Contents: Power and Delay

CMOS Static and Dynamic Power Consumption: J Rabaey et al "Digital Integrated Circutis"

Integration of III/V HEMTs on Si : S Datta et al IEEE Electron Dev. Lett. 28, 2007 p 685 " Ultrahigh-Speed 0.5 V Supply ..."

HEMTS for Beyond-CMOS: D-H Kim et al IEEE Trans. Electron Dev. 54, 2007 p 2606 " Logic Suitability of 50 nm ..."

CMOS Dynamic and Static Power Consumption

Advantages with CMOS:

Full logic swing High noise margin Superior robustness Absence of steady state power consumption

Robust low-power digital technology



Calculate the charging energy:

$$E_{VDD} = \int_{0}^{\infty} i_{VDD}(t) V_{DD} dt = V_{DD} \int_{0}^{\infty} C_L \frac{dv_{out}}{dt} dt = C_L V_{DD} \int_{0}^{VDD} dv_{out} = C_L V_{DD}^2$$

Calculate the stored energy:

$$E_{C} = \int_{0}^{\infty} VDD(t)v_{out}dt = \int_{0}^{\infty} C_{L} \frac{dv_{out}}{dt}v_{out}dt = C_{L} \int_{0}^{VDD} v_{out}dv_{out} = \frac{C_{L}V_{DD}^{2}}{2}$$

Dynamic Power Consumption



 $P_{dyn} = C_L V_{DD}^2 f_{0->1}$

Example: 0.25 μ m CMOS f=500 MHz C_L=15fF/gate V_{DD}=2.5V P_{dyn}=50 μ W

Nanoelectronics: Power and Delay

During charging (low-to-high transition) half energy is stored on capacitor, half energy is dissipated in the transistor

During discharging (high-to-low transition) half energy is stored on capacitor, the stored energy (half energy) is dissipated in the transistor

Direct-Path Current Power Consumption



During the finite time switching, a direct current is flowing in the transistor pair

Assume triangular current peaks

$$E_{dp} = V_{DD} \frac{I_{peak} t_{sc}}{2} + V_{DD} \frac{I_{peak} t_{sc}}{2} = t_{sc} V_{DD} I_{peak}$$

$$P_{dp} = t_{sc} V_{DD} I_{peak} f = C_{sc} V_{DD}^2 f$$

Reduction via Design of Load Capacitance



Using a large load capacitance, the voltage remains across the NMOS transistor during the switching cycle, which limits the current flow in the direct current path.

Figure 5-32 CMOS inverter short-circuit current through NMOS transistor as a function of the load capacitance (for a fixed input slope of 500 ps).

Static Power Consumption

Leakage current typically 10-100 pA/ μ m². Drain area 0.5 μ m² and 1 million gates with V_{DD}=2.5 V gives 0.125 mW. But strong temperature effects!



 $P_{stat} = I_{stat} V_{DD}$

Figure 5-34 Sources of leakage currents in CMOS inverter (for $V_{in} = 0$ V).

Subthreshold Leakage

As the drive voltage is reduced, the threshold voltage should also be scaled (recall $V_t \sim V_{DD}/3!$). This implies that the subthreshold current is substantially increased.

Consider a 0.25 μ m NMOS transistor with SS of 90 mV/dec. and V_t=0.5 V. At V_{GS}=0 V it consumes about 10⁻¹¹ A. Reducing the threshold to 0.3 V increased the Current a factor 170! This gives a power consumption of 10⁶x170x10⁻¹¹x1.25=2.6mW. A reduction in V_t to 0.1 V gives a power consumption of 0.5 W! The threshold voltage reduction corresponds to a performance improvement of 25 and 40 %, respectively.



Figure 5-35 Decreasing the threshold increases the subthreshold current at $V_{GS} = 0$.

Put It All Together!



The Power-Delay Product

Introduce the power-delay product as a quality measure of a logic gate:

 $PDP = P_{av}t_p$

If the gate is switched at full speed, the PDP corresponds To the average energy consumed per switching event (0->1 or 1->0 transition)

$$PDP = C_L V_{DD}^2 f_{\max} t_p = \frac{C_L V_{DD}^2}{2}$$

Better, The Energy-Delay Product

Introduce the energy-delay product, which balances the performance and energy consumption!

$$EDP = PDP \times t_p = P_{av}t_p^2 = \frac{C_L V_{DD}^2}{2}t_p$$

 $t_{\rm p}$ is the propagation delay (gate delay) and $f_{max}{=}1/(2t_{\rm p})$

Voltage Dependence on EDP!!!

$$EDP = PDP \times t_p = P_{av}t_p^2 = \frac{C_L V_{DD}^2}{2}t_p$$

$$t_p \approx \frac{\alpha C_L V_{DD}}{\left(V_{DD} - V_T\right)^2}$$

$$EDP = \frac{\alpha C_L^2 V_{DD}^3}{2(V_{DD} - V_T)^2}$$



Figure 5-36 Normalized delay, energy, and energy-delay plots for CMOS inverter in 0.25-µm CMOS technology.

But what is α and V_{Te}??

Transistor model in linear region:

$$I_{D} = \frac{\mu \varepsilon_{ox}}{t_{ox}} \frac{W}{L} \left[(V_{GS} - V_{t}) V_{DS} - \frac{V_{DS}^{2}}{2} \right]$$

Transistor model in saturation region:

$$I_D = \frac{\mu \varepsilon_{ox}}{2t_{ox}} \frac{W}{L} (V_{GS} - V_t)^2$$

Compare ballistic model:

$$I_{Dsat} = v_{inj} \frac{\varepsilon_{ox}}{t_{ox}} W \left(V_{GS} - V_t \right)$$

But what is α and V_{Te}??

Use the average transistor resistance:

$$R_{eq} = -\frac{1}{V_{DD}/2} \int_{V_{DD}}^{V_{DD}/2} \frac{V}{I_{DSAT}} dV \approx \frac{3}{4} \frac{V_{DD}}{I_{DSAT}}$$

Expand linear model to saturation region ($V_{DSAT}=V_{GS}-V_{T}$):

$$I_{DSAT} = \frac{\mu \varepsilon_{ox}}{t_{ox}} \frac{W}{L} (V_{DD} - V_t)^2$$
 Note $V_{GS} = V_{DD}!!:$

Calculate t_p:

$$t_p = \frac{t_{pHL} + t_{pLH}}{2} = \ln 2 \times C_L \left(\frac{R_{eqn} + R_{eqp}}{2}\right)$$

$$t_{pHL} = \ln 2 \times \frac{3}{4} \frac{C_L V_{DD}}{(W/L)_n (\mu_n \varepsilon_{ox} / t_{ox}) (V_{DD} - V_{tn})^2}$$
$$t_{pHL} = \ln 2 \times \frac{3}{4} \frac{C_L}{(W/L)_n (\mu_n \varepsilon_{ox} / t_{ox}) V_{DD}} \qquad \text{if} \qquad V_{DD} >> V_{Tn}$$

But what is α and V_{Te}??

$$t_{p} = \frac{t_{pHL} + t_{pLH}}{2} = \ln 2 \times C_{L} \left(\frac{R_{eqn} + R_{eqp}}{2}\right)$$
$$t_{pHL} = \ln 2 \times \frac{3}{4} \frac{C_{L}V_{DD}}{(W/L)_{n} (\mu_{n}\varepsilon_{ox}/t_{ox}) (V_{DD} - V_{Tp})^{2}}$$
$$\alpha_{n}$$

Assume equal threshold voltages and saturation voltages for NMOS and PMOS!

$$t_{p} = \alpha_{n} \frac{C_{L}V_{DD}}{(V_{DD} - V_{Tn})^{2}} + \alpha_{h} \frac{C_{L}V_{DD}}{(V_{DD} - V_{Tp})^{2}} = \alpha \frac{C_{L}V_{DD}}{(V_{DD} - V_{T})^{2}}$$

Ultrahigh-Speed 0.5 V Supply Voltage In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As Quantum-Well Transistors on Silicon Substrate

Suman Datta, Senior Member, IEEE, G. Dewey, J. M. Fastenau, Member, IEEE, M. K. Hudait, D. Loubychev, W. K. Liu, Senior Member, IEEE, M. Radosavljevic, W. Rachmady, and R. Chau, Fellow, IEEE



Fig. 1. Cross-sectional TEM images of In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As QW structures on Si using metamorphic buffer architecture: (a) Entire layer structure. (b) magnification of In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As QW along with bottom and top barrier layers. The misfit dislocations are predominantly contained in the buffer layer.

- buffer layer techniques are available
- comparable mobility

Nanoelectronics: Power and Delay



Fig. 2. Electron mobility versus sheet carrier density in n-channel $In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As$ QW device layers grown on Si, GaAs, and InP substrates. In all cases, $In_{0.52}Al_{0.48}As$ is the bottom and top barrier layer.

Comparable RF-data!



Fig. 3. (a) Output characteristic for 80-nm L_g In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As QW transistor on 3.2- μ m metamorphic buffer on silicon (gate voltage V_G is swept from 0.0 to -0.8 V in -0.1-V steps). (b) Transfer characteristic for 80-nm L_g In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As QW transistor on 3.2- μ m buffer on silicon with $V_{\rm DS} = 0.5$ and 0.05 V. Peak transconductance $g_{\rm m}$ for this device was 930 μ S/ μ m at $V_{\rm DS} = 0.5$ V.

- well behaved IV characteristics!
- good DC numbers at 80 nm Lg
- comparable RF data to lattice matched devices



Fig. 4. Plot of deembedded unity gain cutoff frequency as a function of dc power dissipation for 0.5-V $V_{\rm DS}$ 80-nm L_g In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As QW transistors on both silicon and InP substrates, benchmarked against 60-nm L_g silicon NMOS transistors at $V_{\rm DS}$ = 0.5 and 1.1 V.

Logic Suitability of 50-nm In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As HEMTs for Beyond-CMOS Applications

Dae-Hyun Kim, Jesús A. del Alamo, Jae-Hak Lee, and Kwang-Seok Seo

n+ Cap	InGaAs, x = 0.53	20 nm
Stopper	InP	6 nm
Barrier	InAlAs, x = 0.52	8 nm
δ-doping	Si	-
Spacer	InAlAs, x = 0.52	3 nm
Channel	InGaAs, x = 0.53	3 nm
	InGaAs, x = 0.7	8 nm
	InGaAs, x = 0.53	4 nm
Buffer	InAlAs, x = 0.52	500 nm

TABLE I Detailed Gate Structural Information for Four Types of In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As HEMTs That Are Fabricated in This Paper

	Type-A	Туре-В	Туре-С	Type-D
Barrier	InP/In _{0.52} Al _{0.48} As	$In_{0.52}Al_{0.48}As$	$\mathrm{In}_{0.52}\mathrm{Al}_{0.48}\mathrm{As}$	$In_{0.52}Al_{0.48}As$
Stack	Ti/Pt/Au	Ti/Pt/Au	Pt/Ti/Mo/Au	Buried-Pt/Ti/Mo/Au
t _{ins} [nm]	17	11	11	7
$\Phi_{B}\left[eV\right]$	~ 0.4	~ 0.6	~ 0.7	~ 0.8

Fig. 1. Epitaxial layer structure of the $In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As$ HEMTs that are fabricated in this paper.

- 4 types of transistors
- Schottky barrier and insulator thickness
- good DC characteristics
- weak scaling with gate length





Fig. 5. Transconductance (G_m) characteristics of all 50-nm In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As HEMTs at $V_{\rm DS}=0.5$ V.



Scaling with Schottky barrier and insulator thickness

- Tight control needed to improve the performance

TABLE II						
SUMMARY OF LOGIC FIGURES OF MERIT FOR FOUR TYPES						
OF 50-nm In _{0.7} Ga _{0.3} As HEMTs						

	$V_{T}\left[V ight]$	DIBL [mV/V]	S [mV/dec]	$I_{\rm ON}/I_{\rm OFF}$
Туре-А	-1.10	300	200	63
Туре-В	-0.65	220	130	1×10^3
Туре-С	-0.55	180	100	$7.2 imes 10^3$
Type-D	-0.20	160	86	1.7×10^4

Fig. 6. Semilog plot of I_D and I_G of all 50-nm In0.7Ga0.3As HEMTs at $V_{\rm DS}=0.5$ V.

Improved speed and/or reduced power consumption



Fig. 11. Cutoff frequency (f_T) of our 50- and 100-nm type D In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As HEMTs and 80-nm Si MOSFETs as a function of the dc power dissipation.

- Well selected technology is required to maximize Ion/Ioff ratio

- Depending on bias condition benefits can be found in the areas of speed and/or power dissipation



Fig. 14. Gate delay (CV/I) of all 50-nm In_{0.7}Ga_{0.3}As as a function of I_{ON}/I_{OFF} .