

Improving Power Budgeting Estimates in NAND Applications

Michael Abraham (mabraham@micron.com) Applications Engineering Manager Micron Technology, Inc.

Abstract

- Current NAND Flash ICC specifications do not give an accurate representation of active system power.
- **This presentation shows a better approach to** measuring ICC that provides better predictability in the system of how much current devices will draw.
- **This methodology is particularly useful for battery** powered applications like mobile phones, MP3 players, and GPS units as well as large-scale NAND solutions like SSDs.

Power Budgeting

- Accurate system power consumption is important for determine a power budget
- **A power budget is used to**
	- Estimate system battery life
	- Determine voltage regulator sizes
	- Determine needed bulk capacitance
- An application-specific usage model is required to correctly calculate the power budget
	- # of active NAND die
	- Single- vs. multi-plane operations
	- Active vs. Standby
	- Reads vs. writes
	- I/O vs. array

- **In NAND Flash data sheets today, there are few** Icc definitions
	- Read
	- Program
	- Erase
	- Standby

Shortcomings of the Original Icc Test Methodology

- I Icc parameters not sufficiently defined for an application-specific usage model
	- Current related to I/O and the data path should be separate from current related to array operations (program, read, erase)
	- Idle current is not defined
- Icc test methodology is not usable in high volume manufacturing (HVM)
	- Designed for single-site device characterization
	- Unable to correlate bench testing to HVM testing
- **If** Icc test methodology is not reproducible
	- Icc1 (Read) implies data output as it shows $I_{\text{OUT}} = 0 \text{mA}$
	- A program page operation requires data input, yet Icc2 shows no condition for it
	- Does Icc2 measurement include data input or only the current during tPROG?
- **Because of these shortcomings, NAND Flash ICC specifications do not** give an accurate representation of active system power.

Goals of an Icc Test Methodology

- **HVM capable**
- Reproducible
- **Usable for application-specific power budgets**
- **Adaptable to multiple NAND interfaces**
	- Asynchronous (up to 50MB/s per x8 bus)
	- Synchronous DDR (up to 200MB/s per x8 bus)

Icc Test Methodology Implementation Checklist

- **Basic power-related device operations**
- **Example 1 General test conditions**
- **Interface-specific test conditions**
- **Test sequences**
- **Formulas for correlation**

Basic Power-related Operations

- Array read
- Array program
- **Example 25 Array erase**
- **III.** I/O burst read (data output)
- **I** I/O burst write (data input)
- **Bus Idle**
- **Standby**

All NAND behaviors build on and be modeled from these basic operations.

NAND Operation Examples

Page Program is comprised of

- Data Input
- Array Program
- Bus idle and/or standby
- Page Program Cache is comprised of
	- Data Input
	- Array Program + Data Input
	- Bus idle and/or standby
- **Between operations there is dead time**
	- Bus Idle CE# remains LOW
	- Standby $-$ CE# is pulled HIGH

Icc Parameters

- Icc parameters added to allow applicationspecific power budget modeling

- **Common across all NAND interfaces**
- **Fixed wait time is important for multi-site HVM testing**

Define Interface-specific Test **Conditions**

и

Test Sequences: Array

 \blacksquare Icc1 (Array read)

 \blacksquare $\sf Icc2$ (Array program) lcc3 (Array erase)

Santa Clara, CA USA August 2009 **13** \mathbf{M} **13** \mathbf{M}

Test Sequence: Icc4r (I/O Burst Read)

Test Sequence: Icc4w (I/O Burst Write)

Test Sequence: Icc5 (Bus Idle)

■ Icc2 (measured) includes Icc4w, Icc2 (active), and Icc5. **Icc4w Icc2 Icc5(active)**

Icc2 (measured) can be represented as:

$$
Icc2(measured) = \frac{tIO}{tIO + tPROG(max)}Icc4w + \frac{tPROG(typ)}{tIO + tPROG(max)}Icc2(active) + \frac{tPROG(max) - tPROG(typ)}{tIO + tPROG(max)}Icc5}
$$

 $tIO = NAND$ Page Size(bytes (x8) or words (x16)) $\times tWC(min)$

What is the Active Icc2 Current During tPROG?

■ Solve for Icc2(active)

If is possible to solve for active currents from the measured values for Icc1, Icc2, and Icc3, which can then be used in power budget modeling. $\frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} = \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} + \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} + \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} + \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} + \frac{1}{tPROG(typ)} - \frac{1$

Conclusion

- **This presentation shows a better approach to** measuring ICC that provides better predictability in the system of how much current devices will draw based on application-specific usage models.
- This test methodology is
	- HVM capable
	- Reproducible
	- Usable for application-specific power budgets
	- Adaptable to multiple NAND interfaces

Questions and comments?

- **This presentation does not include every** detail of the new test methodology.
- **Nicron welcomes feedback and suggestions** for improvement; please contact the presentation author.
- The test methodology is subject to further change and improvement.

About Michael Abraham

- **Nanager of Micron's NAND Flash** Applications Engineering group
- **B.S. in Computer Engineering from Brigham Young University**

- **Technical representative for Micron** in ONFI and JEDEC for NAND Flash
- Key role in defining and standardizing the highspeed, synchronous DDR NAND interface within Micron and at ONFI

©2007-2009 Micron Technology, Inc. All rights reserved. Products are warranted only to meet Micron's production data sheet specifications. Information, products and/or specifications are subject to change without notice. All information is provided on an "AS IS" basis without warranties of any kind. Dates are estimates only. Drawings not to scale. Micron and the Micron logo are trademarks of Micron Technology, Inc. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

Santa Clara, CA USA August 2009 \sim 21

