Rapid Exploration of Pipelined Processors through Automatic Generation of Synthesizable RTL Models

Prabhat Mishra
pmishra@cecs.uci.edu

Arun Kejariwal
akejariw@cecs.uci.edu

Nikil Dutt
dutt@cecs.uci.edu

Architectures and Compilers for Embedded Systems (ACES) Laboratory
Center for Embedded Computer Systems, University of California, Irvine, CA 92697, USA
http://www.cecs.uci.edu/~aces

Abstract

As embedded systems continue to face increasingly higher performance requirements, deeply pipelined processor architectures are being employed to meet desired system performance. System architects critically need modeling techniques to rapidly explore and evaluate candidate architectures based on area, power, and performance constraints. We present an exploration framework for pipelined processors. We use the EXPRESSION Architecture Description Language (ADL) to capture a wide spectrum of processor architectures. The ADL has been used to enable performance driven exploration by generating a software toolkit from the ADL specification. In this paper, we present a functional abstraction technique to automatically generate synthesizable RTL from the ADL specification. Automatic generation of RTL enables rapid exploration of candidate architectures under given design constraints such as area, clock frequency, power, and performance. Our exploration results demonstrate the power of reuse in composing heterogeneous architectures using functional abstraction primitives allowing for a reduction in the time for specification and exploration by at least an order of magnitude.

1 Introduction

Embedded systems present a tremendous opportunity to customize designs by exploiting the application behavior. Shrinking time-to-market, coupled with short product lifetimes create a critical need for rapid exploration and evaluation of candidate System-on-Chip (SOC) architectures. System architects critically need tools, techniques, and methodologies to perform rapid architectural exploration for a given set of applications to meet the diverse requirements, such as better performance, low power, smaller silicon area, and higher clock frequency.

Recent advances on language driven software toolkit (including compiler and simulator) generation enables performance driven exploration. The software simulator produces profiling data and thus may answer questions concerning the instruction set, the performance of an algorithm and the required size of memory and registers. However, the required silicon area, clock frequency, and power consumption, can only be determined in conjunction with a synthesizable HDL model. Manual or semi-automatic generation of synthesizable HDL model for the architecture is a time consuming process. This can be done only by a set of skilled designers. Furthermore, the interaction among the different teams, such as specification developers, HDL designers, and simulator developers makes rapid architectural exploration infeasible. As a result, system architects rarely have tools or the time to explore architecture alternatives to find the best-in-class solution for the target applications. This situation is very expensive in both time and engineering resources, and has a substantial impact on time-to-market. Without automation and unified development environment, the design process is prone to error and may lead to inconsistencies between hardware and software representations.

Automatic generation of synthesizable HDL design along with software toolkit from a single specification language will be an effective solution for early architectural exploration. The EXPRESSION ADL [1] was developed for the automatic generation of software toolkit, including compiler, simulator, and assembler. The ADL is used to specify the architecture. The software toolkit is generated automatically from the ADL specification. The application programs are compiled and simulated, and the feedback is used to modify the ADL specification of the architecture. In this paper, we focus on automatic generation of synthesizable HDL along with software toolkit for a wide variety of pipelined architectures.

The contribution of this work is a methodology for automatic generation of synthesizable HDL models from a specification language to enable rapid exploration of pipelined architectures. The existing approaches are either semi-

Proceedings of the 14th IEEE International Workshop on Rapid Systems Prototyping (RSP'03)
1074-6005/03 $17.00 © 2003 IEEE

automatic (expects designers to write datapath components manually) or covers a restricted set of architectures. However, none of these approaches are able to capture a wide spectrum of processor features present in DSP, VLIW, EPIC and Superscalar processors, and generate synthesizable RTL from the ADL specification. The main bottleneck has been the lack of an abstraction (covering a diverse set of architectural features) that permits the reuse of the primitives to compose the heterogeneous architectures. We are able to generate synthesizable HDL description for a wide range of pipelined architectures using a functional abstraction technique. Due to our single specification driven exploration approach the hardware and software representations are consistent.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly describes the EXPRESSION ADL. Section 3 presents related work addressing language driven HDL generation approaches. Section 4 presents the functional abstraction technique that permits reuse of abstraction primitives to compose heterogeneous architectures. Section 5 outlines our approach and the overall flow of our ADL driven exploration environment. The synthesizable HDL generation method is described in Section 6. Section 7 presents preliminary experiments using our system. Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 The EXPRESSION ADL

The EXPRESSION framework allows verification, automatic software toolkit generation, and design space exploration for a wide range (DSP, VLIW, EPIC, Superscalar) of programmable embedded systems (processor, co-processor, and memory subsystem). The EXPRESSION ADL has been used to generate compiler, simulator, and assembler for the TI C6x [24], PowerPC [6], ARM [25], Hitachi SH3 [26], ST100 [27], Sun UltraSparc-III [8], and MIPS R10K [7] architectures. The ADL can be used to perform top-down validation of programmable embedded systems ([16], [18], [20]). In this paper, we demonstrate the capability of the framework to perform rapid exploration through automatic generation of synthesizable RTL. We briefly describe the key aspects of the EXPRESSION ADL in this section. The complete reference of the language is provided in [1].

The EXPRESSION ADL captures the structure, behavior, and mapping (between structure and behavior) of the programmable architecture as shown in Figure 1.

The structure of a processor can be viewed as a graph with the components as nodes and the connectivity as the edges of the graph. We consider four types of components: *units* (e.g., ALUs), *storages* (e.g., register files), *ports*, and *connections* (e.g., buses). There are two types of edges: *pipeline edges* and *data transfer edges*. The pipeline edges specify instruction transfer between units via pipeline



Figure 1. The EXPRESSION ADL

latches, whereas the data transfer edges specify data transfer between components, typically between units and storages or between two storages. Each component has a list of attributes. For example, a functional unit will have information regarding latches, ports, connections, opcodes, timing, capacity etc.

The behavior is organized into operation groups, with each group containing a set of operations having some common characteristics. Each operation is then described in terms of it's opcode, operands, behavior, and instruction format. Each operand is classified either as source or as destination. Furthermore, each operand is associated with a type that describes the type and size of the data it contains. The instruction format describes the fields of the operation in both binary and assembly. For example, the binary format for the following *add* operation has opcode (0101) field from 26th bit to 29th bit.

```
(OPCODE add
  (OP_TYPE DATA_OP)
  (OPERANDS (SRC1 int_rf) (SRC2 int_32) (DST int_rf))
  (BEHAVIOR DST = SRC1 + SRC2)
  (FORMAT cond(31-30) 0101 dest(25-21) src1(20-16) ...)
  ........
)
```

The mapping functions map components in the structure to operations in the behavior. It defines, for each functional unit, the set of operations supported by that unit (and vice versa). For example, the operation *add* is mapped to *ALU* unit.

3 Related Work

Two major approaches to synthesizable HDL generation have been proposed. The first one is a generic parameterized processor core based approach. These cores are bound to a single processor template whose tools and architecture can be modified to a certain degree. Another approach is based on processor specification languages. The language based approaches permit specification of the processor at the expense of restrictions on the quality and/or availability of the tools.

Examples of processor template based approaches are Xtensa [23], Jazz [9], and PEAS [13]. Xtensa [23] is a

scalable RISC processor core. Configuration options include the width of the register set, caches, memories etc. New functional units and instructions can be added using the Tensilica Instruction Language (TIE). A synthesizable hardware model along with software toolkit can be generated for this class of architectures. Improv's Jazz [9] processor is a VLIW processor that permits the modeling and simulation of a system consisting of multiple processors, memories, and peripherals. It allows modifications of data width, number of registers, and the depth of hardware task queue. It is also possible to add functional units and add custom functionality in Verilog. PEAS [13] is a GUI based hardware/software codesign framework. It generates HDL code along with software toolkit. It has support for several architecture types and a library of configurable resources. Instruction set and micro-operations are separately described.

Processor description language based HDL generation frameworks can be divided into environments based on the type of information the language can capture. nML [11] and ISDL [5] languages capture the instruction set (IS) of the processor. In nML, the processor IS is described as an attributed grammar with the derivations reflecting the set of legal instructions. The architectural scope is limited to DSPs and ASIPs for nML based specification. In ISDL, constraints on parallelism are explicitly specified through illegal operation groupings. As the generation of functional units is the result of an analysis and optimization process of the HDL generator HGEN, the designer has only indirect influence to the generated HDL model. Itoh et al. [12] have proposed a micro-operation description based synthesizable HDL generation. The structure of the processor is derived by analyzing the micro-operation descriptions. It can handle a very simple processor model with no hardware interlock mechanism or multi-cycle operations. It relies on compiler to insert necessary NOP instructions. As a result, it does not support instructions related to interrupt, cache control, co-processor etc.

MIMOLA [21] captures the structure of the processor wherein the net-list of the target processor is described in a HDL like language. Extracting the instruction set from the structure may be difficult for complicated instructions.

More recently, languages that capture both the structure and the behavior (instruction set) of the processor, as well as detailed pipeline information have been proposed. LISA [28] is one such language that captures operation-level description of the pipeline. The synthesizable HDL generation approach based on LISA language ([2], [14], [15]) is closest to our approach. The LISA machine description provides information consisting of model components for memory, resource, instruction set, behavior, timing, and micro-architecture. It can model only DSP and VLIW architectures. It generates HDL model of the processor's control path and the structure of the pipeline. However, the designer has to manually implement the datapath components. A major problem here is verification since operations have to be described and maintained twice - on the one hand in the LISA model and on the other hand in the HDL model (hand written datapath) of the target architecture. Due to the need of manual intervention, this method is not suitable for rapid design space exploration.

The methodology we present in this paper combines the advantages of the processor template based environments and the language based specifications. In fact, we have taken template based design one step ahead using our functional abstraction technique. Thus unlike previous approaches, we are able to efficiently explore a wide range of pipelined architectures exhibiting heterogeneous architectural styles, as well as the memory subsystems.

4 Functional Abstraction

While contemporary ADLs can effectively capture one class of architecture, they are typically unable to capture a wide spectrum of processor and memory features present in DSP, VLIW, EPIC and Superscalar processors. The main bottleneck has been the lack of an abstraction (covering a diverse set of architectural features) that permits the reuse of the primitives to compose the heterogeneous architectures. In this section, we briefly describe the functional abstraction needed to capture such wide variety of programmable architectures. The complete reference is available in [17].

The notion of functional abstraction comes from a simple observation: different architectures may use the same functional unit (e.g., fetch) with different parameters, the same functionality (e.g., operand read) in different functional unit, or new architectural features. The first difference can be eliminated by defining generic functions with appropriate parameters. The second difference can be eliminated by defining generic sub-functions, which can be used by different architectures at different points in time. The last one is difficult to alleviate since it is new, unless this new functionality can be composed of existing sub-functions (e.g., *multiply-accumulate* operation by combining *multiply* and *add* operations). We have defined the necessary generic functions, sub-functions and computational environment needed to capture a wide variety of processor and memory features. We first explain the functional abstraction needed to capture the structure and behavior of the processor and memory subsystem, then we discuss the issues related to defining generic controller functionality.

We capture the structure of each functional unit using parameterized functions. For example, the fetch unit functionality contains several parameters, such as number of operations read per cycle, number of operations written per cycle, reservation station size, branch prediction scheme, number of read ports, number of write ports etc. Figure 2

```
FetchUnit ( # of read/cycle, res-station size, ....)
{
   address = ReadPC();
   instructions = ReadInstMemory(address, n);
   WriteToReservationStation(instructions, n);
   outInst = ReadFromReservationStation(m);
   WriteLatch(decode_latch, outInst);

   pred = QueryPredictor(address);
   if pred {
      nextPC = QueryBTB(address);
      SetPC(nextPC);
   } else
      IncrementPC(x);
}
```

Figure 2. A Fetch Unit Example

shows a specific example of a fetch unit described using sub-functions. Each sub-function is defined using appropriate parameters. For example, *ReadInstMemory* reads *n* operations from instruction cache using current PC address (returned by *ReadPC*) and writes them to the reservation station. The notion of generic sub-function allows the flexibility of specifying the system in finer detail. It also allows reuse of the components. Furthermore, these components can be pre-verified. Thus the task of verification will reduce to mainly performing interface verification at all levels.

The behavior of a generic processor is captured through the definition of opcodes. Each opcode is defined as a function with a generic set of parameters, which performs the intended functionality. The parameter list includes source and destination operands, necessary control and data type information. We have defined common sub-functions e.g., ADD, SUB, SHIFT etc. The opcode functions may use one or more sub-functions. For example, the MAC (multiply and accumulate) uses two sub-functions (ADD and MUL) as shown in Figure 3.

```
ADD (src1, src2) {
   return (src1 + src2);
}
```

```
MUL (src1, src2) {
   return (src1 * src2);
}
```

```
MAC (src1, src2, src3) {
   return ( ADD( MUL(src1, src2), src3) );
}
```

Figure 3. Modeling of MAC operation

Each type of memory module, such as SRAM, cache, DRAM, SDRAM, stream buffer, victim cache etc., is modeled using a function with appropriate parameters. For example, the cache function has parameters: cache size, line size, associativity, word size, replacement policy, write policy, read/write access times etc. These functions also have parameters for specifying pipelining, parallelism, and access modes (normal read, page mode read, burst read etc.).

The controller is maintained by using a generic control table. The number of rows in the table is equal to the number of pipeline stages in the architecture. The number of columns is equal to the maximum number of parallel units present in any pipeline stage. Each entry in the control table corresponds to one particular unit in the architecture. It also contains information specific to that unit e.g., busy bit (BB), stall bit (SB), list of children, list of parents, opcodes supported etc. This table is generated from the ADL specification. The control table captures all the necessary details to perform necessary stalling and flushing of the pipelines in the presence of branches, hazards, and exceptions.

We have also developed a generic scheme for defining interrupts, exceptions, interrupt handler, DMA, co-processor, and external interface. The detailed description of generic abstractions for all of the microarchitectural components are too long to describe in this section, and can be found in [17].

5 Our Approach

Figure 4 shows our ADL driven architecture exploration framework. System designers have initial ideas about the programmable architecture (processor, coprocessor, memory subsystem) for the given set of applications. They develop architecture specification document based on their expertise and available prototypes.



Figure 4. Architecture Exploration Framework

The first step is to specify the architecture in EXPRESSION ADL. It is necessary to validate the ADL specification to ensure that the architecture is well-formed ([16], [20]). It guarantees the correctness of the generated software toolkit and the HDL implementation. The software toolkit, including compiler, assembler, and simulator, is generated automatically from the ADL specification. The application program is compiled and simulated to generate performance numbers. The simulator produces profiling data and thus may answer questions concerning the instruction set, the performance of an algorithm and the required size of memory and registers. The required silicon area, clock frequency, or power consumption can only be determined by generating a synthesizable HDL model.

In this paper, we present automatic generation of synthesizable HDL models (shown shaded in Figure 4) from the ADL specification. We have developed VHDL models for each generic function and sub-functions as described in Section 4. Our *HDL generator* is capable of composing heterogeneous architectures using functional abstraction primitives. The generated hardware model (VHDL Description) is synthesized using Synopsys Design Compiler [22] to generate evaluation statistics: area, clock frequency, and power consumption. The hardware model is also used to generate performance numbers to validate the generated hardware model against the simulator.

6 Synthesizable HDL Generation

We have already demonstrated the power of functional abstraction in generating simulation models for a wide variety of architectures allowing for a reduction in the time for specification and exploration by at least an order of magnitude [19]. In this paper we have used the functional abstraction technique to automatically generate synthesizable VHDL models from the ADL specification. In fact, there is a direct relationship between generating a simulator and a hardware model: the synthesizable VHDL model is itself a simulator.

The generated HDL description consists of three major parts: instruction decoder, data-path, and control logic. We have implemented all the generic functions and sub-functions (as described in Section 4) using VHDL. In this section we briefly describe how to generate three major components using the VHDL models. The detailed description is available in [3].

6.1 Instruction Decoder

We have implemented a generic instruction decoder that uses information regarding individual instruction format and opcode mapping for each functional unit to decode a given instruction. The instruction format information is available in operations section of the EXPRESSION ADL. The decoder extracts information regarding opcode, operands etc. from input instruction using the instruction format. The mapping section of the EXPRESSION captures the information regarding the mapping of opcodes to the functional units. The decoder uses this information to perform/initiate necessary functions (e.g., operand read) and decide where (pipeline latch) to send the instruction.

6.2 Data Path

The implementation of datapath consists of two parts. First, compose each component in the structure. Second, instantiate components (e.g., fetch, decode, ALU, LdSt, writeback, branch, caches, register files, memories etc.) and establish connectivity using appropriate number of pipeline latches, ports, and connections using the structural information available in the ADL. To compose each component in the structure we use the information available in the ADL regarding the functionality of the component and its parameters. For example, to compose an execution unit, it is necessary to instantiate all the opcode functionalities (e.g, ADD, SUB etc. for an ALU) supported by that execution unit. Also, if the execution unit is supposed to read the operands then appropriate number of operand read functionalities needs to be instantiated unless the same read functionality can be shared using multiplexors. Similarly, if this execute unit is supposed to write the data back to register file, the functionality for writing the result needs to be instantiated. The actual implementation of an execute unit might contain many more functionalities e.g., read latch, write latch, and insert/delete/modify reservation station (if applicable).

6.3 Control Logic

The controller is implemented in two parts. First, it generates a centralized controller (using generic controller function with appropriate parameters) that maintains the information regarding each functional unit, such as busy, stalled etc. It also computes hazard information based on the list of instructions currently in the pipeline. Based on these bits and the information available in the ADL it stalls/flushes necessary units in the pipeline. Second, a local controller is maintained at each functional unit in the pipeline. This local controller generates certain control signals and sets necessary bits based on input instruction. For example, the local controller in an execute unit will activate the add operation if the opcode is *add*, or it will set the busy bit in case of a multi-cycle operation.

7 Experiments

We performed architectural design space exploration by varying different architectural features, achieved by reusing the abstraction primitives with appropriate parameters. In this section, we illustrate the usefulness of our approach by generating synthesizable HDL description and performing rapid exploration of the DLX architecture [10].

We have chosen DLX processor for two reasons. First, it has been well studied in academia and there are HDL implementations available for the DLX processor that we can use for comparison purposes. Second, it has many interesting features, such as fragmented pipelines, multi-cycle units etc., that are representative of many commercial pipelined processor architectures such as TI C6x [24], PowerPC [6], and MIPS R10K [7].



Figure 5. The DLX Processor

7.1 Experimental Setup

Figure 5 shows the DLX processor pipeline that we have captured in our framework. The DLX architecture has five pipeline stages: fetch, decode, execute, memory, and write-back. The *execute* stage has four parallel paths: integer ALU, 7 stage multiplier, four stage floating-point adder, and multi-cycle divider.

The EXPRESSION ADL captures the structure and behavior of the DLX architecture. Synthesizable HDL models are generated automatically from this specification. We have not done any manual changes to the generated HDL models to enhance results. The generated HDL model is validated against the generated simulator using the application programs from DSP and Multimedia domains. We have used Synopsys Design Compiler [22] to synthesize the generated HDL description using LSI 10K technology libraries and to obtain measures in terms of power consumption, clock frequency, and chip area.

7.2 Results

We have performed extensive architectural explorations by varying different architectural features. In this section we present three exploration experiments starting with a simple DLX architecture.

We captured the RISC version of the DLX (say *RISC-DLX*) architecture in the ADL and generated HDL description. We compare the quality of the generated HDL code with the results published by Itoh et al.[12] (say *PEAS-DLX*), which is synthesized using VSC753d (CMOS 0.5 μm) technology library. Table 1 presents the comparative results between *PEAS-DLX* [12] and *RISC-DLX* (generated by our framework). The second column lists the number of words in the specification of both designs. The third column presents the number of words in the generated HDL code. The fourth and fifth columns describe the area (gate count) and clock frequency respectively. The power consumption for our hardware model is 52.4 mW.

	Spec (words)	HDL Code (words)	Area (gates)	Speed (MHz)
RISC-DLX	2063	6612	118 K	33
PEAS-DLX	1196	6259	105 K	5.3

Table 1. Synthesis Results: RISC-DLX vs PEAS-DLX

Next, we modified this *RISC-DLX* model to add several architectural features from VLIW and Superscalar domains that would not be possible with any existing ADL based framework. We modified the ADL specification of the DLX (say *VLIW-DLX*) to add support for interlocking, stalling, flushing, and multi-cycle operations. We have obtained area (185 K gates) and power (70 mW) numbers for this model.

Finally, we modified the ADL specification to add superscalar features (say *Superscalar-DLX*) and generated the HDL description. We have obtained the hand written version of the Superscalar DLX (say *Darmstadt-DLX*) processor from the repository of Darmstadt University of Technology [4]. We made necessary modifications to make it synthesizable using Synopsys Design Compiler. Table 2 presents the comparative results between *Darmstadt-DLX* (modified) and *Superscalar-DLX* (generated by our framework). The second, third and fourth columns describe the area (gate count), clock frequency, and power consumption respectively.

	Area (gates)	Speed (MHz)	Power (mW)
Superscalar-DLX	239 K	20	108.27
Darmstadt-DLX	198 K	27.7	71

Table 2. Hardware Synthesis Results

Our generated design (without any manual intervention) is 20-40% off in terms of area, power, and clock speed. Indeed, these are reasonable ranges for rapid system prototyping and exploration. Each iteration in our exploration framework is in the order of hours to days depending on the amount of modification needed in the ADL and the synthesis time. However, each iteration will be in the order of weeks to months for manual or semi-automatic development of HDL models. The reduction of HDL generation time is at least an order of magnitude.

We have analyzed our results and observed that the execution units are consuming 50-60% of the total area and power. This is due to the fact that we have not considered

the optimization and resource sharing issues of our data path components yet.

8 Summary

We have presented a synthesizable HDL generation method for pipelined processors using an ADL specification. The EXPRESSION ADL captures the structure and the behavior of the architecture. The synthesizable HDL description is generated automatically from the ADL specification using the functional abstraction technique. The generated hardware model is validated against the generated simulator. The synthesis of the generated HDL model is performed to generate evaluation statistics such as chip area, clock frequency, and power consumption. The feasibility of our technique is confirmed through experiments. The result shows that a wide varieties of processor features can be explored in hours to days – an order of magnitude reduction in time compared with existing approaches that employ semi-automatic or manual generation of HDL models.

Our future work will focus on generating HDL models for real world architectures. We have not considered the optimization and resource sharing issues of our data path components yet. As a result, the execution units consumes 50-60% of the total area and power of the generated hardware model. Our future research includes an improved methodology to generate optimized data path components with shared resources.

9 Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by NSF grants CCR-0203813 and CCR-0205712. We would like to acknowledge Jonas Astrom for his contribution to the synthesizable RTL generation work, and members of the ACES laboratory for their inputs.

References

[1] A. Halambi et al. EXPRESSION: A Language for Architecture Exploration through Compiler/Simulator Retargetability. *Proc. DATE*, Mar. 1999.

[2] A. Hoffmann et al. A Methodology for the Design of Application Specific Instruction Set Processors (ASIP) Using the Machine Description Language LISA. *ICCAD*, 2001.

[3] A. Kejariwal et al. HDLGen: Architecture Description Language driven HDL Generation for Pipelined Processors. CECS TR 03-04, University of California, Irvine, 2003.

[4] http://www.rs.e-technik.tu-darmstadt.de/TUD/res/dlxdocu/SuperscalarDLX.html. *A Superscalar Version of the DLX Processor*.

[5] G. Hadjiyiannis et al. ISDL: An Instruction Set Description Language for Retargetability. *DAC*, 1997.

[6] http://www.motorola.com/SPS/PowerPC. *MPC7400 PowerPC Microprocessor*.

[7] http://www.sgi.com/processors/r10k. *MIPS R10000 Microprocessor*.

[8] http://www.sun.com/microelectronics/UltraSparc-III. *UltraSparc III*.

[9] Improv Inc. *http://www.improvsys.com*.

[10] J. Hennessy and D. Patterson. *Computer Architecture: A quantitative approach*. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc, San Mateo, CA, 1990.

[11] M. Freericks. The nML Machine Description Formalism. TR SM-IMP/DIST/08, TU Berlin CS Dept., 1993.

[12] M. Itoh et al. Synthesizable HDL Generation for Pipelined Processors from a Micro-Operation Description. *IEICE Trans. Fundamentals*, E00-A(3), March 2000.

[13] M. Itoh et al. PEAS-III: An ASIP Design Environment. *ICCD*, 2000.

[14] O. Schliebusch et al. Architecture Implementation using the Machine Description Language LISA. *VLSI Design / ASP-DAC*, 2002.

[15] O. Wahlen et al. Application Specific Compiler/Architecture Codesign: A Case Study. *LCTES-SCOPES*, 2002.

[16] P. Mishra et al. Automatic Verification of In-Order Execution in Microprocessors with Fragmented Pipelines and Multicycle Functional Units. *DATE*, 2002.

[17] P. Mishra et al. Functional Abstraction of Programmable Embedded Systems. UCI-ICS TR 01-04, University of California, Irvine, January 2001.

[18] P. Mishra and N. Dutt. Automatic Functional Test Program Generation for Pipelined Processors using Model Checking. *HLDVT*, 2002.

[19] P. Mishra et al. Functional Abstraction driven Design Space Exploration of Heterogeneous Programmable Architectures. *ISSS*, 2001.

[20] P. Mishra et al. Automatic Modeling and Validation of Pipeline Specifications driven by an Architecture Description Language. *ASPDAC / VLSI Design*, 2002.

[21] R. Leupers and P. Marwedel. Retargetable Code Generation based on Structural Processor Descriptions. *Design Automation for Embedded Systems*, 3(1), 1998.

[22] Synopsys. *http://www.synopsys.com*.

[23] Tensilica Inc. *http://www.tensilica.com*.

[24] Texas Instruments. *TMS320C6201 CPU and Instruction Set Reference Guide*, 1998.

[25] The ARM7 User Manual. *http://www.arm.com*.

[26] http://www.hitachi.com. *The SH-3 DSP RISC Embedded Processor*.

[27] The ST100 DSP-MCU Architecture. *http://www.st.com*.

[28] V. Zivojnovic et al. LISA - Machine Description Language and Generic Machine Model for HW/SW Co-Design. *VLSI Signal Processing*, 1996.