# Using BDDs to Design ULMs for FPGAs

# Zeljko Zilic and Zvonko Vranesic Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering University of Toronto

## Overview

- Motivation
- Universal Logic Modules (ULMs)
- ULMs for FPGAs
- New Design Method for ULMs useful in FPGAs
- Design Examples: 3- input and 4- input blocks
- Applications

# **More Efficient FPGAs?**

- Given LUT architecture:
- Input Permutations:
  - Provided by routing resources
- Input Inversions:
  - Provided by previous blocks
- LUT replacements that exploit permutations and inversions?



### ULMs

- Logic Blocks that realize any function of *n* variables
- Assumed that input permutations and inversions are free



• Example: ULM. 2 - used in Actel



### **Standard ULMs**

Many pins needed:



- Attempts to use in FPGAs: incomplete functionality
  - ULM.3: [Lin,Sadowska, Gatlin 94]



ULM.4: [Thakur, Wong 95] - n=4, m=8, 201/208 functions

### **Need Different ULMs**

- No additional inputs
- Just like LUTs:



• Design procedure for these ULMs?

## **Design of ULMs - Idea**

- Equivalence classes: npn, np
  Input negation
  Output negation
  Input permutation
- · Sufficient to realize only class representatives in ULM





Programming bits encode only class

n	3	4	5
npn Classes	14	222	616126
Bits -npn	4	8	20
Bits - np	5	9	21
Bits- LUT	8	16	32

### **ULM Design - Using BDDs**

- Want to both classify and physically realize
- Use BDDs



- Unique representation
- Realization: each node is a MUX:

#### BDDs for all classes: n=3



#### Super BDD: n=3

SBDD.3: can realize all 10 BDDs



Edges optimized by inversions, permutations

5 nodes

7 switches - 1 bit saved

#### **Complete ULM**

· Encode all possible input combinations



Input Encoding - No influence on speed

#### Input Encoding

• First four switches: only 4 combinations  $\rightarrow$  2 bits



S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>3</sub>	S <sub>4</sub>	B <sub>0</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>
0	х	х	х	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	0
1	1	1	1	1	1

Simple decoding logic:

$$S_1 = B_0 + B_1$$
$$S_2 = S_3 = B_0 \cdot B_1$$
$$S_4 = B_1$$

#### Implementation Comparison





	ULM.3	LUT.3
Memory	5 bits	8 bits
Transistors	70	78
Delay	1.31ns	1.38 ns

## Larger Case: n= 4

- Enumeration of classes
- Representative Realization: 208 BDDs
- Super BDD optimize interconnection
- Minimize # switches in SBDD
- Optimize circuits by input encoding
- Several alternative encodings

## ULM. 4 -LUT. 4 Replacement

• Super BDD -SBDD. 4



### **Input Encodings**

- Optimal number of bits logic too complex
- Tradeoff: area versus number of bits
- Combine input encoding programs and decompositions

Encoding	Pre-encoding	Logic	Bits
None	none	none	16
4 Switches	2 gates	none	15
Bit Sharing	3-input decoder	10 gates	13
Dense Groups	groups decoder	126 literals	11
Group Compact	folding circuits	683 literals	9
Flat	none	719 literals	9

### **Technology Mapping and Applications**

- Technology Mapping
  - Assume: np- equivalent ULM
  - Polarity disagreement blocks need opposing polarities
  - [Lin, Sadowska 94] 6.6% extra blocks needed for ULM. 3
- Functionally incomplete blocks
  - Not interesting for n= 3
  - Many possibilities 201/208 functions with 13 bits and logic overhead of 2 gates
  - ULMs can help evaluate tradeoffs
- Realistic architectures that can use ULMs
  - Reconfigurable computing [Jones, Lewis]
  - • Hard- wired blocks [Chung, Rose]

### Conclusions

- Exploited permutation and inversion availability in FPGAs
- New kind of ULMs
- Applicable in FPGAs
- LUT replacements that save programming bits
- Comparable to LUTs (area, speed)
- Require optimal or suboptimal number of programming bits
- Possible basis for new architectures