CP ASIC/FPGA PDR — Summary

- □ 1-day review on Tuesday 25th January
- Reviewers: Paul Bright-Thomas
 Ullrich Pfeiffer
 Sam Silverstein
 Richard Staley
- **E-mail comments from reviewers to Viraj in advance**
- Viraj presented summary of the specifications and addressed major points from the reviewers
- A revised specifications document, incorporating most of the pre-review proposed changes, is already in preparation – draft available to reviewers
- □ List of recommendations discussed with Viraj at the end of the review

Summary:

- 1. <u>Error-monitoring</u> concern about inability to identify rapidly which input channel is producing parity errors
 - → add a 42-bit error register set by parity errors to indicate suspect channel

2. Saturation of digital sums

- → specifications must define clearly how digital arithmetic treats saturation
- 3. Isolation thresholds
 - → include logic to ensure that setting isolation threshold to FF is equivalent to turning isolation off
- 4. FIFO control
 - → add input signal ("FIFO flush") to empty FIFO on demand from CPM Read-out Controller (to guarantee correct shadowing of ROC FIFO)
- 5. <u>Unused inputs</u> it is essential that where serial inputs are not driven *(e.g. at \eta extremes)* their data are set to zero, but this would generate permanent parity errors
 - → add a mask register to disable parity-checking for unused channels
 - → confirm that the Serialising FPGA sends all-zero bitstreams when fed from a non-driven LVDS Rx
- Input data monitoring considerable concern expressed about difficulty of monitoring incoming data only via scan path technique
 - → explore alternative techniques e.g. by loading new configuration file into chip (only if FPGA)

7. ASIC vs FPGA

→ include some indications in the specifications about the criteria for choosing between ASIC or FPGA implementations (latency-cost trade-off, etc.)

8. <u>Schedule issues</u>

→ specifications must include details of how the CP ASIC/FPGA design-manufacture-test schedule meshes with the similar schedules for the Serialising FPGA and CPM prototype

Conclusions from the two reviews:

- Combining pre-review written comments (via e-mail)
 with a full 1-day meeting was very successful
- □ This was a much more effective way of reviewing designs that was used last year *(e-mail alone)*
- Most valuable feature was the dialogue between reviewers and designer(s)
- Several points emerged which had not previously been noticed, only because of the interaction of discussions
- □ This will serve as a model for all future reviews