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Introduction

- Content addressable memories (CAMs) are widely used in digital systems
  - E.g., router, cryptography, etc.
- With the advent technology, large CAMs can be embedded into system-on-chips (SOCs)
  - Performance and power consumption of CAMs can significantly be improved
- However, testing embedded CAMs is difficult due to poor accessibility
- Moreover, CAM testing is more difficult than RAM testing, since CAM cell structure is more complicated
Difference Between RAM and CAM

RAM
- Address
- R/W
- Data

CAM
- Data
- Cmd
- Hit
- Address
Typical CAM Architecture

- Comparand Register
- Mask Register
- Address Decoder
- Data I/O
- Priority Encoder

Comparison:

- Word 0
- Word 1
- Word 2
- Word N-1

- VB 0
- VB 1
- VB 2
- VB N-1

Hit: $M_0 | M_1 | ... | M_{N-1}$

- Address Decoder
- Data I/O

Hit Signal Generator:

- Highest Priority
- Matched Address
Basic Components

- **Comparand Register**
  - It contains the data to be compared with the content of the memory array

- **Mask Register**
  - It is used to mask off portions of the data word(s) which do not participate in the operations

- **Memory Array**
  - It provides storage and search (compare) medium for data

- **Hit Signal Generator/Priority Encoder**
  - It indicates success or failure of a compare operation
Binary CAM (BCAM)

- Binary CAM
  - It is comprised of binary CAM cells and each cell only can store “0” or “1”
- A typical NOR-type binary CAM cell

![Binary CAM Diagram](image-url)
An NOR-Type BCAM Word

Comparison logic
CAM Functional Faults

- Functional faults of CAM
  - RAM faults
  - Comparison faults

- Comparison fault
  - Fault effect is observed by the output of comparison results

- CAM basic operations
  - Write and Compare operations only
    - Testing is more difficult since the observability is poor
  - Write, Read, and Compare operations
    - Testing is more easy since the observability is good
Comparison Faults of BCAMs

- Comparison faults of BCAM
  - Stuck-Match Fault (SMF)
  - Stuck-Mismatch Fault (SMMF)
  - Conditional-Match Fault (CMF)
  - Partial-Match Fault (PMF)
  - Equivalence-Mismatch Fault (EMMF)
  - Inequivalence-Match Fault (IMF)

[Source: K.-J. Lin and C.-W. Wu, IEEE TCAD00]
SMF & SMMF

- SMF (SMMF): a cell always matches (mismatches) the corresponding input bit irrespective of the CAM cell state and input pattern
- E.g., $q$ and $bit$ short
  - SMF
- E.g., T5 stuck-on
  - SMMF
A cell function is correct if it stores a logic value $x$ (either 0 or 1), but it always provides an incorrect result for the subsequently Compare operations if it stores $x'$.

E.g., $bit'$-cmp short

- CM1F
A cell is stuck-matched for all subsequent Compare operations when a logic value $x$ is written into the cell, and stuck-mismatched when $x'$ is written into it.

E.g., $q$ and $cmp$ short

- PM0F
EMMF

- The Compare operation fails if the CAM cell stores a value \( x \) and is compared with the same input value \( x \)
- E.g., T4 stuck-on
  - EMM0F
IMF

- The Compare operation fails if the CAM cell stores a value $x$ and is compared with the complementary input value $x'$
- E.g., $\text{bit}$ and GND short
  - IM0F

![Diagram of IM0F circuit]
Cell Response of Comparison Faults

- Cell responses of a BCAM cell executing compare-after-write operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fault Free</th>
<th>$w_0, c_0$</th>
<th>$w_0, c_1$</th>
<th>$w_1, c_0$</th>
<th>$w_1, c_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMMF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM1F</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM0F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM1F</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM0F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMM1F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMM0F</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM1F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM0F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: K.-J. Lin and C.-W. Wu, IEEE TCAD00]
Notation for Test Algorithms

- \( wA \): write an input pattern \( A \) to a given word and validate the word
- \( rA \): read an expect data \( A \) from the addressed word
- \( cPA \): compare an input pattern \( P_A \) with all words
- \( E \) (Erase): reset the valid bit of a specified word, i.e., invalidate the word

A masked input pattern is an input pattern filtered by a mask pattern

- Every masked input pattern has the form \( P_A^M \), where \( P_M \) is the mask pattern
March-Like Test Algorithms

Test algorithms

- \( T_{\text{CAM}}^1 = \{ \langle \text{w1}; (cP_0^{\omega(0)}, cP_0^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_0^{\omega(W-1)}) \rangle \} \)
- \( T_{\text{CAM}}^2 = \{ \langle \text{w0}, cP_0, \text{w1} \rangle \} \)
- \( T_{\text{CAM}}^3 = \{ \langle \text{w0}; (cP_1^{\omega(0)}, cP_1^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_1^{\omega(W-1)}) \rangle \} \)
- \( T_{\text{CAM}}^4 = \{ \langle \text{w1}, cP_1, \text{w0} \rangle \} \)

where \( \omega(i) = 2^W - 1 - 2^i \) for a CAM with \( W \)-bit words

[Source: K.-J. Lin and C.-W. Wu, IEEE TCAD00]
### Faults Detected by Test 1

- $T_{CAM}^1 = \{ \varnothing (wl); (cP_0^{\omega(0)}, cP_0^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_0^{\omega(W-1)}) \}$

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Detected faults**
  - SMF
  - CM0F
  - IM1F
Faults Detected by Test 2

- $T_{CAM}^2 = \{\uparrow (w0, cP_0, w1)\}$

- Detected faults:
  - SMMF
  - PMF
  - EMM0F
CAM Test with Read & Compare

- If a CAM has both Read and Compare operations, the test length can be reduced
  
  \[ MLT - 1 = \{ \uparrow (w1); \uparrow (w0, cP_0, w1); \uparrow (r1, w0); \]
  \[ (cP_1^{\omega(0)}, cP_1^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_1^{\omega(W-1)}); \downarrow (w1, cP_1, w0); \]
  \[ \downarrow (r0, w1); (cP_0^{\omega(0)}, cP_0^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_0^{\omega(W-1)}) \}\]

- The intra-word coupling faults are not fully covered by the MLT-1

- The proposed MLT-2 test algorithm for the intra-word CFs is as shown below
  
  \[ MLT - 2 = \{ \uparrow (wD); \uparrow (w\overline{D}); (cP_D^{\omega(0)}, cP_D^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_D^{\omega(W-1)}); \]
  \[ \uparrow (wD); (cP_D^{\omega(0)}, cP_D^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_D^{\omega(W-1)}) \}\]

  where D={0011,0101} for 4-bit words

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
Faults Detected by MLT-1

Fault-free status when element \( \uparrow (w_0, cP_0, w_1) \) is executed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>( W_0 ) addressed</th>
<th>( W_1 ) addressed</th>
<th>( W_2 ) addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( w_0 )</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_1 )</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_2 )</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( cP_0 )</td>
<td>000 (1)</td>
<td>111 (0)</td>
<td>111 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_1 )</td>
<td>000 (1)</td>
<td>111 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_2 )</td>
<td>111 (0)</td>
<td>000 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( w_1 )</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_1 )</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( W_2 )</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test element can detect the SAFs and interword CFs whose victims are forced to 1. The aggressors of the CFs undergo the \( \uparrow \) transition and are located at lower addresses than the victims. Also, the SMMF, PMF, EMMF, and XMMF can be detected since they cause the match signals to become mismatched and the Hit output is 0.

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
Faults Detected by MLT-1

Fault-free status when element $\uparrow (r1, w0)$ is executed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation</th>
<th>$W_0$ addressed</th>
<th>$W_1$ addressed</th>
<th>$W_2$ addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r1$</td>
<td>$W_0$ 111 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$W_1$ 111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$W_2$ 111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w0$</td>
<td>$W_0$ 000 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$W_1$ 111 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$W_2$ 111 (x)</td>
<td>111 (x)</td>
<td>000 (x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test element can detect the inter-word CFid where the aggressors are located at higher addresses than the victims and the inter-word CFid where the aggressors are located at lower addresses than the victims. SAF(0) and inter-word CFst where the aggressors are in state 0 and at lower addresses than the victims or in state 1 and at higher addresses than the victims also can be detected.

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
Faults Detected by MLT-1

Fault-free status when element $(cP_1^{\omega(0)}, cP_1^{\omega(1)}, \ldots, cP_1^{\omega(W-1)})$ is executed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content $(M_i)$</th>
<th>$cP_1^6$</th>
<th>$cP_1^5$</th>
<th>$cP_1^3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$W_0$</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_1$</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$W_2$</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
<td>000 (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This test element can detect the SMF, CMF, and IMF. Any other fault that forces the cell state to become 1 can also be detected, e.g., SAF(1) and the CF whose aggressor is 0 or undergoes a $\downarrow$ transition to turn the victim into 1.

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
Fault-Location Tests

- Algorithms for locating the faulty cells in a row
  - \( FLR - 0 = \{ \uparrow (E); w0; (cP^\omega(0), cP^\omega(1), \ldots, cP^\omega(W-1)) \} \)
  - \( FLR - 1 = \{ \uparrow (E); w1; (cP^\omega(0), cP^\omega(1), \ldots, cP^\omega(W-1)) \} \)

```plaintext
Valid bit  w0   cP^\omega(0)  cP^\omega(1)  cP^\omega(2)

1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0
1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0
1 1 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 1
```

\( WcPcPcPwEFLR \| w0 \| w1 \)
## Fault-Location Tests

- Algorithms for locating the faulty cells in a column
  - $FLC - 0 = \{(\uparrow (E);(w0,cP^M_1,E))\}$
  - $FLC - 1 = \{(\uparrow (E);(w1,cP^M_0,E))\}$
  - $M$ is the same as the mask pattern of the Compare operation detecting the faulty column

- For example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid bit</th>
<th>$(w0,cP^0_1,E)$</th>
<th>$(w0,cP^0_1,E)$</th>
<th>$(w0,cP^0_1,E)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W₀ addressed</td>
<td>W₁ addressed</td>
<td>W₂ addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experimental Results

- Fault coverage for comparison faults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SMF</th>
<th>SMMF</th>
<th>CMF</th>
<th>PMF</th>
<th>EMMF</th>
<th>IMF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{CAM}}$</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT-1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fault coverage for RAM faults

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SAF</th>
<th>TF</th>
<th>$CF_{st}$</th>
<th>$CF_{id}$</th>
<th>$CF_{in}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$T_{\text{CAM}}$</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT-1</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLT1+MLT-2</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
CAM BIST/BISD Implementation

[Source: J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tzeng and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03]
Testing Priority Encoder Faults of CAMs

[Source: J.-F. Li, ITC05]
Previous Works on CAM Testing

Testing of binary CAMs

- P. Mazumder, et al., IEEE TCAD, 1988—test NPSFs in binary CAMs
- K.-J. Lin and C.-W. Wu, IEEE TCAD00; P. R. Sidorowicz and J. A. Brzozowski, IEEE TCAD02—fault modeling & comparison fault testing
- J. Zhao, et al., IEEE TC00—comparison and RAM fault testing for single-port and two-port CAMs
- J.-F. Li, R.-S. Tseng, and C.-W. Wu, JETTA03—testing and diagnosis methodologies for BCAMs
- J.-F. Li, IEICE Trans. Information & Systems, 2004—testing and diagnosing BCAMs with Comparison and RAM faults

All the previous works focus on testing cell array faults of CAMs
Show that conventional CAM tests for cell array faults cannot fully detect the SAFs in the priority encoder of CAMs

Develop a test algorithm to detect the SAFs in the priority encoder of CAMs
Typical CAM Architecture

Comparand Register

Mask Register

Address Decoder

Data I/O

Priority Encoder

Hit Signal Generator

Address

Data

Highest Priority Matched Address
Match signal responses when various CAM tests are applied

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Compare Operations</th>
<th>Expect Responses ( (M_0M_1\ldots M_{N-1}) )</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Result Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>( (100\ldots 000) )</td>
<td>Type-1</td>
<td>Hit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (010\ldots 000) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (001\ldots 000) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \ldots )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (000\ldots 001) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>( (000\ldots 001) )</td>
<td>Type-2</td>
<td>Lowest Matched Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (000\ldots 011) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (000\ldots 111) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \ldots )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( (111\ldots 111) )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>( (000\ldots 000) )</td>
<td>Type-3</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Priority Encoder

- **Architecture of the priority encoder**

  \[ Y_0 = M_0 \]
  \[ Y_1 = M_1 \overline{M_0} \]
  \[ Y_2 = M_2 \overline{M_1} \overline{M_0} \]
  \[ \vdots \]
  \[ Y_{N-1} = M_{N-1} \overline{M}_{N-2} \cdots \overline{M}_0 \]
Let $A_i = \prod_{j=0}^{j=i-1} \overline{M_j}$, then $Y_0 = M_0$ and $Y_i = A_i M_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq N-1$.

Thus the prefix computation logic usually can be realized by a two-stage logic circuit including a group logic ($Y_i = A_i M_i$) and a output logic ($A_i = \prod_{j=0}^{j=i-1} \overline{M_j}$) [N. Weste, 2005]

Different group networks can be used to build the group logic:
- E.g., ripple, lookahead, tree, etc.

We divide the testing of prefix computation logic into two parts:
- Testing of group logic
- Testing of output logic
PCL with Ripple Group Logic

Ripple group logic

Output logic

A \quad N-1

Y \quad N-1

Y \quad N-2

Y \quad Y_1

Y \quad Y_2

Y \quad Y_3

Y \quad Y_0
## Testing of Output Logic

- Test patterns for detecting SAFs in output logic of the prefix computation logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pattern  ( (M_0M_1M_2\ldots M_{N-1}) )</th>
<th>Test data received by ( \text{AND}_O_i )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1111\ldots1111)</td>
<td>01 received by all ( \text{AND}_O_i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000\ldots0000)</td>
<td>10 received by all ( \text{AND}_O_i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(01XX\ldotsXXXX)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}_O_1 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(001X\ldotsXXXX)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}_O_2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0001\ldotsXXXX)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}_O_3 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000\ldots1XXX)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}<em>O</em>{N-4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000\ldots01XX)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}<em>O</em>{N-3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000\ldots001X)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}<em>O</em>{N-2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000\ldots0001)</td>
<td>11 received by ( \text{AND}<em>O</em>{N-1} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing of Group Logic
Testing of Group Logic

- Test patterns for detecting SAFs in group logic of the prefix computation logic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pattern $(M_0M_1M_2\ldots M_{N-1})$</th>
<th>Test data received by AND_G$_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0001)</td>
<td>11 received by all AND_G$_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1000....0001)</td>
<td>01 received by all AND_G$_i$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0100....0001)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0010...0001)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0001...0001)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...1001)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_{N-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0101)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_{N-3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0011)</td>
<td>10 received by AND_G$_{N-2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing SAFs of PCL

- Test patterns for detecting SAFs of PCL with ripple group logic (exporting the lowest matched address is assumed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Pattern</th>
<th>Fault-free outputs of PCL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$M_0 M_1 M_2 \ldots M_{N-1}$</td>
<td>$Y_0 Y_1 Y_2 \ldots Y_{N-1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1111...1111)</td>
<td>(1000...0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0000)</td>
<td>(0000...0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0001)</td>
<td>(0000...0001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1000...0000)</td>
<td>(1000...0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0100...0000)</td>
<td>(0100...0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0010...0000)</td>
<td>(0010...0000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...1001)</td>
<td>(0000...1000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0101)</td>
<td>(0000...0100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0000...0011)</td>
<td>(0000...0010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Test Algorithm

Consider an NxB-bit CAM, the proposed test algorithm is as follows:

1) FOR i=0 to N-1 DO {
   IF (i=N-1) {
      Write on word i with the binary value of \(2^{B-1}-1\);}
   ELSE {
      Write on word i with the binary value of 0;}}
2) Compare 0 with the bit B-1 of all words and the other bits of all words are masked. Check if the matched address is 0.
3) Compare 1 with the bit B-1 of all words and the other bits of all words are masked. Check if the matched address is invalid.
4) Compare \(2^{B-1}-1\) with all words and check if the matched address is N.
5) FOR i=0 to N-2 DO{
   Write on word i with the binary value of \(2^{B-1}-1\).
   Compare \(2^{B-1}-1\) with all words and check if the matched address is i.
   Write on word i with the binary value of 0.}
Example

If a 4x8-bit CAM is tested, the test algorithm is applied as follows:

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 x x x x x x x
M1
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M1
```

```
0 x x x x x x x
M2
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M0
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M1
0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
M2
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```

```
0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
M3
```
Testing PCL with Lookahead Group Logic
Fault Coverage Analysis

- We use the Verifault of Verilog-XL simulator to simulate the fault coverage of SAFs of the prefix computation logic with ripple group logic
- Comparison of fault coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Type-1, Type-3</th>
<th>Type-2, Type-3</th>
<th>$T_{PE}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$N=8$</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N=16$</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N=32$</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>90.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N=64$</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Test Algorithms

- Let Test A (B) be a test algorithm causes that the CAM has Type-1 and Type-3 (Type-2 and Type-3) match signal responses
- Comparison of different test algorithms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Priority Encoder Fault Coverage</th>
<th>Hit Signal Generator Fault coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test A</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test B</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test A+T_{PE}</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test B+T_{PE}</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- Content addressable memories are widely used in digital systems, especially in network applications
- Efficient testing and diagnosing methodologies for CAMs are needed
- This lecture presents efficient testing and diagnosing methodologies for binary CAMs
- Also, a test algorithm for detecting the SAFs of priority encoder also has been presented