This checklist must be submitted as a PDF as part of your submission.

Name of Certifying Engineer(s): Romain TRILLING Email of Certifying Engineer(s): romain.trilling@st.com

Name(s) of System Under Test:

NUCLEO-L4R5ZI-P, NUCLEO-L4R5ZI-P_70MHz, NUCLEO-U385RG-Q, NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q, NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q_60MHz, NUCLEO-H7A3ZI-Q, NUCLEO-H7A3ZI-Q_40MHz

Division (check one):

□ Open

☑ Closed

Category (check one):

☑ Available

Benchmark(s) (check all that apply):

☑ Visual Wake Words

☑ Keyword Spotting

☑ Anomaly Detection

☑ Image Classification

☑ Streaming Wake Word

Please fill in the following table adding lines as necessary:

System Under Test Name	Benchmark	Accuracy/AUC
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P	Anomaly Detection (AD)	77.8% / 0.86
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P	Image classification (IC)	87.0% / 0.98
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P	Keyword Spotting (KWS)	90.2% / 0.99
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P	Visual Wake Words (VWW)	85.2% / 0.94
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q	Anomaly Detection (AD)	77.8% / 0.86
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q	Image classification (IC)	87.0% / 0.98
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q	Keyword Spotting (KWS)	90.2% / 0.99
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q	Visual Wake Words (VWW)	85.2% / 0.94
NUCLEO-U385RG-Q	Anomaly Detection (AD)	77.8% / 0.86
NUCLEO-U385RG-Q	Image classification (IC)	87.0% / 0.98
NUCLEO-U385RG-Q	Keyword Spotting (KWS)	90.2% / 0.99
NUCLEO-U385RG-Q	Visual Wake Words (VWW)	85.2% / 0.94

This checklist must be submitted as a PDF as part of your submission.

System Under Test Name	Benchmark	FN / FP
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO_L4R5ZI-P_70MHz	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO-U385RG-Q	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO-U575ZI-Q_60MHz	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO-H7A3ZI-Q	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4
NUCLEO-H7A3ZI-Q_40MHz	Streaming Wake Word (SWW)	6 / 4

For each SUT, is the benchmark Accuracy/AUC target met? (Not a requirement for the Open division) (check all that apply): ☑ Yes (Visual Wake Words ... 80% Accuracy) ☑ Yes (Keyword Spotting ... 90% Accuracy) **☑** Yes (Anomaly Detection ... 0.85 AUC) ☑ Yes (Image Classification ... 85% Accuracy) ☐ No, for some combination of benchmark, scenario and SUT For each SUT and benchmark, did the submission run on the whole validation set in accuracy mode? (check one): Yes □ No For each SUT and benchmark, does the submission use the EEMBC Runner? (check one) ✓ Yes ☐ No For each SUT and benchmark, is the same code run in accuracy and performance modes? (check one)

✓ Yes

	e weights calibrated using data outside of the official calibration set? (check one) Yes No
	INT4 INT8 INT16 UINT18 UINT16 FP11 FP16 BF16 FP32 Other, please specify:
_ _ _	Vendor backend, please name: TF-Lite Micro Micro TVM Other, please specify: X-CUBE-Al v10.2.0
ideally	of the following caching techniques does the submission use? (check all that apply, none): Caching Inputs between iterations Caching responses between iterations Caching intermediate computations between iterations
	of the following techniques does the submission use? (check all that apply, ideally none if tting to the closed division.) Quantization aware training Wholesale weight replacement Weight supplements

This checklist must be submitted as a PDF as part of your submission.

_ _ _	Discarding non-zero weight elements Pruning Modifying weights during the timed portion of an inference run Hard coding the total number of queries None of the above
	submission congruent with all relevant MLPerf rules? Yes No
If the a	answer to the above question is no, please explain:
	ch SUT, have you filled out the JSON system description file? Yes No
	ch SUT, does the submission accurately reflect the real-world performance of the SUT? Yes No
	System description file Code that implements the benchmarks Code/scripts that train the model(s) (Open Division) Metadata that describes each system-implementation combination tested Scripts that set up and execute each system implementation tested Result logs for each system implementation tested
	This Checklist