# IBIS Model Simulation Accuracy Improvement by Including PSIJ Effect

Yifan Ding\*, Yin Sun<sup>#</sup>, Randy Wolff<sup>+</sup>, Zhiping Yang<sup>^</sup>, Chulsoon Hwang<sup>\*</sup>

Center and the second s

CENTER FOR

CENTER FOR

\*Missouri S&T EMC Laboratory, #Zhejiang Lab, +Micron, ^Waymo

> Asian IBIS Virtual Summit (China) November 4, 2022

#### Outline

#### I. Introduction

- Power Supply Induced Jitter
- Limitation of the Current Power-Aware IBIS Model

#### **II. Jitter Sensitivity Based Modification**

• Ku/Kd Modification Based on PSIJ Sensitivity

#### **III. Simulation Validation**

- 8 Stage Inverter Chain with Different Loads
- DDRx DQ Tx Buffer with Pre-driver with Different Terminals

#### **IV. Conclusion**

## Power Supply Induced Jitter (PSIJ)

Power supply induced jitter (PSIJ):

• The time variation in the output transition edges from ideal positions due to the voltage fluctuations on power rail.



- The Vcc noise can take effect during the propagation delay time range;
- The influence is accumulated, just considering instantaneous voltage value is not accurate.



Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

#### Limitations of the Current Power-Aware IBIS Model

• <u>**Cannot**</u> account for the delay change caused by power noise correctly.



Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

#### Limitations of the Current Power-Aware IBIS Model

• Power-aware IBIS model considers gate modulation effect, ratio modification on Ku, Kd based on power rail voltage value

#### Gate Modulation Coefficients

The ST "Gate Modulation" solution is based on the introduction of two coefficients, one for the Pullup and one for the Pulldown stage, which modulate properly the IBIS standard current (I\_IBIS-STD) when a bouncing noise occurs on the power and ground nodes



$$K_{d}(t)I_{pd} \rightarrow K_{sspd}(V_{pd})K_{d}(t)I_{pd}$$
$$K_{u}(t)I_{pu} \rightarrow K_{sspu}(V_{pu})K_{u}(t)I_{pu}$$

$$K_{sspd} \left( V_{pd} \right) = \frac{V_{pd}}{I_{sspd} \left( 0 \right)}$$
$$K_{sspu} \left( V_{pu} \right) = \frac{V_{pu}}{I_{sspu} \left( 0 \right)}$$

Source: "BIRD 98 and ST 'Gate Modulation' Convergence", IBIS Open Forum Teleconference, Jan. 26<sup>th</sup>, 2007 http://www.ibis.org/docs/BIRD98&ST\_Proposal\_Convergence.ppt

The ratio modification Ksspd, Ksspu on Ku, Kd is only a function of V<sub>pd</sub> (Vcc-Vout) or V<sub>pu</sub> (Vout-Vgnd), it cannot reflect the effect of power rail voltage noise on switching edge timing change

Previous method on modification of Ku, Kd does not consider the time averaged effect; Source: Behavioral modeling of jitter due to power supply noise for input/output buffers (US Patent 9842177B1)

### Previous Proposed Behavior Model

- Modify Ku(t), Kd(t) as a function of **time averaged** power rail voltage Vcc(t); introduce correction coefficient B and A as a function of time  $K_u(t) = K_{u0}(t) + B_u(t) \cdot \left[ \frac{\int_0^t V_{cc}(\tau) d\tau}{t} - V_{cc0} \right] + A_u(t) \left[ \frac{\int_0^t V_{cc}(\tau) d\tau}{t} - V_{cc0} \right]^2$  t, time elapsed since switching  $K_{d}(t) = K_{d0}(t) + B_{d}(t) \cdot \left[ \frac{\int_{0}^{t} V_{cc}(\tau) d\tau}{t} - V_{cc0} \right] + A_{d}(t) \left[ \frac{\int_{0}^{t} V_{cc}(\tau) d\tau}{t} - V_{cc0} \right]^{2}$ Input switching happens, time=0 Achieved by adding delay elements that store The time of switching edges Ku, Kd under Quadratic fitting Averaged Vcc(t) after the Linear fitting nominal Vcc Time averaged Vcc since coefficient coefficient switching event happens; switching event happens
- 2 equations, 2 unknowns' algorithm to extract Ku(t), Kd(t) for typ/min/max

 $K_{u}(t)*I_{u}(V_{1}) + K_{d}(t)*I_{d}(V_{1}) = I_{out}(V_{1})$  $K_{u}(t)*I_{u}(V_{2}) + K_{d}(t)*I_{d}(V_{2}) = I_{out}(V_{2})$ 

• 2 equations, 2 unknowns' algorithm to extract Bu(t), Au(t) and Bd(t), Ad(t)

 $K_{u_{max}}(t) = K_{u0}(t) + B_u(t)(V_{cc_{max}} - V_{cc0}) + A_u(t)(V_{cc_{max}} - V_{cc0})^2$  $K_{u_{min}}(t) = K_{u0}(t) + B_u(t)(V_{cc_{min}} - V_{cc0}) + A_u(t)(V_{cc_{min}} - V_{cc0})^2$ 

Ku/Kd correction coefficients B and A are related to Process, Voltage and
Temperature instead of only the supply voltage fluctuation.

Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

Y. Sun and C. Hwang, "Improving Power Supply Induced Jitter Simulation Accuracy for IBIS Model," 2021 IEEE International Joint EMC/SI/PI and EMC Europe Symposium, 2021, pp. 1127-1132, doi: 10.1109/EMC/SI/PI/EMCEurope52599.2021.9559139.

#### DC Jitter Sensitivity

• Jitter sensitivity can be applied to calculate the total jitter



Y. Sun, J. Lee and C. Hwang, "A Generalized Power Supply Induced Jitter Model Based on Power Supply Rejection Ratio Response," in IEEE Transactions on Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) Systems, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 1052-1060, June 2021, doi: 10.1109/TVLSI.2021.3072799.

Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

#### Ku/Kd Modification Based on PSIJ Sensitivity

• Propose to use Jitter sensitivity to do modification



 $\Delta t = (Driver output PSIJ sensitivity - original IBIS PSIJ sensitivity + pre-driver PSIJ sensitivity) * (Vdd_max - Vdd_typ)$ 

#### Simulation Validation – Inverter Chain

• 8 stage inverter chain with different load capacitance



< All NMO5>	< All FMOS.
nch_tn	pch_tn
<b>W</b> = 1 um	W = 2 um
L = 180 nm	L = 180 nm

### Results Comparison – Inverter Chain Output Rising Edge

- 8 stage inverter chain with different load capacitance
- DC power noise 1.7V/1.8V/1.9V

	PSIJ Sensitivity (ps/V)					
	Load 1pF to V <sub>SS</sub>		Load 2pF to $V_{SS}$		Load 10pF to V <sub>SS</sub>	
SPICE	184.45		207		350	
Non-Power-aware IBIS	6.5		9.5		39.5	
Power-aware IBIS	35.5		54		217	
Proposed Algorithm	187		210.5		355	
	Δ (to SPICE)					
	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%
Non-Power-aware IBIS	177.95	96.48	197.5	95.41	310.9	88.71
Power-aware IBIS	148.95	80.75	153	73.91	133	38
Proposed Algorithm	2.55	1.38	3.5	1.69	5	1.43

### Results Comparison – Inverter Chain Output Falling Edge

- 8 stage inverter chain with different load capacitance
- DC power noise 1.7V/1.8V/1.9V

	PSIJ Sensitivity (ps/V)					
	Load 1pF to V <sub>SS</sub>		Load 2pF to $V_{SS}$		Load 10pF to V <sub>SS</sub>	
SPICE	193.91		194.16		188.71	
Non-Power-aware IBIS	-24.41		-36.07		-123.21	
Power-aware IBIS	-25		-35		-135	
Proposed Model	188.95		186.75		175.85	
	Δ (to SPICE)					
	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%	Absolute diff (ps/V)	%
Non-Power-aware IBIS	218.32	112.59	230.23	118.58	311.92	165.29
Power-aware IBIS	218.91	112.89	229.16	118.03	323.71	171.53
Proposed Model	4.96	2.56	7.41	3.82	12.86	6.81

#### **Output Waveform Comparison**



Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

### Simulation Validation -- DDRx DQ Tx Buffer

• DDRx DQ Tx Buffer with Pre-driver



https://ibis.org/atm\_wip/archive/20211026/randywolff/Output%20Buffer%20PSIJ%20Analysis/Micron\_PSIJ\_Analysis\_for\_IBIS\_ATM.pdf

Missouri S&T Electromagnetic Compatibility Laboratory

#### Pre-driver Included in Model

SPICE transistor level simulation

IBIS behavior model simulation can not simulate with pre-driver

Proposed model simulation



### Results Comparison – DDRx DQ Tx Buffer Output Rising

- DDRx DQ Tx Buffer with Pre-Driver
- DC power noise 1.045V/1.1V/1.155V

	PSIJ Sensitivity (ps/V)					
	Load 50 ohm t	ad 50 ohm to V <sub>SS</sub> Load 50 ohm to V <sub>DDQ</sub> (variable)		Load 50 ohm to V <sub>DDQ</sub> (Fixed 1.1V)		
SPICE	156.65		134.17		95.45	
Non-Power-aware IBIS	15.45		38.18		6.36	
Power-aware IBIS	60		45.45		14.55	
Proposed Model	159.09		147.27		107.27	
	Δ (to SPICE)					
	Absolute error (ps/V)	%	Absolute error (ps/V)	%	Absolute error (ps/V)	%
Non-Power-aware IBIS	141.2	90.14	95.99	71.54	89.09	93.34
Power-aware IBIS	96.65	61.70	88.72	66.13	80.9	84.76
Proposed Model	2.44	1.56	13.1	8.9	11.82	12.38

#### Conclusion

- A behavior model based on driver DC jitter sensitivity is proposed to improve the IBIS simulation accuracy in time domain.
- Time averaged effect on power rail is considered.
- Pre-driver PSIJ effect can be included in IBIS simulation.