40
Figure 4.13: Delay variation percentages with V_{th} variation for various technology nodes [90]	41
Figure 4.14: Delay variation percentages with temperature variation for various technology nodes	41
Figure 4.15: PDP variation percentages with V_{th} variation for various technology nodes [90]	42
Figure 4.16: PDP variation percentages with temperature variation for various technology nodes	43
Figure 4.17: Power constraints with V_{th} for various technology nodes [90].....	44
Figure 4.18: Delay constraints with V_{th} for various technology nodes [90]	44
Figure 4.19: PDP constraints with V_{th} for various technology nodes [90].....	45
Figure 5.1: Leakage current sources in deep submicron devices [47]	47
Figure 5.2: Gate leakage dominant states in FPGA pass-transistor device	48
Figure 5.3: Multi-Threshold CMOS (MTCMOS).....	49
Figure 5.4: Dual-threshold voltage technique	50
Figure 5.5: Reverse Body Biasing (RBB)	50
Figure 5.6: V_{th} variations sources in FinFET devices, σV_{th} [mV]	51
Figure 5.7: Leakage power segmentation.....	52
Figure 5.8: Leakage power consumed by the entire cluster vs the sum of leakage power of the units comprising the cluster with the difference representing the loading effect.	53
Figure 5.9: Leakage power variation with V_{th} variation	54
Figure 5.10: Dynamic and leakage power consumption percentages with V_{th} variation	54
Figure 5.11: Temperature dependency of leakage power	55
Figure 5.12: Leakage power with V_{th} variation for the three solutions.....	58
Figure 5.13: Leakage power variation with V_{th} variation for the three solutions	58
Figure 5.14: Delay overhead with V_{th} variation for the three solutions	59
Figure 5.15: FinFET Inverter	59
Figure 5.16: FinFET 2-to-1 multiplexer.....	60
Figure 5.17: FinFET 6T SRAM cell.....	61
Figure A.1: The difference between ITRS off-current and PTM off-current impact on TG-FF power [123]	74
Figure A.2: The difference between ITRS off-current and PTM off-current impact on TG-FF delay [123].....	75
Figure A.3: The difference between ITRS off-current and PTM off-current impact on TG-FF PDP [123]	75

Nomenclature

ADE	Analog Design Environment
ASIC	Application-Specific Integrated Circuits
BLE	Basic Logic Element
BSIM	Berkley Short-channel IGFET Model
CAD	Computer-Aided Design
CMG	Common Multi-Gate
CMOS	Complementary Metal-Oxide Semiconductor
DIBL	Drain-Induced Barrier Lowering
DLL	Delay-Locked Loop
D2D	Die-to-Die
FinFET	Fin Field Effect Transistor
FPGA	Field-Programmable Gate Array
GIDL	Gate-Induced Drain Leakage
IGFET	Independent-Gate FET
LER	Line-Edge Roughness
LSTP	Low Standby Power Devices
LUT	Look-Up Table
NWE	Narrow Width Effects
OPE	Optical Proximity Effects
PDF	Probability Density Function
PDP	Power-Delay Product
PLL	Phase-Locked Loop
RDF	Random Dopant Fluctuations
SCE	Short Channel Effects
SGFET	Shorted-Gate FET
SoPC	System-on-a-Programmable-Chip
SRAM	Static Random Access Memory
SSTA	Statistical Static Timing Analysis
WID	Within-Die

Abstract

As CMOS technology is scaled towards the deep sub-micron regime, digital circuits' designers are facing increased variability in form of either process variations or environmental variations. Those variations are classified to Die-to-Die variations and Within-Die variations. Our work presented in this thesis aims at evaluating the performance of a FinFET-Based FPGA cluster under threshold voltage variation that represents the Die-to-Die variations with technology scaling starting from 20nm down to 7nm nodes using Berkley Predictive Technology Models, showing the scaling trends of different performance metrics including the average power, delay, and power-delay product. Some design insights and recommendations are proposed for the designers to achieve yield percentage of 99.87%.

Since the leakage power is much more pronounced in advanced technology nodes, we also studied the leakage power and its variation for 14nm technology node under threshold voltage and temperature variations. The results emphasized the log-normal dependency of the leakage power on the threshold voltage and also the exponential dependency with temperature. Some solutions are proposed and implemented for leakage power control under threshold voltage variation including transistor stacking, minimum leakage vector (MLV), and gate sizing. These solutions have shown improvements for both the leakage power and leakage power variation, but also these solutions introduced a minor delay and area overheads which are reported and compared as well.

The FPGA cluster we built for our study is configured to a 2-bit adder benchmark used for both the performance evaluation study with technology scaling and the leakage power evaluation study as well. Cadence Virtuoso and ADE-GXL are used for both FPGA cluster building and simulations respectively.

Chapter 1 : Introduction

This chapter presents a short introduction about the significance of studying the effect of process variations while scaling down CMOS technologies coming to different FinFET technologies. Section 1.1 presents the motive behind this research work. Section 1.2 provides the thesis outline and organization.

1.1. Motivation

More than four decades of scaling CMOS technology has been the biggest driver for electronics industry. CMOS transistor scaling allowed building chips with billions of transistors in modern Integrated Circuits (ICs) and a broad range of electronic products with very high integration levels [1]. Nevertheless, the continued rigorous scaling of CMOS technology in sub-100nm regime has created massive design challenges, especially when transitioning to advanced technology nodes starting from 22nm technology. Assignable to process control limitations, manufacturing tolerances in process technology are not equally scaling as the transistor channel length [2-5]. Furthermore, process variations due to fundamental physical limits such as Line-End Roughness (LER) and Random Dopant Fluctuations (RDF) are significantly increasing with technology scaling [2, 6-11]. Consequently, statistical parameter variations are getting worse with consecutive technology generations, and variability is currently becoming one of the biggest challenges that face the semiconductor industry, resulting in huge yield losses [5]. That variability has been affecting analog design for some considerable time, and currently it is significantly impacting digital design at nanometer technology nodes. In addition, scaling the threshold voltage in nanometer regime posed a massive increase in the sub-threshold leakage current due to the exponential dependence, hence affecting the power efficiency which is becoming the key to sustaining continually enhanced performance for future VLSI circuits,

1.2. Organization of the Thesis

In order to have an overview about the process variations effects on the next generation FPGAs incorporating FinFETs devices in the manufacturing process, it is important to study the variations effects on the basic performance metrics such as the average power, delay, and power-delay product.

An introduction about the process variations in general, their sources and impacts on the digital circuits, is illustrated in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 gives an introduction about FPGAs, their structures, and the FPGA cluster we used for our study. It also contains the description of each unit comprising the FPGA cluster along with its simulation waveforms and measurements for basic performance metrics such as power, delay, and power-delay product (PDP).

In Chapter 4, we study the impact of threshold voltage variation with, representing D2D variations, with FinFET technology scaling from 20nm down to 7nm over the

FPGA cluster we built for our evaluation study. Also some design insights are presented in this chapter that help achieving a yield percentage of 99.87%.

Since the leakage power is becoming much more pronounced with the continued technology scaling, Chapter 5 presents the work done in order to study the leakage power variation with both the threshold voltage and temperature on the FPGA cluster. Also some solutions are proposed and implemented in order to control the leakage power for 14nm node.

And finally, the conclusion and the potential future work are drawn in “Discussion and Conclusions” section.

Appendix A illustrates the PTM models we used in our simulation in detail.