

# **Incorporating Voltage Fluctuations of the Power Distribution Network into the Transient Analysis of CMOS Logic Gates**

### **KEVIN T. TANG1,2 AND EBY G. FRIEDMAN<sup>1</sup>**

*1Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627-0231 2Digital Video Technology, Broadcom Corporation, San Jose, California, CA 95134 E-mail: ktang@broadcom.com; friedman@ece.rochester.edu*

Received August 10, 2000; Revised August 10, 2000; Accepted December 29, 2000

**Abstract.** Decreased power supply levels have reduced the tolerance to voltage changes within power distribution networks in CMOS integrated circuits. High on-chip currents, required to charge and discharge large on-chip loads while operating at high frequencies, produce significant transient *IR* voltage drops within a power distribution network. These transient *IR* voltage drops can affect the propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate, creating delay uncertainty within data paths. Analytical expressions characterizing these transient *IR* voltage drops are presented in this paper. The peak value of these transient *IR* voltage drops is within 6% as compared to SPICE. Circuit- and layout-level design constraints are also discussed to manage the peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops. The propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate based on these analytical expressions is within 5% of SPICE while the estimate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops can exceed 20% for a 20  $\Omega$  power line.

**Key Words:** IR drops, power distribution network, system-on-a-chip

### **I. Introduction**

As modern VLSI technology moves into the very deep submicrometer (VDSM) regime, millions of transistors will be integrated onto a single chip (a system-on-achip), operating at frequencies greater than a gigahertz. The die size is expected to increase from  $400 \text{ mm}^2$ in 1999 to  $1120 \text{ mm}^2$  by 2009 while average on-chip currents will increase from 50 amperes in 1999 to 190 amperes by 2009 [1]. Power distribution networks in high complexity CMOS integrated circuits must be able to provide sufficient current to support an average and peak power demand within all parts of an integrated circuit [2–4]. The large chip dimensions and on-chip average currents require special design strategies to maintain a constant voltage supply within a power distribution network [5,6].

The voltage supply is expected to decrease from 1.8 volts in 1999 to 0.9 volts by 2009 [1], reducing the tolerance to voltage changes within a power distribution network. Because of the lossy characteristics of the metal interconnections in CMOS integrated circuits, *IR* voltage drops within a mesh power distribution structure are no longer negligible [7,8]. For example, metal 4 in the Alpha 21164 provides the power supply for each element within the entire integrated circuit [9]. The thickness of metal 4 is  $1.53 \mu m$ and the pitch is  $6.0 \mu m$  [3]. The average on-chip current is about 15 amperes. The current density is approximately  $1.2 \text{ mA}/\mu\text{m}^2$  and the current is about 5.5 mA for a 3.0  $\mu$ m wide line. For a 9.0 mm long aluminum power line with a resistivity of 4.0  $\mu\Omega$ -cm, a parasitic line resistance of 59  $\Omega$  results in an average *IR* voltage drop of close to 0.33 volts, which is about 10% of the voltage supply (3.3 volts for the Alpha 21164). Transient *IR* voltage drops which occur during logic transitions in a synchronous CMOS integrated circuit are even greater than these average *IR* voltage drops.

Therefore, significant transient *IR* voltage drops can occur in a synchronous CMOS integrated circuit. These *IR* voltage drops can create delay uncertainty within data paths due to momentary changes in the power supply voltage, making the maximum and minimum propagation delays difficult to estimate, such as needed in clock skew scheduling in the design of high performance clock distribution networks [10].

Additional power planes are an effective design technique to reduce transient *IR* voltage drops, decreasing the parasitic resistance associated with a power distribution network.

An analysis of transient *IR* voltage drops is presented in this paper. The MOS transistors are characterized by the *n*th power law I-V model [11]. Analytical expressions describing these transient *IR* voltage drops are developed based on an assumption of a fast ramp input signal. The peak *IR* voltage drops are shown to occur when the input signal completes a transition. The peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops based on the analytical expression is within 6% as compared to SPICE. Circuit- and layout-level design constraints are also addressed to manage the maximum *IR* voltage drops. Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage and propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate are presented for both a capacitive and a resistive-capacitive load, respectively. A propagation delay model based on these analytical expressions is within 5% as compared to SPICE while an estimate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops can reach 20% for a 20  $\Omega$  power line.

Analytical expressions characterizing transient *IR* voltage drops are developed in Section II. A

comparison of the analytical result with SPICE and discussions of circuit- and layout-level constraints are presented in Section III. The effects of transient *IR* voltage drops on the output voltage and propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate are addressed for both a capacitive and a resistive-capacitive load in Section IV followed by some concluding remarks in Section V.

#### **II. Modeling of Transient** *IR* **Voltage Drops**

Transient *IR* voltage drops are caused by a large number of logic gates switching close to the same time in a synchronous integrated circuit. For a switching CMOS logic gate, the current through the power lines is assumed to be *m* times greater than the current through a single CMOS logic gate. This assumption is equivalent to *m* simultaneously triggered logic gates connected to the same power line.

A circuit schematic of *m* simultaneously triggered logic gates, each of which is connected to the same power rail, is depicted in Fig. 1. An analytical expression characterizing the transient *IR* voltage drops on the ground rail is developed in this section for a



*Fig. 1.* Equivalent circuit for analyzing transient *IR* voltage drops.



*Fig. 2.* Operating regions of a CMOS inverter during the high-to-low output transition.

high-to-low output transition.  $R_{V_{ss}}$  is the parasitic resistance of the ground rail. In order to derive an analytical expression characterizing the transient *IR* voltage drops on the power rail, the short-circuit current is neglected based on an assumption of a fast ramp input signal [12],

$$
V_{in}(t) = \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} \quad \text{for } 0 \le t \le \tau_r \tag{1}
$$

permitting the current through the PMOS transistor to be neglected. The regions of operation of a CMOS inverter during a high-to-low output transition are illustrated in Fig 2.

In region I, the input voltage is less than the threshold voltage of the NMOS transistor. The NMOS transistor is OFF and no current flows to the ground rail; therefore, the transient *IR* voltage drops in region I are zero.

Once the input voltage exceeds the threshold voltage of the NMOS transistor, the NMOS transistor turns ON and is assumed to operate solely in the saturation region during the input transition. The drain-to-source current in this region is

$$
I_{DS} = B_n (V_{in} - V_{TN} - m R_{V_{ss}} I_{DS})^{n_n}
$$
 (2)

Assuming that  $m R_{V_{ss}} I_{DS}$  is less than  $V_{in} - V_{TN}$ , the drain-to-source current can be approximated as

$$
I_{DS} = \frac{B_n (V_{in} - V_{TN})^{n_n}}{1 + m R_{V_{ss}} n_n B_n (V_{in} - V_{TN})^{(n_n - 1)}}
$$
(3)

Therefore, the transient *IR* voltage drops in region II are

$$
V_{IR} = m R_{V_{ss}} \frac{B_n \left(\frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN}\right)^{n_n}}{1 + m R_{V_{ss}} n_n B_n \left(\frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN}\right)^{(n_n - 1)}}
$$
  
for  $\tau_n \le t \le \tau_r$  (4)

where  $\tau_n = \frac{V_{TN}}{V_{dd}} \tau_r$ . Transient *IR* voltage drops reach the maximum value at  $t = \tau_r$ ,

$$
V_{IR,\text{max}} = m R_{V_{ss}} \frac{B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n}}{1 + m R_{V_{ss}} B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n - 1}}
$$
(5)

The NMOS transistor is assumed to remain saturated when the input transition is completed, which is the behavior modeled by region III in Fig. 2. The drain-to-source current is a constant, independent of the output voltage. The transient *IR* voltage drops in this region are the same as  $V_{IR, \text{max}}$ .

After  $\tau_{sat}$ , the NMOS transistor operates in the linear region. In order to derive a tractable expression, the drain-to-source current is characterized by  $\gamma_n V_{DS}$ , where  $\gamma_n$  is the effective output conductance of the NMOS transistor. The transient *IR* voltage drops in region IV can be characterized as

$$
V_{IR} = V_{IR,\text{max}}e^{-\alpha(t-\tau_{sat})}
$$
\n(6)

where  $\alpha = \frac{\gamma_n}{C_L(1+m R_{V_{ss}} \gamma_n)}$  and  $C_L$  is the load capacitance. However, the effective output conductance of a MOS transistor also depends upon the output voltage in the linear region, changing from  $\gamma_{nsat}$  to  $2\gamma_{nsat}$  [11]. In order to accurately characterize the transient *IR* voltage drops in the linear region, a value of  $\gamma_n$  is chosen between γ*nsat* and 2γ*nsat*.

## **III. Characteristics of Transient** *IR* **Voltage Drops**

The waveform and peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops based on the analytical expression (5) are compared to SPICE in Section III-A. Circuit- and layout-level design constraints to manage the peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops are discussed in Sections III-B and III-C, respectively.

### *A. Comparison with SPICE*

A comparison of the analytical expression characterizing the waveform of the transient *IR* voltage drops



*Fig. 3.* Comparison of the analytical waveform of transient *IR* voltage drops with SPICE for  $w_n = 1.8 \mu m$ ,  $w_p = 3.6 \mu m$ , and  $m = 10$ .

with SPICE is shown in Fig. 3 for both the  $V_{ss}$  and  $V_{dd}$ rails. The transient *IR* voltage drops at the  $V_{ss}$  rail increase the potential on the  $V_{ss}$  rail, while the transient  $IR$  voltage drops at the  $V_{dd}$  rail decrease the potential on the *V<sub>dd</sub>* rail, as shown in Fig. 3. Thus, the overall voltage swing is decreased, degrading system speed. Transient *IR* voltage drops on the power supply rails increase the effective gate voltage required to turn on the MOS transistors ( $V_{GS} = V_{TN} + V_{IR}$  for the NMOS transistor). Note that the analytical prediction is quite close to SPICE. The difference is caused by the effective output conductance of the MOS transistors changing from  $\gamma_{sat}$  to  $2\gamma_{sat}$  in the linear region [11].

The results of comparing the peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops with SPICE are listed in Tables 1 and 2 for both the high-to-low and low-to-high output transitions, respectively, with  $w_n = 1.8 \,\mu \text{m}$ ,  $w_p = 3.6 \mu \text{m}$ , and  $C_L = 0.1 \text{pF}$ . The peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops based on the analytical expression (5) is within 6% as compared to SPICE.

#### *B. Circuit-Level Constraints*

Assuming the maximum *IR* voltage drops should be less than a critical voltage  $V_c$ , the product of  $m$  and  $R_{V_{ss}}$  must satisfy

$$
m R_{V_{ss}} \leq \frac{V_c}{B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n} - V_c B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n-1}} \tag{7}
$$

*Table 1.* Comparison of peak *IR* voltage drops on the  $V_{ss}$  rail with SPICE.

| $R_{V_{ss}}(\Omega)$ | $\tau_r$ (ps) | $\boldsymbol{m}$ | Analytic (V)   | SPICE (V)      | $\delta$ (%) |
|----------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| 40.0                 | 100           | 20<br>15         | 0.971<br>0.786 | 0.968<br>0.800 | 0.3<br>1.8   |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.569          | 0.595          | 4.4          |
|                      | 150           | 20               | 0.971          | 0.945          | 2.8          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.785          | 0.780          | 0.6          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.568          | 0.578          | 1.7          |
|                      | 200           | 20               | 0.971          | 0.931          | 4.3          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.785          | 0.767          | 1.0          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.568          | 0.569          | 0.2          |
| 30.0                 | 100           | 20               | 0.785          | 0.786          | 0.1          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.626          | 0.641          | 2.3          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.445          | 0.468          | 4.9          |
|                      | 150           | 20               | 0.785          | 0.766          | 2.5          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.626          | 0.624          | 0.3          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.445          | 0.455          | 2.2          |
|                      | 200           | 20               | 0.785          | 0.754          | 4.1          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.626          | 0.614          | 2.0          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.445          | 0.447          | 0.4          |
| 20.0                 | 100           | 20               | 0.568          | 0.571          | 0.5          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.445          | 0.458          | 2.8          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.311          | 0.329          | 5.5          |
|                      | 150           | 20               | 0.568          | 0.556          | 2.2          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.445          | 0.445          | 0.0          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.311          | 0.319          | 2.5          |
|                      | 200           | 20               | 0.568          | 0.546          | 4.0          |
|                      |               | 15               | 0.445          | 0.439          | 1.4          |
|                      |               | 10               | 0.311          | 0.313          | 0.6          |
| Maximum error        |               |                  |                |                | 5.5          |
| Average error        |               |                  |                |                | 2.0          |
|                      |               |                  |                |                |              |

| $R_{V_{dd}}(\Omega)$ | $\tau_f$ (ps) | $\mathfrak{m}$ | Analytic (V) | SPICE (V) | $\delta$ (%) |
|----------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| 40.0                 | 100           | 20             | 4.07         | 3.95      | 3.0          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.23         | 4.13      | 2.4          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.43         | 4.35      | 1.8          |
|                      | 150           | 20             | 4.07         | 3.99      | 2.0          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.23         | 4.16      | 1.7          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.43         | 4.37      | 1.4          |
|                      | 200           | 20             | 4.07         | 4.00      | 1.8          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.23         | 4.18      | 1.2          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.43         | 4.39      | 0.9          |
| 30.0                 | 100           | 20             | 4.23         | 4.13      | 2.4          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.37         | 4.29      | 1.9          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.54         | 4.48      | 1.3          |
|                      | 150           | 20             | 4.23         | 4.16      | 1.7          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.37         | 4.32      | 1.2          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.54         | 4.50      | 0.9          |
|                      | 200           | 20             | 4.23         | 4.18      | 1.2          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.37         | 4.33      | 0.9          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.54         | 4.52      | 0.4          |
| 20.0                 | 100           | 20             | 4.43         | 4.35      | 1.8          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.54         | 4.48      | 1.3          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.67         | 4.63      | 0.8          |
|                      | 150           | 20             | 4.43         | 4.38      | 1.1          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.54         | 4.50      | 0.9          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.67         | 4.65      | 0.4          |
|                      | 20            | 20             | 4.43         | 4.39      | 0.9          |
|                      |               | 15             | 4.54         | 4.52      | 0.4          |
|                      |               | 10             | 4.67         | 4.66      | 0.2          |
| Maximum error        |               |                |              |           | 3.0          |
| Average error        |               |                |              |           | 1.3          |

*Table 2.* Comparison of peak *IR* voltage drops on the  $V_{dd}$  rail with SPICE.



The constraint defined in equation (7) demonstrates that the product of *m* and  $R_{V_{ss}}$  should be less than a constant determined by the right hand side of equation (7). Therefore, the maximum parasitic resistance of a power rail can be determined for a fixed *m*; the maximum number of simultaneously triggered logic gates can also be determined for a target power rail resistance of  $R_{V_{ss}}$  as shown in Fig. 4(a).

#### *C. Layout-Level Constraints*

For a metal interconnection, the parasitic resistance can be expressed as

$$
R = \rho \frac{l}{wt} \tag{8}
$$

where  $\rho$  is the resistivity of the material, and *l*, *w*, and *t* are the length, width, and thickness of the metal line, respectively. In practical CMOS integrated circuits, the current density must be less than a limit set by the electromigration constraint [8]. Therefore, for a metal interconnection with a fixed thickness, the minimum width and maximum length of the metal line can be determined by combining equations (7) and (8). The maximum length of the power supply rail with  $w = 3.0 \,\mu \text{m}$ ,  $t = 1.53 \,\mu$ m, and  $\rho = 4.0 \,\mu\Omega$ -cm is shown in Fig 4(b).

Both equations (7) and (8) provide design guidelines for managing the transient *IR* voltage drops within a power distribution network. The use of additional power planes is an effective design technique to reduce the peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops,



(b) Maximum length of the power supply rail versus the number of simultaneously switching logic gates with  $w = 3.0 \mu \text{m}$ ,  $t = 1.53 \mu \text{m}$ , and  $\rho = 4.0 \mu \Omega$ -cm.

*Fig. 4.* Maximum number of simultaneously switching logic gates and maximum length of the power supply rail for  $V_c = V_{TN}$ .

### 254 *Tang and Friedman*

| <b>Operating Region</b> | <b>Analytical Expressions</b>   |      |
|-------------------------|---|------|
| $[\tau_n, \tau_r]$      | $V_o = V_{dd} - \frac{\tau_r B_n}{C_L (n_n + 1) V_{dd}} \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{(n_n + 1)} + \frac{m R_{V_{ss}} B_n^2 \tau_r}{2 C_L V_{dd}} \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{2 n_n}$ | (9)  |
| $[\tau_r, \tau_{sat}]$  | $V_o = V_o(\tau_r) - \frac{B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n}}{C_L (1 + m R_{V_{ss}} n B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{(n_n-1)})} (t - \tau_r)$   | (10) |
| $t \geq \tau_{sat}$     | $V_o = (V_{sat} + V_{IR,\text{max}})e^{-\frac{\gamma_n}{C_L(1+mR_{V_{SS}}\gamma_n)}(t-\tau_{sat})}$   | (11) |

*Table 3.* Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage with *IR* voltage drops for a capacitive load.

significantly reducing the parasitic resistance associated with a power distribution network.

### **IV. Output Voltage and Propagation Delay**

The effect of transient *IR* voltage drops on the output voltage and propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate is discussed in this section. Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage waveform are developed for both a capacitive and a resistive-capacitive load in Sections IV-A and IV-B, respectively. The propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate based on these analytical expressions is also compared with SPICE.

### *A. Capacitive Load*

Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage of a CMOS logic gate driving a capacitive load are listed in Table 3 based on an assumption of a fast ramp input signal.  $\tau_{sat}$  is the time when the NMOS transistor starts to operate in the linear region and is determined from equation (10). The analytical results are compared to both SPICE and the analytical prediction without considering *IR* voltage drops in Fig. 5. Note that transient *IR* voltage drops affect the propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate. Therefore, delay uncertainty caused by transient *IR* voltage drops should be included when analyzing the timing of critical data paths [10].

The drain-to-source saturation voltage is typically greater than  $0.5V_{dd}$ , therefore, the high-to-low propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate can be expressed as

$$
t_{P_{HL}} = \frac{C_L (1 + mR_{V_{ss}} \gamma_n)}{\gamma_n} \ln \frac{2(V_{sat} + V_{IR,\text{max}})}{V_{dd}}
$$

$$
+ \tau_{sat} - \frac{\tau_r}{2}
$$
(12)

The error of the propagation delay model of a CMOS logic gate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops is illustrated in Fig. 6. A comparison of the propagation delay based on equation (12) with both SPICE and an estimate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops is listed in Tables 4 and 5



*Fig. 5.* Comparison of the analytical output voltage with SPICE,  $w_n = 1.8 \mu$ m,  $w_p = 3.6 \mu$ m, and  $m = 10$ .



*Fig. 6.* Error of the propagation delay model of a CMOS logic gate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops with  $\tau_r = 150 \text{ ps}$ ,  $w_n = 1.8 \mu \text{m}$ , and  $w_p = 3.6 \,\mu \text{m}$ .

*Table 4.* High-to-low propagation delay with *IR* voltage drops for a capacitive load.

|                  | Table 5. Low-to-high propagation delay with IR voltage drops for a |  |  |  |
|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| capacitive load. |  |  |  |  |



## 256 *Tang and Friedman*

| <b>Operating Region</b> | <b>Analytical Expressions</b>   |      |
|-------------------------|---|------|
| $[\tau_n, \tau_r]$      | $V_o = V_{dd} - \frac{\tau_r B_n}{C_L (n_n + 1) V_{dd}} \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{(n_n + 1)} + \frac{m R_{V_{ss}} B_n^2 \tau_r}{2 C_L V_{dd}} \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{2 n_n}$ |      |
|                         | $-R_L \left  B_n \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{n_n} - m R_{V_{ss}} n_n B_n^2 \left( \frac{t}{\tau_r} V_{dd} - V_{TN} \right)^{(2n_n-1)} \right $   | (13) |
| $[\tau_r, \tau_{sat}]$  | $V_o = V_o(\tau_r) - \frac{B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{n_n}}{C_L (1 + m R_{V_{ss}} n B_n (V_{dd} - V_{TN})^{(n_n - 1)})} (t - \tau_r)$   | (14) |
| $t \geq \tau_{sat}$     | $V_o = (V_{sat} + V_{IR, max})e^{-\frac{r n}{C_L(1 + m R_{V_{SS}} \gamma_n + R_L \gamma_n)}(t - \tau_{sat})}$   | (15) |

*Table 6.* Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage with *IR* voltage drops for a resistive-capacitive load.

for the high-to-low and low-to-high output transitions, respectively. Note that the maximum error of the proposed delay model is within 3% as compared to 20% when transient *IR* voltage drops are not considered (for a 20  $\Omega$  power line which is equivalent to a resistance of a 0.23 cm long power line with  $w = 3.0 \,\mu \text{m}$ ,  $t = 1.53 \,\mu \text{m}$ , and  $\rho = 4.0 \,\mu \Omega \text{-cm}$ .

#### *B. Resistive-Capacitive Load*

In this discussion, the interconnect is characterized by a lumped resistive-capacitive model.  $R_L$  is the load resistance of the interconnect. Analytical expressions describing the waveform of the output voltage are depicted in Table 6 based on the same assumption made in section IV-A while  $\tau_{sat}$  is determined by equation (14).

If the drain-to-source saturation voltage is greater than  $0.5V_{dd}$ , the high-to-low propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate is

$$
t_{P_{HL}} = \frac{C_L (1 + mR_{V_{ss}} \gamma_n + R_L \gamma_n)}{\gamma_n} \ln \frac{2(V_{sat} + V_{IR,\text{max}})}{V_{dd}}
$$

$$
+ \tau_{sat} - \frac{\tau_r}{2}
$$
(16)

A comparison of the propagation delay based on equation (16) with both SPICE and an estimate without considering transient *IR* voltage drops is listed in Tables 7 and 8 for the high-to-low and low-to-high output transitions, respectively. Note that the maximum error of the proposed delay model is within 2% as compared to about 23% for  $\tau_f = 100 \text{ ps and } m = 20$ when transient *IR* voltage drops are not considered





| Condition                  |                  |                  |                      |                   | Analytic             |                   |                    |
|----------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| $R_{V_{dd}}$<br>$(\Omega)$ | $\tau_f$<br>(ps) | $\boldsymbol{m}$ | <b>SPICE</b><br>(ps) | Wo IR<br>(ps)     | $\delta$<br>$(\%)$   | Wi IR<br>(ps)     | $\delta$<br>$(\%)$ |
| 40.0                       | 100              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 232<br>210<br>188    | 144<br>144<br>144 | 37.9<br>31.4<br>23.4 | 231<br>206<br>184 | 0.4<br>1.9<br>2.1  |
|                            | 150              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 240<br>219<br>197    | 154<br>154<br>154 | 35.8<br>29.6<br>21.8 | 243<br>217<br>194 | 1.3<br>0.9<br>1.5  |
|                            | 200              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 250<br>227<br>206    | 163<br>163<br>163 | 34.8<br>28.2<br>20.9 | 256<br>228<br>204 | 2.4<br>0.4<br>1.0  |
| 30.0                       | 100              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 210<br>194<br>177    | 144<br>144<br>144 | 31.4<br>25.8<br>18.6 | 206<br>189<br>174 | 1.9<br>2.6<br>1.7  |
|                            | 150              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 219<br>203<br>186    | 154<br>154<br>154 | 29.7<br>24.1<br>17.2 | 217<br>200<br>184 | 0.9<br>1.5<br>1.1  |
|                            | 200              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 227<br>211<br>195    | 163<br>163<br>163 | 28.2<br>22.7<br>16.4 | 228<br>210<br>193 | 0.4<br>0.5<br>1.0  |
| 20.0                       | 100              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 188<br>177<br>166    | 144<br>144<br>144 | 23.4<br>18.6<br>13.3 | 184<br>174<br>164 | 2.1<br>1.7<br>1.2  |
|                            | 150              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 197<br>186<br>175    | 154<br>154<br>154 | 21.8<br>17.2<br>12.0 | 194<br>184<br>174 | 1.5<br>1.1<br>0.6  |
|                            | 200              | 20<br>15<br>10   | 206<br>195<br>184    | 163<br>163<br>163 | 20.9<br>16.4<br>11.4 | 204<br>193<br>183 | 1.0<br>1.0<br>0.5  |
| Maximum error              |                  |                  |                      | 37.9              |                      | 2.4               |                    |
|                            | Average error    |                  |                      |                   | 17.8                 | 1.3               |                    |

*Table 8.* Low-to-high propagation delay with *IR* voltage drops for a resistive-capacitive load.

(assuming a 20  $\Omega$  power line which is equivalent to a resistance of a 0.23 cm long power line with  $w = 3.0 \,\mu$ m,  $t = 1.53 \mu \text{m}$ , and  $\rho = 4.0 \mu \Omega \text{-cm}$ .

#### **V. Conclusions**

Analytical delay and design constraint expressions characterizing transient *IR* voltage drops are presented in this paper. The peak *IR* voltage drops occur when the input signal completes a transition (for a fast ramp input signal). The peak value of the transient *IR* voltage drops based on the analytical expression is within 6% as compared to SPICE. Analytical expressions characterizing the output voltage and propagation delay of a CMOS logic gate are also presented for a capacitive and a resistive-capacitive load, respectively. The propagation delay model based on these analytical expressions is within 5% of SPICE while the delay model without considering *IR* voltage drops can reach 20% for a 20  $\Omega$ power line. Circuit- and layout-level design constraints are also addressed to manage the maximum value of the transient *IR* voltage drops, providing guidelines for the design of power distribution networks. Additional power planes are one effective design technique to reduce transient *IR* voltage drops, significantly reducing the parasitic resistance associated with a power distribution network.

### **Acknowledgments**

This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation under Grant No. MIP-9610108, the Semiconductor Research Corporation under Contract No. 99-TJ-687, a grant from the New York State Science and Technology Foundation to the Center for Advanced Technology–Electronic Imaging Systems, and by grants from Xerox Corporation, IBM Corporation, Intel Corporation, Lucent Technologies Corporation, and Eastman Kodak Company.

#### **References**

- 1. Semiconductor Industry Association, "The national technology roadmap for semiconductors," 1997.
- 2. Dobberpuhl, D. W., et al., "A 200-MHz 64-bit dual-issue CMOS microprocessor." *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* SC-27(11), pp. 1555–1565, November 1992.
- 3. Bowhill, W. J., et al., "Circuit implementation of a 300-MHz 64-bit second-generation CMOS alpha CPU." *Digital Technical Journal* 7(1), pp. 100–118, 1995.
- 4. Bailey, D. W. and Benschneider, B. J., "Clocking design and analysis for a 600-MHz alpha microprocessor." *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* SC-33(11), pp. 1627–1633, November 1998.
- 5. SRC, "SRC physical design top ten problem." Technical Report, SRC Physical Design Task Force, Semiconductor Research Corporation, November 1998.
- 6. SRC, "Design sciences TAB: physical design task force report." Technical Report, Semiconductor Research Corporation Physical Design Task Force, Semiconductor Research Corporation, April 1997.
- 7. Jiang, Y.-M. and Cheng, K.-T., "Analysis of performance impact caused by power supply noise in deep submicron devices," in

#### 258 *Tang and Friedman*

*Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM Design Automation Conference,* pp. 760–765, June 1999.

- 8. Song, W. S. and Glasser, L. A., "Power distribution techniques for VLSI circuits." *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* SC-21(1), pp. 150–156, February 1986.
- 9. Gronowski, P. E., et al., "High-performance microprocessor design." *IEEE Journal of Solid-State Circuits* SC-33(5), pp. 676– 686, May 1998.
- 10. Friedman, E. G., *High Performance Clock Distribution Networks*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997.
- 11. Sakurai, T. and Newton, A. R., "A simple MOSFET model for circuit analysis." *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices* ED-38(4), pp. 887–894, April 1991.
- 12. Hedenstierna, N. and Jeppson, K. O., "CMOS circuits speed and buffer optimization." *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* CAD-6(2), pp. 270– 280, March 1987.



**Tianwen (Kevin) Tang** received the B.E. degree in electrical engineering from Tsinghua University, Beijing, China in 1991 and the M.E. degree in electrical & electronics engineering from Nanyang Technological University, Singapore in 1997. He received both the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees in electrical engineering from the University of Rochester, New York, in 1998 and 2000, respectively.

He is currently working as a staff design scientist in Digital Video Technology Division in Broadcom Corporation, San Jose, California. His research interests include clock skew scheduling, clock tree synthesis, interconnect coupling noise, transient *IR* voltage drops, simultaneous switching noise, and mixed digital/analog circuit design. He is the author of 26 technical papers.



**Eby G. Friedman** received the B.S. degree from Lafayette College in 1979, and the M.S. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of California, Irvine, in 1981 and 1989, respectively, all in electrical engineering.

From 1979 to 1991, he was with Hughes Aircraft Company, rising to the position of the manager of the Signal Processing Design and Test Department, responsible for the design and test of high performance digital and analog IC's. He has been with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering at the University of Rochester since 1991, where he is a professor, the Director of the High Performance VLSI/IC Design and Analysis Laboratory, and the Director of the Center for Electronic Imaging Systems. His current research and teaching interests are in high performance synchronous digital and mixed-signal microelectronic design and analysis with application to high speed portable processors and low power wireless communications.

He is the author of about 150 papers and book chapters and the author or editor of four books in the fields of high speed and low power CMOS design techniques, high speed interconnect, and the theory and application of synchronous clock distribution networks. Dr. Friedman is a Regional Editor of the *Journal of Circuits, Systems, and Computers,* a member of the editorial board of *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Analog and Digital Signal Processing and Analog Integrated Circuits and Signal Processing,* a member of the CAS BoG, Chair of the *IEEE Transactions on VLSI Systems* steering committee, CAS liaison to the Solid-State Circuits Society, Program Co-chair of the 2000 SiSP conference, and a member of the technical program committee of a number of conferences. He previously was a member of the editorial board of the *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems II: Analog and Digital Signal Processing,* Chair of the VLSI Systems and

Applications CAS Technical Committee, Chair of the Electron Devices Chapter of the IEEE Rochester Section, Chair for VLSI track for ISCAS '96 and '97, Technical Co-Chair of the 1997 International Workshop on Clock Distribution Networks, Editor of several special issues in a variety of journals, and a recipient of the Howard Hughes Masters and Doctoral Fellowships, an IBM University Research Award, an Outstanding Chapter Chairman award, and a University of Rochester College of Engineering Teaching Excellence Award. Dr. Friedman is also a Fulbright scholar and an IEEE fellow.