

AXI-REALM: Safe, Modular and Lightweight Traffic Monitoring and Regulation for Heterogeneous Mixed-Criticality Systems

Thomas Benz^x, Graduate Student Member, IEEE, Alessandro Ottaviano^x, Graduate Student Member, IEEE, Chaoqun Liang^{id}, Graduate Student Member, IEEE, Robert Balas^{id}, Graduate Student Member, IEEE, Angelo Garofalo^{id}, Member, IEEE, Francesco Restuccia^{id}, Member, IEEE, Alessandro Biondi^{id}, Member, IEEE, Davide Rossi^{id}, Senior Member, IEEE, and Luca Benini^{id}, Fellow, IEEE

Abstract—The automotive industry is transitioning from federated, homogeneous, interconnected devices to integrated, heterogeneous, mixed-criticality systems (MCS). This leads to challenges in achieving timing predictability techniques due to access contention on shared resources, which can be mitigated using hardware-based spatial and temporal isolation techniques. Focusing on the interconnect as the point of access for shared resources, we propose AXI-REALM, a lightweight, modular, technology-independent, and open-source real-time extension to AXI4 interconnects. AXI-REALM uses a budget-based mechanism enforced on periodic time windows and transfer fragmentation to provide fair arbitration, coupled with execution predictability on real-time workloads. AXI-REALM features a comprehensive bandwidth and latency monitor at both the ingress and egress of the interconnect system. Latency information is also used to detect and reset malfunctioning subordinates, preventing missed deadlines. We provide a detailed cost assessment in a 12 nm node and an end-to-end case study implementing AXI-REALM into an open-source MCS, incurring an area overhead of less than 2%. When running a mixed-criticality workload, with a time-critical application sharing the interconnect with non-critical applications, we demonstrate that the critical application can achieve up to 68.2% of the isolated performance by enforcing fairness on the interconnect traffic through burst fragmentation, thus reducing the subordinate access latency by up to 24 times. Near-ideal performance, (above 95% of the isolated performance) can be achieved by distributing the available bandwidth in favor of the critical application.

Index Terms—Real-time, predictable, interconnect, AXI4

I. INTRODUCTION

The current trend in industrial domains such as automotive, robotics, and aerospace is towards autonomy, connectivity, and electrification, significantly increasing the demand for onboard computing power and communication infrastructure, thus driving a paradigm shift in their design [1]–[6].

A clear example is the automotive domain, where the traditional approach — relying on hundreds of embedded real-

time electronic control units (ECUs) distributed throughout the vehicle — cannot meet the growing compute demands and complicates cable harness management, impacting space, weight, power, and cost (SWaP-C) [6]–[8]. This paradigm cannot support the rapid shift toward Autonomous driving, Connectivity, Electrification, and Shared mobility (ACES), which is laying the foundation of Advanced Driver Assistance System (ADAS) and software-defined vehicless (SDVs) [2]. Hence, integrated, interconnected *zonal* and *domain* architectures are becoming the preferred replacements for discrete ECUs, as they deliver the flexibility and compute capability required for ACES mobility and the SWaP-C problem [8], [9].

These architectures are heterogeneous mixed criticality systems (MCSs) [10]. They comprise general-purpose and domain-specific sub-systems with diverse real-time and specialized computing requirements that execute concurrently on the same silicon die, sharing communication, storage, and micro-architectural resources [11], [12]. Some subsystems handle hard safety- and time-critical workloads, such as engine, brake, and cruise control [6], [13], [14], while others run less time-critical but computationally demanding tasks like perception pipelines, infotainment, and commodity applications [6].

Time- and safety-critical tasks require strict real-time guarantees, ensured through time-predictable run-time mechanisms, composable timing analysis, and safety assessments [15]. However, in heterogeneous MCSs, this process is complicated by the increased interference generated by multiple domains contending for shared hardware resources on the same platform [13]. This additional contention may introduce unpredictable behavior during the system’s execution, causing possible deadline misses for time- and safety-critical tasks [16], [17]. To preserve the timing behavior of the system under known and predictable bounds, techniques such as spatial and temporal isolation become a prerequisite, as they enhance the *observability* and *controllability* of shared hardware (HW) resources [4], [18]. The *interconnect* in modern system-on-chips (SoCs) is of particular concern; several previous works have highlighted that interference in accessing shared resources regulated by bus arbiters and interconnects is a major source of unpredictability [13], [14], [16], [19].

In this paper, we present AXI-REALM, an AXI4-based, interconnect extension that improves real-time and predictability behavior of MCSs by monitoring and controlling both the

^x Both authors contributed equally to this research.

T. Benz, A. Ottaviano, R. Balas, A. Garofalo and L. Benini are with the Integrated Systems Laboratory (IIS), ETH Zurich, Switzerland.

E-mail: {tbenz,aottaviano}@ethz.ch

Francesco Restuccia is with the Department of Computer Science and Engineering, UC San Diego, San Diego, CA USA.

Alessandro Biondi is with the Department of Excellence in Robotics & AI, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Pisa, Italy.

C. Liang, A. Garofalo, D. Rossi, and L. Benini are with the Department of Electrical, Electronic, and Information Engineering (DEI), University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy.

ingress and *egress* data streams. The architecture is split into two sub-systems: *irealm*, tasked to guard and regulate the *ingress* stream (requests and data issued by managers) with a *budget and time-slicing* approach; *erealm*, tasked to supervise the *egress* stream (data and responses issued by subordinates) with bandwidth and latency statistics, and eventually protect the system from malfunctioning subordinate devices.

This paper extends our previous work [20], enhancing several aspects: we provide a more detailed description of the internal HW components, combine the *ingress* [20] with the *egress* units [21] to an unified AXI-REALM system, we extend the system-level evaluation by integrating AXI-REALM in an open-source MCS characterizing functional, energy, and power performance, and we extend the IP-level evaluation. This work provides the following contributions:

- **AXI-REALM:** We present a scheme to enforce predictable behavior compatible with any AXI4-based interconnect which relies on *observing* and *controlling* both its *ingress* and *egress* data streams using ad-hoc HW methodologies. The resulting architecture demands minimal additional hardware resources and no internal modifications to the baseline interconnect, enabling portability across diverse SoC targets.
- **HW-driven traffic controllability:** AXI-REALM’s *irealm* unit implements a configurable number of subordinate *regions* per manager. Each *region* is runtime-programmable with address range, transfer fragmentation size, transfer budget, and reservation period to control the bus traffic through a *time slicing* approach.
- **HW-driven traffic observability:** AXI-REALM’s *irealm* and *erealm* units include modules that observe and track per-manager access and interference statistics, such as transaction latency, bandwidth, and interference with each other manager. With bandwidth-based observability, AXI-REALM can perform per-manager bandwidth throttling, modulating back-pressure.
- **HW-driven safety measures for malfunctioning subordinates:** We include a HW mechanism [21] to isolate and reset malfunctioning subordinates individually, taking advantage of AXI-REALM’s *erealm* latency tracking capabilities to identify response timeouts, mismatching transactions, and invalid handshakes.
- **IP-level characterization:** We extensively characterize AXI-REALM in a 12 nm technology, presenting an area model as well as timing and latency information.
- **In-system implementation assessment:** We evaluate AXI-REALM in an open-source heterogeneous MCS research platform ¹. We demonstrate the versatility of the proposed approach under interference scenarios between critical and non-critical managers of the system, achieving at least 68 % of the single-initiator case (over 95 % when distributing the budget in favor of the critical manager). Further, the proposed transfer fragmentation reduces the access latency of the critical manager by 255 cycles from 266 to 11 cycles. AXI-REALM incurs an area overhead of less than 2 % in the presented MCS.

The synthesizable and silicon-proven register transfer level description of AXI-REALM and its integration into the presented real-time system are available open-source under a libre Apache-based license ².

This paper is organized as follows. Section II provides background information. In Section III, we present the architecture of the AXI-REALM system. Section IV and Section V present the IP-level evaluation of our extension and AXI-REALM’s experimental results integrated into a MCS. In Section VI, we discuss how AXI-REALM compares to state-of-the-art (SOTA). Finally, Section VII concludes the paper by summarizing its key contributions and achievements.

II. BACKGROUND

A. The AMBA AXI4 On-Chip Interconnect

AXI4 is an industry-standard protocol for high-bandwidth, non-coherent, on-chip communication. It defines five separate channels for read and write requests (*AR*, *AW*, *W*) and responses (*R*, *B*). An AXI4 *beat* is the communication in one cycle on an AXI4 channel [22]. An AXI4 *transaction* is the number of beats a manager requires to communicate to a subordinate. The manager initiates a transaction by emitting an *address and control beat* containing the meta information (address, attributes, and length in beats, ...) over either the *AR* or the *AW* channel. The *burst* attribute defines the increment mechanism of the write or read addresses during a transaction.

Each AXI4 transaction carries a *transaction ID (tID)*. All beats in a transaction must have the same tID. The subordinate completes a transaction by sending a response over the *B* channel in the write case or by returning the last read response over the *R* channel read case. The protocol also supports multiple *outstanding* transactions, i.e., initiated by the same manager and simultaneously in progress with the same tID.

Based on tID, the protocol dictates three *ordering rules* for write and read transactions. We recall them in the following: ① for different tIDs, write data on the *W* channel must follow the same order as the address and control beats on the *AW* channel, as *W* beats do not have a tID field; ② transactions with different tIDs can be completed in any order; on the *R* channel, the read data can be interleaved; ③ a manager can have multiple outstanding transactions with the same tID, but they must be performed and completed in the order they were requested, for both writes and reads.

This work uses an open-source and silicon-proven implementation of AXI4 network elements ³. We refer to a *crossbar* as the main point-to-point network junction between managers and subordinates in the systems (Section III-B and Section V).

B. MCS Terminology: Essential Insights

Criticality designates “the level of rigor required to develop safety-critical functions so that the risk of failure can be brought to an acceptable level” [23]. An MCS involves applications with different criticality requirements deployed on the same platform. Safety functions in MCSs are treated as

¹github.com/pulp-platform/carfield

²github.com/pulp-platform/axi_rt

³github.com/pulp-platform/axi




Fig. 1: Overview of a generic system extended with AXI-REALM. The irealm units monitor and control data from the managers and erealm units guard the subordinate devices.

belonging to the highest safety integrity level unless *independence* between them is guaranteed, i.e., applications achieve freedom from interference with each other. This implies demonstrating that (i) independence is achieved in both spatial and temporal domains, and (ii) violation of independence can be controlled (see [24], Sect. 7.4.2.9).

A way to achieve independence is through *isolation*, or partitioning, of HW resources and software (SW) components. Isolation allows the segregation of faults, improves predictability by providing bounds on resource access times [25], and reduces the SW validation and verification (V&V) effort [26]. *Physical* isolation relies on federated HW for each SW component. Hence, resources at all levels are physically decoupled. *Virtual* isolation establishes partitioned HW provisions that allow multiple SW components to run on the same HW platform, namely, an MCS [10].

Within *virtual isolation*, we distinguish between *spatial* and *temporal isolation*. Spatial isolation means that an application shall not change data used by another application; it can be achieved with virtualization techniques through a memory management unit (MMU) [18]. However, on an integrated HW platform, virtual partitions still share resources such as caches, interconnects, and memory endpoints, making their temporal behavior inter-dependent [10], [25]. Temporal isolation ensures that one application will not cause malfunction of another application by blocking a shared resource over time or consuming another resource execution time. This can be achieved with adequate scheduling methods in SW, or HW/SW time slicing and fencing [23].

Current industrial and academic activities around MCSs do not share a holistic view of fully exploiting HW's potential to isolate executing application layers. However, some initiatives are being developed and studied [27]. A promising direction is that HW can cooperate with SW by enabling fine-grained *observability* and *controllability* of individual application behavior [18]. Proceeding from this premise and terminology background, this work aims to improve the observability and controllability of shared interconnect buses by leveraging time slicing, a temporal isolation technique.

III. ARCHITECTURE

An overview of a system extended with AXI-REALM is provided in Figure 1. At the *ingress* of the interconnect, *irealm* units [20] monitor and shape traffic injected by managers,

enforcing fairness and reducing congestion within the network as well as at the target devices. The irealm unit tracks the bandwidth and budget on the granularity of a *region*. Each region can encompass a subordinate space, combine multiple subordinates, or only cover a fraction thereof. The number of supported regions can be set through a SystemVerilog parameter at design time, and the address space covered by each region through SW at runtime. This is explicitly designed to be independent of the addressing of the interconnect.

At the *egress*, *erealm* units [21] guard the subordinate devices. They protect the interconnect and prevent deadline misses of real-time tasks in the case of protocol failures and subordinate regions/devices that extensively delay their responses. Our erealm unit provides two messaging options to inform the core of the unresponsive subordinates: interrupts and AXI4 protocol responses. Moreover, it integrates a framework to isolate, reset, and reinitialize malfunctioning devices within a single cycle [28].

A. The irealm Unit and Architecture

The irealm unit comprises three main submodules, shown in Figure 2: the *burst splitter* (a), the *write buffer* (b), and monitoring and regulation unit (M&R unit) (c). At the irealm unit's input, an AXI4 isolation block isolates the manager during dynamic reconfiguration of the unit, once the manager's assigned budget expires, or when commanded through SW.

Figure 3 shows the function of the irealm unit at two exemplary write transactions from a time-critical manager and a direct memory access (DMA) engine (Figure 3a). In the *unregulated* case, Figure 3b, the critical transaction experiences a completion latency of up to fifteen cycles. With our irealm unit activated, the DMA beats are fragmented after the burst splitter, Figure 3c, and bandwidth reservation is mitigated, Figure 3d, by stalling AWs until their corresponding W beats arrive. In this *regulated* case, Figure 3e, the transaction latency of the critical manager is at most four cycles.

This section explains the architecture and functionality of the irealm unit, detailing how it addresses unfairness from unregulated burst-based communication in round-robin (RR) arbitrated interconnect systems. It describes how the unit ensures execution predictability using time slicing through static or dynamic budget and period assignments to the managers.

1) *Granular Burst Splitter*: On-chip interconnects can employ burst-based transactions to increase the efficiency of non-coherent interconnect architectures. Such transactions increase bus utilization and decrease the addressing overhead. In heterogeneous SoCs, transactions of different granularities, e.g., short, cache-line-sized transactions issued by a core and a long burst requested by a domain-specific accelerator (DSA), are common transaction patterns [16]. Classic and fair RR arbitration on individual transactions affects bandwidth distribution fairness by increasing the completion latency of short, fine-granular transactions in the presence of long bursts.

As shown in Figure 2b, the *burst splitter* accepts incoming burst transactions and splits them to a runtime-configurable granularity, from one to 256 beats, according to the AXI4 specification [22]. Any transaction not supported by the burst-




Fig. 2: Internals of the irealm unit: (a) granular burst splitter, (b) write buffer, and (c) management and regulation unit.




Fig. 3: Write transaction passing through our irealm unit.

splitter is rejected and handled by an *error subordinate*. For instance, atomic bursts and *non-modifiable* transactions of length sixteen or smaller cannot be fragmented [22]. We store a burst transaction’s meta information (address, transaction size, AXI4 flags), emit the corresponding fragmented transactions, and update the address information. Write responses of the

fragmented bursts are coalesced transparently. Read responses are passed through, except for the *R.last* signal, which is gated according to the length of the original transaction. A large granularity requires the write buffer module following the burst-splitter to be large enough to hold a single fragmented write burst. If a manager only emits single-word transactions, the granular burst splitter can be disabled from the irealm unit to reduce the area footprint.

2) *Write Buffer*: The meta information of a transaction is inherently tied to the data being written. AXI4 physically decouples meta information from the payload to increase bus efficiency [22]. However, the write data beats and meta information are not fully decoupled as the write channel does not have a *tID* field. Most interconnect architectures reserve the bandwidth for an entire write transaction on the *W* channel once the corresponding *AW* is received [22]. Additionally, according to the AXI4 standard, the *W* channel remains indefinitely allocated to the request’s issuer once the request has been propagated through the interconnect. The standard does not specify a maximum delay between the propagation of the request and the provisioning of the corresponding data. A manager device can reserve a large transaction by holding the *W* channel, potentially stalling the interconnect by delaying data injection. In practice, this mechanism is observed with slow manager devices or DMA units copying data from high-latency or bandwidth-limited endpoints, which cause interference in the downstream memory system, as discussed in [29]. We prevent this behavior by storing the fragmented write burst in a *write buffer*, Figure 2b. The buffer forwards the *AW* request and the *W* burst only if the write data is fully contained within the buffer. The transaction buffer is configured to hold two *AW*s and one fragmented write burst.

3) *Monitoring and Regulation Unit*: In contrast to safety- and time-critical tasks executed on general-purpose processors, DSAs often work independently [13] and employ double buffering using their large internal memories; this results in memory-intensive phases followed by compute-intensive phases. The asynchronous nature of DSAs accessing the system’s memory coupled with coarse-grained synchronization results in unpredictable memory access patterns, increasing the timing uncertainty of critical tasks.




Fig. 4: The internal architecture of the erealm unit. The read and write parts are constructed equally.

The M&R unit, presented in Figure 2c, uses a hardware-implemented period-based bandwidth limiting mechanism to prevent managers from injecting more bandwidth for each subordinate region into the network than allowed. The M&R unit is symmetrically designed with identical read and write components. Transactions first pass through the address decoder, which maps them to their respective subordinate region. A *bus probe* measures the transaction bandwidth and latency, providing this data to the *bookkeeping* unit, which is responsible for budget checks and monitoring bandwidth and latency. Each irealm unit can track the data sent to each region.

A different time period and budget can be specified for each irealm unit and each subordinate region. Once activated, this specified budget amount is available and is reduced by every beat passing the unit. Once one subordinate region’s budget exceeds the allocated amount, the number of outstanding transactions is reduced. The corresponding manager is completely isolated once one budget is depleted using the irealm unit’s isolation cell, see Figure 2. The budget is automatically renewed once the time period expires.

If the total budget assigned to each manager’s irealm unit is less or equal to what the interconnect and the subordinate devices can handle within a period, the AXI-REALM system ensures each manager can use its assigned budget. The budget distribution should be set according to the real-time task running on the general-purpose cores [13]. The time period, budget checking, and budget renewal are tracked and handled entirely in hardware, allowing the system to react with clock-cycle accuracy. This allows the irealm unit to set very short periods, ensuring agile regulation and fair bandwidth sharing in the presence of a DSA manager.

Furthermore, we extend this monitor to track the average transaction latency issued through the irealm unit. After a simple profiling run measuring the latency of each manager to each subordinate region in isolation during V&V, average completion latency can be used to reveal inter-manager interference within the network and its subordinate regions or devices. Thus, online performance data can help fine-tune the budget and period settings for each manager and assess how well irealm ensures time-critical tasks meet their deadlines.

B. Interconnect layer

We design AXI-REALM to be independent of the system’s memory architecture, except for fundamental properties. Our

approach expects the interconnect to ensure a progress guarantee and route transactions using RR arbitration, which is the most common policy in commercial interconnects [14], [16], [30]. AXI-REALM is primarily intended for mixed-critical systems where DSAs require a high-performance interconnect to satisfy their data demand, and critical actors rely on real-time guarantees. We specifically choose an RR-arbitration mechanism over more classical real-time distribution patterns, like time division multiple access (TDMA), to maintain the high-performance memory access required by the system’s DSAs. We aim to enhance the determinism and fairness of a classic RR-arbitrated interconnect by minimally intruding on its design, using lightweight helper modules at its boundaries.

As mentioned in Section II, the in-system case study and IP-level evaluation presented in this work use a point-to-point-based interconnect constructed from AXI4 crossbars. AXI-REALM can handle hierarchical point-to-point interconnects thanks to the concept of subordinate regions.

C. The erealm Unit and Architecture

The erealm unit uses a HW-based approach to monitor the latency of transactions sent to a subordinate device or region, responding promptly to unexpected misbehavior or malfunctions that disrupt the predictability of real-time tasks. This unit is essential because the assumption of perfect behavior by subordinate devices, often made in SOTA [16], [19], does not hold in real-world scenarios. Additionally, the erealm proactively ensures protocol compliance for all transactions without impacting system throughput or latency.

When responses from a subordinate device exceed user-programmable timeouts or when a protocol violation is detected, erealm completes the outstanding transactions and communicates the cause of the issue with the core either using interrupts or the AXI4 response channel. Error information, including tID, address, and the *specific transaction stage* in which the error occurred, are logged into registers. The unit can reset the connected subordinates through an agile reset controller [28] either within one clock cycle upon fault detection, or when commanded by the core as part of the fault handling. Overall, erealm guards subordinate devices, guaranteeing responses within user-defined time frames, preventing the interconnect from locking up.

The architecture of erealm is shown in Figure 4. An ID remapper at the unit’s input compacts the typically sparsely used tID space, requiring fewer tID bits to track all transactions. The data path is then split into a similarly constructed *Write* and a *Read module*, presented in more detail below.

1) *Dynamic Outstanding Transaction Queue (DOTQ)*: AXI-REALM supports multiple outstanding, multi-id transactions commonly occurring when accessing high-performance subordinate devices; requiring dynamic tracking of multiple data streams, each with several outstanding transactions.

The erealm unit manages this through a dynamic queue consisting of three linked tables: an *ID Head-Tail (HT)* table, a *Transaction Linked Data (LD)* table, and a *Write (W)* or *Read (R)* table present in the write and read path, respectively. The HT table keeps track of active tIDs and enforces ordering




Fig. 5: Tracked stages in the erealm unit.

for transactions with the same tID and supports efficient tID lookups without scanning through all transactions in the LD table. The LD table stores metadata such as tID, address, state, latency, and timeout, allowing detailed tracking of each outstanding transaction. Finally, the W/R table ensures that write data maintains the correct sequence with address beats, aligning data properly even when tIDs are not explicitly available on the write data channel. The tracking capacity is defined by two design parameters: the maximum number of unique tIDs and the maximum number of transactions each unique tID can support simultaneously.

2) *Stage-Level Tracking for each Transaction*: AXI4 transactions occur in multiple *stages*: address and meta information is sent first, followed by the data beats, and finally, the response stage. As shown in Figure 5, the counter-based tracking logic monitors *six* and *four* stages for write and read transactions, respectively. The first stage is the initial handshake transferring address and meta information (*ax_valid* to *ax_ready*) to confirm the transaction acceptance. For the write case, this is followed by the transition from address acceptance to data availability (*aw_ready* to *w_valid*) to ensure that data beats readiness promptly follows. Monitoring continues with the acceptance of the first data beat (*w_valid* to *w_ready*) and in a subsequent stage, the data beat from the first to the last beat (*w_valid* to *w_last*) to guarantee continuous and correct data flow. After the last write data beat, the monitoring tracks from (*w_last* to *b_valid*), which is to confirm that the subordinate device sends the write response in time. Finally, the transition from write response valid to response ready (*b_valid* to *b_ready*) checks that the acknowledgment is properly issued by the manager device, which marks the end of the transaction. For read operations, the transition from address acceptance to data availability (*rw_ready* to *r_valid*) is monitored, along with the data beats (*r_valid* to *r_last*) and the timely delivery of the read response.

3) *Dynamic Time Budget Allocation*: In AXI4 systems, transactions of the same tID are processed sequentially. The time budget for each transaction is dynamically scaled based on its burst length and the cumulative burst lengths of prior transactions recorded in the transaction LD table.

For write transactions, this impacts the time budget from the *aw_ready* to *w_first* stage, while the time from *w_first* to *w_last* is counted only when the transaction begins servicing, thus excluding prior transaction latency. A similar dynamic budgeting method is applied for read transactions. This ensures that transactions, particularly those with large data beats, have sufficient time to complete.




Fig. 6: The architecture of the *bus guard*.

D. Configuration Interface

In its basic configuration, both irealm and erealm units are configured through a shared set of memory-mapped registers, as shown in Figure 1. The shared configuration register file can be physically decoupled to increase the scalability of the AXI-REALM architecture in larger designs. Configurations with dedicated configuration register files for each irealm and erealm unit are supported.

The register values are reset to a default configuration on startup, the erealm units are deactivated, and the irealm are bypassed. In this reset state, the AXI-REALM system is inert, interconnect accesses are unregulated, and no additional latency is introduced. One privileged manager, e.g., the booting core from a secure domain, programs the AXI-REALM system. The system's memory protection or AXI-REALM's *bus guard* restricts configuration space access to privileged managers. AXI-REALM can be dynamically reconfigured during the system's runtime.

E. Bus Guard

AXI-REALM's configuration space must be protected against malicious or erroneous accesses. Most systems use physical memory protection units or virtual memory space, e.g., through MMUs, to isolate critical configuration spaces.

Even in systems with no such protection device, our minimal *bus guard* unit, presented in Figure 6, restricts unwanted access to the configuration interface. After a system reset, a trusted manager must claim ownership of the configuration space by writing to a *guard register* within the *bus guard*. In the unclaimed state, every access to the configuration space except for the *guard register* returns an error. Once a manager has claimed the address space, it can perform a *handover* operation to transfer the exclusive read/write ownership to any other manager in the system. The *bus guard* differentiates between managers using their unique tID.

IV. IP-LEVEL CHARACTERIZATION

This section provides an extensive area, timing, and latency model to enable quick design-space exploration and promotes fair comparison with other works. For gate-level assessment, we use GlobalFoundries' GF12LP+ node with a 13-metal stack and 7.5-track standard cell library in the typical corner. We synthesize the designs using Synopsys Design Compiler NXT 2023.12 in topological mode to account for place-and-route constraints, congestion, and physical phenomena. We provide all area results in *gate equivalent (GE)*, a technology-independent circuit complexity metric. A GE represents the area of a two-input, minimum-strength NAND gate.

TABLE I: Area contribution *weights* of AXI-REALM’s building blocks as a function of their parameters. All numbers are in GE, at 1 GHz using typical conditions.

Category	Sub-category	Item	Parameters								Weight [GE]
			Addr Width ^{ab}	Data Width ^{ab}	Num Pending ^c	Num tIDs	Buffer Depth ^c	Storage Size ^{ade}	Num Counters ⁱ	Counter Storage ^j	
Config. Registers	PUR	(i) Status	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24.6
		(i) Budget/Period	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1320
	PU	(i) Region Bound.	20.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		(i) Config	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83.5
		(e) Status/Config	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.7
PS	(e) R/W Budget	0	0	0	0	0	0	770	0	0	
	Bus Guard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	261	
irealm	PUR	Tracking Cnts.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1930
		Region Decoders	20.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	PU	Isolate/Throttle	3.5	2.7	9.0	0	0	0	0	0	267
		Burst Splitter	49.3	1.5	729	0	0	0	0	0	4840
		Meta Buffer	38.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1310
Write Buffer	0	0	0	0	0	264	0	0	11.4		
erealm	PU	ID Remap.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		Stage Cnts.	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	0	735
		HT Table	0	0	201	0	0	0	0	0	0
		LD Table	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	0	0
		R/W Table/Ctrl.	0	0	0	0	0	0	329	0	356
Reset Ctrl.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1270		

^a In [bit] ^b Evaluated 32 to 64 b ^c Evaluated 2 to 16 elements
^d Product of *Buffer Depth* and *Data Width* ^e Evaluated 256 to 8192 b
^f Base area independent of params ⁱ Product of *Num Pending* and *Num tIDs*
^j Product of *Num Counters* and the counter width (10 to 32 b)

A. Area Model

Our linear area model, given in Table I, allows us to estimate a system’s AXI-REALM configuration given the number of irealm and erealm units with their respective parameters. We synthesize our AXI-REALM system to construct the model, sweeping the parameter space. The resulting areas are correlated with the input parameters, and a linear model is fitted. The model is divided into three categories: *Configuration Registers*, *irealm*, and *erealm*. Each category is grouped into the sub-categories: *per-system (PS)*, *per-unit (PU)*, and *per unit and region (PUR)*. To estimate the area of an AXI-REALM system or its components, the system’s desired configuration is determined. This includes the number of irealm and erealm units, configuration register files, and regions, as well as the IP’s desired SystemVerilog parameters. The area of the individual sub-units is given by a linear function of the IP parameters with the coefficient in Table I. The total AXI-REALM area can be obtained by summing over the individual sub-unit’s contributions.

We use the AXI-REALM MCS’s configuration (Table II) presented in Section V as an example of how to use our model. The *bus guard* is the only PS item with a constant contribution of 261 GE. For each PU and PUR elements we evaluate

$$A_{contrib} = \sum_i param_i * weight_i + constant$$

to obtain their respective area contribution. E.g., for the *write buffer*, we multiply 264 GE with the storage size of 256 and add 11.4 GE. Our example features three irealm units, bringing the total area contribution of all *write buffers* in the AXI-REALM system to 203 kGE. The total modeled area, presented in Table II, is calculated by summing all PS, PU, and PUR

TABLE II: Parametrization, the resulting modeled, and actual area of the irealm and erealm units in Carfield (Section V).

Sub-system	Num. Units	Num. Regions	SystemVerilog Parameters								Model Area [kGE]	Design Area [kGE]
<i>irealm</i>	3	2	48 b	64 b	16	-	4	256 b	-	-	330	328
<i>erealm</i>	1	-	48 ^a	64 ^a	2	2	-	-	20	200 ^b	50	45

contributions together.

B. Timing and Latency

The AXI-REALM architecture and its units are designed to achieve clock speeds exceeding 1.5 GHz (corresponding to 25 logic levels) in GF12LP+ when combined with optimized AXI4 IPs for application-specific integrated circuits (ASICs). The achieved frequency can be further increased at the cost of additional latency by either adding AXI4 cuts around the AXI-REALM units or introducing pipelining into the AXI-REALM units. The irealm unit adds no additional cycle of latency when bypassed and introduces one cycle through the write buffer (Section III-A2) when active. The erealm unit adds no additional latency, whether bypassed or active.

V. CASE STUDY: OPEN-SOURCE AUTOMOTIVE MCS

Carfield establishes a heterogeneous platform for mixed-criticality systems and application across domains like automotive, space, and cyber-physical embedded systems. At the core of Carfield, the *host* domain consists of a Linux-capable dual-core CVA6 system enhanced with virtualization extensions, namely RISC-V’s *H-extension* and virtualized fast interrupts. The platform is complemented by a *safety* and a *security* domain, allowing for reliable operation and secure boot, respectively. Carfield computational capabilities are enhanced through general-purpose DSAs. We instantiate two DSAs: one specialized for integer and one for floating-point workloads. Each accelerator features an internal DMA engine to copy data between its private scratchpad memory (SPM) and the MCS’s main storage. Carfield features two memory endpoints, a 512 KiB banked level-two (L2) memory and an off-chip DRAM accessed through a last-level cache (LLC). Each rank of the platform’s LLC can be configured either as software-managed SPM or cache for the DRAM. All five domains are connected through a 64-bit point-to-point AXI4 crossbar.

We integrate AXI-REALM into Carfield by adding four irealm units at the crossbar’s ingress of all time-critical managers the two DSAs and the two CVA6 cores. An erealm unit ensures real-time responses from the platform’s Ethernet (ETH) controller, which accesses time-critical sensor data. Characterization in Carfield shows ETH to be prone to data loss, and it further exhibits strong fluctuations in timing behavior. Figure 7 shows the enhanced architectural block diagram enhanced with our AXI-REALM units.




Fig. 7: Architectural block diagram of the Carfield platform.




Fig. 8: Carfield's hierarchical area including AXI-REALM.

A. Area Impact

We synthesize Carfield with the AXI-REALM extensions in GlobalFoundries' 12 nm node using typical timing corners. Figure 8 presents the total SoC area of 24 MGE and the hierarchical area contributions of our units introduced. The irealm units incur a total overhead of 330 kGE, contributing 1.4% to the total area. The erealm unit uses 50 kGE (0.21%) of the SoC's area. The parameterization of the AXI-REALM units implemented in Carfield is given in Table II, Section IV.

B. Synthetic Performance Analysis of irealm

We first evaluate the functional performance of the irealm architecture using a memory-bound synthetic benchmark, which emulates the real-time-critical task, to maximize the effects of interconnect and subordinate interference between the processor cores and the platform's DSAs. This synthetic benchmark uses CVA6 to copy data between different memory locations while a DMA engine in one of the DSAs performs data transfer operations. The default configuration is to copy 1 KiB of data with the core from Carfield's hybrid LLC, configured as a SPM, to L2 memory while the DSA causes interference in the SPM using long bursts of 256 beats. Large and equal budget periods as well as a fragmentation size of one are used if nothing else is specified. Results from application benchmarks are presented in Section V-D.

1) *Controlling Fairness: Burst Fragmentation*: We configure the irealm units of CVA6 and one of the DSA to fragment transactions at different granularities without any budget limitation. For this synthetic assessment, the write buffer is disabled, as both managers are under our control, eliminating the possibility of bandwidth stealing. To simulate different DSA workloads, we vary the DMA transaction length in Figure 9a from 32 to 256 64-bit words. Fragmenting all beats to single-word granularity results in the best performance independent of the nature of the DMA transfer; in this setting, CVA6 achieves 68% of its isolated performance. The worst slowdown can be observed in the presence of 256-word-long




Fig. 9: Performance results of CVA6 copying data between (a) SPM and L2 with the DSA accessing SPM at various granularities in 64-bit beats and (b) DRAM and L2 with the DSA accessing DRAM at various problem sizes in byte. *iso* denotes the isolated, *unr* the unregulated performance.

bursts without fragmentation activated, which represents the unregulated case: CVA6 only achieves 1% of the isolated performance. The latency of each core access increases from 11 cycles to 266 cycles, as core transfers are interleaved by the 256-cycle-long DSA transfers.

In a second experiment, Figure 9b, we copy data between the system's external DRAM cached by the LLC and the L2 memory. The DSA DMA is configured to emit 256-word-long bursts at varying data set sizes. Due to conflict misses between the DSA and the core, and capacity misses when the DSA transfer size surpasses the LLC capacity, the fraction of isolated performance drops from 80% (16kB) to 23% (64kB) at single-word fragmentation. AXI-REALM can help mitigate interference in accessing a shared cached memory location, allowing Carfield to achieve up to 23% of the isolated performance as opposed to 4% without regulation. To improve performance further, complementary regulation strategies must be put in place for the shared LLC. For example, cache coloring or partitioning can mitigate conflict misses or DMA cache bypassing to eliminate capacity misses.

2) *Period and Budget Considerations*: This section assesses AXI-REALM's period and budget functionality at fixed fragmentation. In particular, we demonstrate that tuning each manager's period and budget can prioritize traffic of certain




Fig. 10: (a) Fractional performance at different budget imbalances favoring the critical manager assuming fragmentation one and (b) fractional performance at different period sizes assuming fragmentation size one and equal budget.




Fig. 11: Schedule of the periodic (p) real-time-critical transactions running on CVA6 and the data copy operation (period P) by the DSA DMA.

managers over others and even increase fairness [13] further compared to solely acting on the fragmentation size. We observe that the budget imbalance favoring the real-time task restores performance up to 95% of the isolated case, at a performance detriment to the DSA DMA, see Figure 10a.

Similarly, the period can be used as a knob for online traffic regulation [13]. AXI-REALM does not limit the managers in how to spend the budget within each period. Larger periods introduce less regulation overhead but allow DSA managers to cause more interference. We assume the periodic execution schedule for the critical manager and the DMA DSA given in Figure 11. The first has a period p , 200 cycles, and the latter a period P , set to 1600 cycles. Both managers utilize the interconnect 50% within their period; for the critical manager this corresponds to 800 B in 200 cycles, for the DMA 6400 B in 1600 cycles. The corresponding irealm units are configured equally to a fragmentation size of one. The regulation time period is swept from 50 to 1600 cycles with the budget set to half the maximum transfer size possible during the regulation period. E.g., the budget for the critical manager and the DMA are set to 6400 B each when selecting a period of 1600 cycles.

Figure 10b shows the fractional performance of the DMA and the core given selected period sizes. The performance of the DMA decreases when the irealm period falls below the DMA's period of P , regardless of whether the critical manager is active. This happens due to *overregulation* as every DMA transaction no longer fits a period, interrupting it at least once.

The critical manager nearly matches isolated memory performance — over 93% of the isolated case — when the irealm period aligns with the core's task period of p . Below this critical period, the core's transfer is again overregulated.

3) *Power and Energy Efficiency Analysis*: Section V-B1 establishes full fragmentation as the configuration achieving the best performance in the presence of DSA interference.




Fig. 12: Power and energy of CVA6 copying data between SPM and L2 with the DSA accessing SPM given different fragmentation sizes.

However, fragmenting transfers to word-level accesses increases the switching activity (e.g., the address changes on every access) and, thus, the power consumed by the interconnect and the subordinate devices. We evaluate the energy and power consumption of our synthetic benchmark running on Carfield using timing-annotated switching activity on a post-layout netlist using Synopsys PrimeTime 2022.03. We vary the fragmentation size of the irealm units from one to sixteen beats. The peak power consumed by the host domain, which includes the host, the MCS's main interconnect, and the SPM memory, is linearly increasing with decreasing fragmentation size. When evaluating CVA6's energy spent to copy 1 KiB of data, the energy required is minimal at a fragmentation size of one. Even though the activity of fragmenting transactions is increasing the power consumption of the benchmark, the reduction in execution time outweighs the increase in activity.

C. Synthetic Performance Analysis of erealm

To evaluate the functional performance of erealm connected in front of the ETH peripheral in Carfield, we inject AXI4 transaction faults within the ETH peripheral by either delaying to accept requests or stalling responses. This behavior may occur due to a full transmission buffer or the ETH device failing to send the requested data.

We define the worst-case detection time (WCDDT) as the time between the occurrence of a fault and the erealm unit detecting it. Most protocol errors, e.g., a wrong tID or a superfluous handshake, are detected instantaneously. To derive the WCDDT, we thus consider a timeout event. As explained in Section III-C, an AXI4 transaction is tracked in different stages, each having a dedicated time budget assigned. The




Fig. 13: TACLeBench [31] performance of CVA6. A budget imbalance of 1:1 and a period longer than the application’s runtime is selected. We vary the fragmentation granularity. The applications contain an initialization, *init*, and a *main* phase. *iso* denotes the isolated, *unr* the unregulated performance.

WCDT is equal to the time of the largest budget configured for all stages. For most transactions, the longest stage monitors the read or write data beats (r/w_first to r/w_last), see Figure 5. A timeout happens when a peripheral sends the first read or write r/w_first but never continues to issue any more beats; the erealm unit detects this after the stage’s budget is depleted.

In Carfield, we set the budgets for all stages, but the r/w_first to r/w_last to 20 cycles. As the ETH IP supports bursts up to 256 beats in length, we set the budget for the read and write monitoring to 300 cycles, corresponding to the WCDT of the ETH IP. Carfield implements fast virtualized interrupt support through a core-local interrupt controller, enabling best-in-class interrupt responses of 100 cycles on the CVA6 host core, ensuring quick and agile system reactions to disturbances. The worst-case latency, from the fault occurring to the core reacting, is thus at most 400 cycles. The erealm unit can be configured to automatically reset the faulty subordinate devicethin two cycles from fault detection, preparing it to resume operation immediately once the core is informed.

Thanks to the stage-level tracking of erealm and the fast interrupt support of Carfield, we can inform the core and reset the subordinate in as low as 100 cycles with a WCDT of 400 cycles for the ETH IP in Carfield. This response time is substantially lower than waiting for a deadline miss or a system-wide watchdog reset due to an interconnect stall from a faulty subordinate.

D. Case Study on Carfield

We evaluate the performance of AXI-REALM using heterogeneous benchmark applications on Carfield. We combine a machine learning (ML) inference application running on Carfield’s machine-learning-optimized DSA while executing time-critical applications from *TACLeBench* [31] on the platform’s host RISC-V cores. To simulate a truly heterogeneous application including communication and coarse-grained synchronization, both the DSA and the time-critical tasks access Carfield’s shared L2 SPM memory. TACLeBench provides two real-world applications: *lift* and *powerwindow*; the first mimics the controller of an industrial elevator, the latter one of the four

car windows controlled by the driver and the passenger [31].

We use AXI-REALM to control and monitor the data streams injected by the DSA and the RISC-V cores to restore the performance of the TACLeBench applications. We keep the budget between the two actors equal and large enough to restrict neither the accelerator’s DMA nor the cores from accessing L2. We chose a reasonably small period to mitigate any imbalance issues presented in Section V-B2. The fragmentation is swept between *one*, *fairest*, and 255 (no fragmentation).

For compute-bound applications (*lift*), we observe no interference of the DSA with the execution of the critical program. AXI-REALM does not introduce any measurable overheads in these cases. AXI-REALM can be rapidly disabled, see Section III-D, should a non-memory intensive task be executed on the platform, fully eliminating any dynamic power overhead of the AXI-REALM units. The *powerwindow* task faces $7 \times$ interference from the DSA in shared memory (Figure 13). AXI-REALM reduces this delay by achieving up to 99 % of isolated performance with full fragmentation.

VI. RELATED WORK

We structure AXI-REALM’s related work into two parts: Section VI-A compares the irealm unit to real-time interconnects and regulation modules and Section VI-B compares the erealm unit to SOTA transaction monitoring units.

A. Real-time Extensions: irealm

The SOTA of real-time interconnect extensions can be divided into two fundamental design strategies: *drop-in regulation modules*, which are integrated between the managers and the interconnect itself, or intrusive *interconnect architecture customizations*. The latter strategy profoundly changes the interconnect’s internal structure, intertwining the enhancements with a given memory system architecture and, thus, with a given system [14], [16], [30].

1) *Drop-in Regulation Modules*: Credit-based mechanisms are commonly introduced at the boundary of existing interconnect configurations to impose spatial and temporal bounds on non-coherent, on-chip interconnect networks.

Pagani *et al.* and Restuccia *et al.* analyze and address the problem of multiple DSAs either competing for bandwidth or causing interference in heterogeneous, AXI4-based field programmable gate array (FPGA) SoCs. They propose three units to mitigate contention. The *AXI4 budgeting unit* (ABU) [13] extends the concept of inter-core memory reservation established in multi-processor system-on-chips (MPSoCs) to heterogeneous SoCs. The ABU uses counter-based budgets and periods assigned for each manager in the system, reserving a given bandwidth to each manager. The *AXI4 burst equalizer* (ABE) [19] tackles unfair arbitration by limiting the nominal burst size and a maximum number of outstanding transactions for each manager. The *Cut and Forward* (C&F) [29] unit prevents ahead-of-time bandwidth reservations by holding back transactions until they can certainly be issued. Our AXI-REALM architecture tackles these challenges while optimizing the design to be suitable for high-performance systems

and use cases. AXI-REALM adds only one cycle of latency (Section III) and extremely low area overhead (Section IV).

Farshchi et al. [32] propose the *Bandwidth Regulation Unit* (BRU), a HW module aimed at reducing the regulation overheads of SW approaches. Designed for coherent multi-core SoCs, BRU manages memory traffic per core. Akin to AXI-REALM, it employs a time-slicing approach, albeit with one global period shared by all domains. The design can only regulate the maximum bandwidth, whose size is fixed to the dimension of a cache line, while the number of memory access transactions is user-configurable. Implemented in a 7 nm node, BRU adds minimal logic overhead (<0.3%) and reduces the maximum achievable frequency by <2%. Furthermore, BRU can independently control the write-back traffic to the main memory, mitigating write-read imbalances. Unlike SW techniques [33], this functionality requires significant HW modifications to the cache hierarchy. We argue that it would favor a cache-centric partitioning strategy over an auxiliary module for the system bus.

A key aspect of achieving temporal isolation for shared resources involves extracting significant data from functional units during V&V. This step is essential for determining an optimal upper limit for resource usage during operation. Cabo et al. [34], [35] propose *SafeSU*, a minimally invasive statistics unit. SafeSU tracks inter-core interference in MPSoCs using dedicated counters. Instead of limiting the number of transferred bytes, the maximum-contention control unit (MCCU) allocates timing interference quotas to each manager core in clock cycles. Whenever the allocated quota is exceeded, an interrupt is raised. SafeSU uses temporal information, including contention, request duration, and interference quota, as knobs to enhance traffic observability and enforce controllability. Furthermore, the mechanism addresses interference exclusively in symmetric, general-purpose, multi-core systems. AXI-REALM leverages spatial and temporal information for traffic regulation (i.e., bandwidth reservation and time slicing) and extends the monitoring capabilities to heterogeneous MCSs comprising of real-time-critical, general-purpose, and high-performance domain-specific managers.

2) *Interconnect Customization*: Restuccia et al. [16] propose *HyperConnect*, a custom AXI4-based functional unit block for virtualized FPGA-SoCs. While being the closest SOTA to AXI-REALM, HyperConnect does not tackle ahead-of-time bandwidth reservation issues caused by a slow manager stalling the interconnect (Section III-A2).

Recently, Jiang et al. introduced *AXI-IC^{RT}* [14], one of the first end-to-end AXI4 microarchitectures tailored for real-time use cases. AXI-IC^{RT} leverages the AXI4 user signal to assign priorities and introduces a dual-layer scheduling algorithm for the dynamic allocation of budget and period to each manager during runtime. To prevent request starvation on low-priority managers, AXI-REALM does not depend on the concept of priority, but rather on a credit-based mechanism and a *burst splitter* to distribute the bandwidth according to the real-time guarantee of the SoC. While AXI-IC^{RT} supports several budget reservation strategies, it limits the assessment to managers with equal credit (bandwidth). Finally, from an implementation angle, the design strategy followed by AXI-IC^{RT}

adds extensive buffering to the microarchitecture to create an observation window for early service of incoming transactions based on priorities. Overall, HyperConnect and AXI-IC^{RT} lack monitoring capabilities to track traffic statistics.

In industry, Arm’s *CoreLink QoS-400* is widely integrated into modern FPGA-SoCs to manage contention using the QoS signal defined in the AXI4 and AXI5 specifications. However, QoS-400 has several limitations, as analyzed in [30]. One significant drawback is its intrusiveness; for instance, in a Zynq Ultrascale+ FPGA, the authors report the need to coordinate over 30 QoS points to effectively control traffic [30].

B. Subordinate Guarding: erealm

All the works described in Section VI-A assume *perfect* subordinate behavior, providing a response within a bounded time, and focus on the manager side without considering malfunctioning or misbehaving subordinates. Our erealm unit tackles these challenges by monitoring and guarding subordinate devices. Transaction monitoring and guarding are crucial in studying security, performance analysis, fault detection, and system reliability. With the erealm unit, we use these established concepts in real-time memory interconnect systems.

Arm’s *SP805 Watchdog* [36] is primarily designed for fault detection and system protection by safeguarding the SoCs against SW malfunctions due to unresponsive or runaway processes. The operating system has to reset an internal counter regularly; if it becomes unresponsive, SP805 can either emit an interrupt or reset the entire system. In contrast, erealm provides a HW solution that monitors every subordinate access, reducing fault detection latency. We allow dynamic time budgeting of each subordinate device’s transaction phases and thus support tight latency bounds for each device individually. Unlike SP805, our approach allows the selective reset of the non-responsive subordinate device within a single cycle, leaving the rest of the system operational.

We identify multiple units specialized in monitoring subordinate devices. With Synopsys’ *Smart Monitor* [37] and AMD’s *AXI4 Performance Monitor* [38], industry provides performance monitoring solutions for AXI4 buses and subordinate devices. These units monitor bus traffic and compute key performance metrics, such as data byte count, throughput, and latency. In academia, Ravi et al. present a *Bus Monitor* [39] and Kyung et al. describe their *Performance Monitoring Unit* (PMU) [40] to capture key performance metrics such as transaction count, transfer size, and latency distributions for AXI4 transactions through HW counters. Compared to erealm, neither support multiple outstanding transactions nor provide detailed, *stage-specific* transaction insights. This limits their use in heterogeneous SoCs, where high-performance DSAs emit complex transactions, and detailed performance reports of individual transactions are required.

Delayed or missing responses are not the only critical fault a subordinate device can experience. Lee et al. [41] describe a *Reconfigurable Bus Monitor Tool Suite* for on-chip monitoring of SoCs. The suite offers a *Bus Monitor IP* designed to monitor the device’s performance and check key protocol properties. For the latter, it verifies simple specification-compliance, but

TABLE III: SOTA comparison of AXI-REALM.

		Budget/ Time Slicing	Granularity	Fair Arbitration	Bandwidth Reservation Prevention	Manager Isolation	Statistics	Protocol Checking	Fault Handling	Multiple Outstanding	Target Technology	Area Overhead	
irealm	Regulation Helpers	ABU [13]	Period-based ^a	One subordinate only	✗	✗	✗	N.A.	Ideal subordinate assumed	✗	Xilinx FPGA	715 LUT ^c 908 FF	
		ABE [19]	✗	N.A.	Transfer fragmentation	✗	✗	N.A.	Ideal subordinate assumed	✓	Xilinx FPGA	1130 LUT ^c 582 FF	
		C&F [29]	✗	N.A.	✗	Write buffering	✗	✗	N.A.	Ideal subordinate assumed	N.A.	Xilinx FPGA	3088 LUT ^{d,e} 1467 FF
		SafeSU [34], [35]	SW	SW	N.A.	✗	✗	Bandwidth, latency, interference	N.A.	✗	✗	Tech.-independent	83.1 kGE ^{f,g} 223 kGE ^{f,h}
		BRU [32]	Global period-based ^a	Shared memory	✗	✗	✗	✗	N.A.	Ideal subordinate assumed	✗	Tech.-independent	57.2 kGE ^b
	Interconn. Cust.	Hyperconnect [16]	Period-based ^a	Per subordinate	Transfer fragmentation	Write buffering	✗	✗	N.A.	Ideal subordinate assumed	✓	Xilinx FPGA	3020 LUT ^c 1289 FF
		AXI-IC ^{RT} [14]	Period-based ^a	Per subordinate	Transfer buffering	Buffering	✗	✗	N.A.	✗	✓	FPGA	4745 LUT ⁱ 4184 FF
		QOS-400 [30]	Prio.-based ^a	Per subordinate	✗	✗	✗	✗	N.A.	N.A.	✓	Tech.-independent	N.A.
	erealm	Subordinate Guarding	SP805 [36]	N.A.	Entire system	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✗	IRQ, Global reset	✗	Tech.-independent
Synopsys [37]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✗	N.A.	✗	Tech.-independent	N.A.
AMD [38]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✗	N.A.	✗	Tech.-independent	N.A.
Ravi <i>et al.</i> [39]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✗	N.A.	✗	Tech.-independent	8.86 kGE ^j
Kyung <i>et al.</i> [40]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✗	N.A.	✗	FPGA platform	N.A.
Lee <i>et al.</i> [41]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	✗	✓	✓	Logging-only	✗	FPGA platform	N.A.
AXIChecker [42]			N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	✗	Performance	✗	✗	Tech.-independent	70.7 kGE
irealm	AXI-REALM [Ours]	Period-based ^a	Configurable subordinate regions	Transfer fragmentation	Write buffering	Per manager	Per-region bandwidth, latency	N.A.	IRQ, per-subordinate reset	Throttling mechanism	Tech.-independent	As low as 5 kGE	
erealm		N.A.	Per subordinate	N.A.	N.A.	Per subordinate	Latency fine-granular	✓	✓	✓		As low as 15 kGE	

^a in hardware^b assuming 0.08748 μm^2 for 1 GE (NAND2x1_ASAP7_75t_R)^c Xilinx Zynq-7020^d Xilinx ZCU102^e C=4^f assuming 1.28 μm^2 for 1 GE^g SafeSU^h SafeSU-2ⁱ Xilinx VC709^j assuming 0.718 μm^2 for 1 GE

unlike erealm, it does not offer any protection in multi-ID scenarios with multiple outstanding transactions, e.g., tID mismatch. Chen *et al.* developed *AXIChecker* [42], a rule-based, synthesizable protocol checker enforcing 44 rules ensuring managers and subordinates operate protocol-compliant. Compared to erealm, it can log protocol issues but lacks performance monitoring and reaction capabilities.

C. Final Remarks: AXI-REALM

A distinctive aspect of *AXI-REALM* is in its modular design. It seamlessly combines ingress monitoring and throttling to ensure real-time behavior across managers with egress monitoring and guarding to guarantee timely responses from subordinate devices. Its transparent and modular design requires minimal changes to the system, and its compatibility with many well-tested, silicon-proven crossbars and interconnects eases integration and verification. Most SOTA solutions explicitly restrict the design and evaluation on FPGA platforms, lacking support for ASICs. Our technology-independent approach provides in-system and IP-level gate-level characterization in a modern technology node, facilitating SOTA comparisons.

VII. CONCLUSION

We present *AXI-REALM* a lightweight, minimally invasive, architecture-independent, open-source interconnect extension to enable real-time behavior in high-performance interconnects used in heterogeneous systems.

The irealm unit offers an effective solution for monitoring and moderating manager traffic during interference scenarios on a shared interconnect. It provisions isolation and enforces real-time guarantees to managers executing critical tasks in heterogeneous systems. Integrated into Carfield, an open-source MCS research platform, we achieve 68% of the ideal performance in memory-bound applications, massively reducing the memory access latency by 24 \times , while incurring less than 2% of additional area. When distributing the budget in favor of the core, we achieve over 95% of the isolated performance. Running applications from TACLeBench, we achieve over 98% of the isolated performance.

With the erealm unit, we include an effective HW-based solution to gracefully handle malfunctioning subordinates individually without stalling or locking the rest of the interconnect or the system. The unit monitors the transaction latency and protocol correctness of each guarded subordinate, being able to inform the application-class core in as low as 100 cycles, handshake open transaction, and reset the device should a transaction be overly delayed or the subordinate malfunctioning ensuring timely responses and real-time guarantees.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part through funding from the European High Performance Computing Joint Undertaking (JU) under Framework Partnership Agreement No 800928 and Specific Grant Agreement No: 101036168 (EPI SGA2) and

No: 101034126 (The EU Pilot) and by the Spoke 1 on Future HPC of the Italian Research Center on High-Performance Computing, Big Data and Quantum Computing (ICSC) funded by MUR Mission 4 - Next Generation EU.

REFERENCES

- [1] Semiconductor Research Corporation (SRC), “MAPT microelectronics and advanced packaging technologies roadmap,” [srmapt.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/SRC-MAPT-Roadmap-2023-v4.pdf](https://www.srmapt.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/SRC-MAPT-Roadmap-2023-v4.pdf), Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [2] O. Burkacky, F. Steiner, M. Kellner, J. Deichmann, and J. Werra, “Getting ready for next-generation E/E architecture with zonal compute,” [mckinsey.com/industries/semiconductors/our-insights/getting-ready-for-next-generation-ee-architecture-with-zonal-compute#](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/semiconductors/our-insights/getting-ready-for-next-generation-ee-architecture-with-zonal-compute#), Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [3] A. Mutschler, “Automotive OEMs focus on SDVs, zonal architectures,” [semiengineering.com/automotive-oems-focus-on-sdvs-zonal-architectures/](https://www.semiengineering.com/automotive-oems-focus-on-sdvs-zonal-architectures/), Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [4] Z. Jiang, K. Yang, Y. Ma, N. Fisher, N. Audsley, and Z. Dong, “Towards hard real-time and energy-efficient virtualization for many-core embedded systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 72, no. 1, pp. 111–126, 2023.
- [5] S. Kasarapu and S. M. P. Dinakarao, “Performance and environment-aware advanced driving assistance systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 74, no. 1, pp. 131–142, 2025.
- [6] R. Fletcher, A. Mahindroo, N. Santhanam, and A. Tschiesner, “The case for an end-to-end automotive-software platform,” [mckinsey.com/industries/automotive-and-assembly/our-insights/the-case-for-an-end-to-end-automotive-software-platform](https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/automotive-and-assembly/our-insights/the-case-for-an-end-to-end-automotive-software-platform), Accessed 12/20/2024.
- [7] J. Lim, J. Lee, Y. S. Hong, and C. Kang, “A framework for designing zonal architectures for in-vehicle networks: Balancing communication load and wiring length,” *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [8] S. Pinto, H. Araujo, D. Oliveira, J. Martins, and A. Tavares, “Virtualization on trustzone-enabled microcontrollers? Voilà!” in *2019 IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*, 2019, pp. 293–304.
- [9] H. Jang, C. Park, S. Goh, and S. Park, “Design of a hybrid in-vehicle network architecture combining zonal and domain architectures for future vehicles,” in *2023 IEEE 6th International Conference on Knowledge Innovation and Invention (ICKII)*, 2023, pp. 33–37.
- [10] A. Burns and R. I. Davis, “A survey of research into mixed criticality systems,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 50, no. 6, Nov 2017.
- [11] S. Majumder, J. F. D. Nielsen, and T. Bak, “Partaa: A real-time multi-processor for mixed-criticality airborne systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 69, no. 8, pp. 1221–1232, 2020.
- [12] B. Sá, J. Martins, and S. Pinto, “A first look at RISC-V virtualization from an embedded systems perspective,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 71, no. 9, pp. 2177–2190, 2022.
- [13] M. Pagani, E. Rossi, A. Biondi, M. Marinoni, G. Lipari, and G. Buttazzo, “A bandwidth reservation mechanism for AXI-based hardware accelerators on FPGAs,” in *31st Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS 2019)*, 2019.
- [14] I. Gray, Z. Jiang, K. Yang, N. Fisher, N. Audsley, and Z. Dong, “AXI-IC^{RT}: Towards a real-time AXI-interconnect for highly integrated SoCs,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 786–799, 2023.
- [15] R. Wilhelm, J. Engblom, A. Ermedahl, N. Holsti, S. Thesing, D. Whalley, G. Bernat, C. Ferdinand, R. Heckmann, T. Mitra, F. Mueller, I. Puaut, P. Puschner, J. Staschulat, and P. Stenström, “The worst-case execution-time problem—overview of methods and survey of tools,” *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, vol. 7, no. 3, May 2008.
- [16] F. Restuccia, A. Biondi, M. Marinoni, G. Cicero, and G. Buttazzo, “AXI HyperConnect: A predictable, hypervisor-level interconnect for hardware accelerators in FPGA SoCs,” in *2020 57th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [17] Certification Authorities Software Team (CAST), FAA: Washington, DC, USA, “Position paper, CAST-32A, multi-core processors, rev 0,” [faa.gov/aircraft/air_cert/design_approvals/air_software/cast/cast-32a.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/aircraft/air_cert/design_approvals/air_software/cast/cast-32a.pdf), Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [18] F. Rehm, J. Seitter, J.-P. Larsson, S. Saidi, G. Stea, R. Zippo, D. Ziegenbein, M. Andreozzi, and A. Hamann, “The road towards predictable automotive high - performance platforms,” in *2021 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2021, pp. 1915–1924.
- [19] F. Restuccia, M. Pagani, A. Biondi, M. Marinoni, and G. Buttazzo, “Is your bus arbiter really fair? Restoring fairness in AXI interconnects for FPGA SoCs,” *ACM Transactions on Embedded Computing Systems*, vol. 18, no. 5s, Oct 2019.
- [20] T. Benz, A. Ottaviano, R. Balas, A. Garofalo, F. Restuccia, A. Biondi, and L. Benini, “AXI-REALM: A lightweight and modular interconnect extension for traffic regulation and monitoring of heterogeneous real-time SoCs,” in *2024 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2024, pp. 1–6.
- [21] C. Liang, T. Benz, A. Ottaviano, A. Garofalo, L. Benini, and D. Rossi, “Towards reliable systems: A scalable approach to AXI4 transaction monitoring,” in *2025 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2025, pp. 1–6.
- [22] ARM, “AMBA AXI and ACE Protocol Specification AXI3, AXI4, and AXI4-Lite ACE and ACE-Lite,” 2023, developer.arm.com/documentation/ih0022/k, Version K, Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [23] A. Esper, G. Nelissen, V. Nelis, and E. Tovar, “An industrial view on the common academic understanding of mixed-criticality systems,” *Real-Time Systems*, vol. 54, no. 3, p. 745–795, Jul 2018.
- [24] “IEC 61508-3: Functional safety of electrical/electronic/programmable electronic safety-related systems - Part 3: Software requirements,” International Electrotechnical Commission, webstore.iec.ch/en/publication/5517, Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [25] B. Cilku and P. Puschner, “Towards temporal and spatial isolation in memory hierarchies for mixed-criticality systems with hypervisors,” in *Proceedings of the 19th IEEE International Conference on Embedded and Real-Time Computing Systems and Applications, 1st workshop on Real-Time Mixed Criticality Systems*, pp. 25–28, 2013.
- [26] J. Cardona, C. Hernandez, J. Abella, and F. J. Cazorla, “Maximum-contention control unit (MCCU): Resource access count and contention time enforcement,” in *2019 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2019, pp. 710–715.
- [27] ARM, “Arm architecture reference manual supplement memory system resource partitioning and monitoring (MPAM) for Armv8-A,” 2023, developer.arm.com/documentation/ddi0598/db, Version D.b, Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [28] T. Benz, L. Bertaccini, F. Zaruba, F. Schuiki, F. K. Gürkaynak, and L. Benini, “A 10-core SoC with 20 fine-grain power domains for energy-proportional data-parallel processing over a wide voltage and temperature range,” in *IEEE 47th European Solid State Circuits Conference (ESSCIRC 2021)*, 2021, pp. 263–266.
- [29] F. Restuccia and R. Kastner, “Cut and forward: Safe and secure communication for FPGA system on chips,” *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, vol. 41, no. 11, pp. 4052–4063, 2022.
- [30] A. Serrano-Cases, J. M. Reina, J. Abella, E. Mezzetti, and F. J. Cazorla, “Leveraging hardware QoS to control contention in the Xilinx Zynq UltraScale+ MPSoC,” in *33rd Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS 2021)*, ser. LIPIcs, vol. 196, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2021, pp. 3:1–3:26.
- [31] H. Falk, S. Altmeyer, P. Hellinckx, B. Lisper, W. Puffitsch, C. Rochange, M. Schoeberl, R. B. Sørensen, P. Wagemann, and S. Wegener, “TACLeBench: A benchmark collection to support worst-case execution time research,” in *16th International Workshop on Worst-Case Execution Time Analysis (WCET 2016)*, ser. OpenAccess Series in Informatics (OASIS), vol. 55, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2016, pp. 2:1–2:10.
- [32] F. Farshchi, Q. Huang, and H. Yun, “BRU: Bandwidth regulation unit for real-time multicore processors,” in *2020 IEEE Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*, 2020, pp. 364–375.
- [33] M. G. Bechtel and H. Yun, “Denial-of-service attacks on shared cache in multicore: Analysis and prevention,” *2019 RTAS*, pp. 357–367, 2019.
- [34] G. Cabo, S. Alcaide, C. Hernández, P. Benedicte, F. Bas, F. Mazzochetti, and J. Abella, “Safesu-2: a safe statistics unit for space mpsoCs,” in *2022 Design, Automation & Test in Europe Conference & Exhibition (DATE)*, 2022, pp. 1085–1086.
- [35] P. Andreu, S. Alcaide, P. Lopez, J. Abella, and C. Hernandez, “Expanding SafeSU capabilities by leveraging security frameworks for contention monitoring in complex SoCs,” *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 163, p. 107518, 2025.
- [36] ARM, “ARM watchdog module (SP805) technical reference manual,” 2024, developer.arm.com/documentation/ddi0270/b, Version r1p0, Accessed 12/20/2024.

- [37] Synopsys, “Enhancing Arm SoCs performance with smart monitors,” 2023, synopsys.com/blogs/chip-design/smart-monitors-improve-arm-socs-performance.html, Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [38] AMD, “AXI performance monitor v5.0,” 2017, docs.amd.com/v/u/en-US/pg037_axi_perf_mon_PG037, Accessed: 12/20/2024.
- [39] S. Ravi, K. Ezra, and K. H. Mallikarjun, “Design of a bus monitor for performance analysis of AXI protocol based SoC systems,” *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology (IJRASET)*, vol. 9, no. 19, pp. 6313–6324, 2014.
- [40] H.-m. Kyung, G.-h. Park, J. W. Kwak, W. Jeong, T.-J. Kim, and S.-B. Park, “Performance monitor unit design for an AXI-based multi-core SoC platform,” in *Proceedings of the 2007 ACM symposium on Applied computing*, 2007, pp. 1565–1572.
- [41] P.-C. Lee and J. Huang, “Reconfigurable bus monitor tool suite for on-chip SoC for performance and protocol monitoring,” in *2014 9th International Symposium on Reconfigurable and Communication-Centric Systems-on-Chip (ReCoSoC)*, 2014, pp. 1–6.
- [42] C.-H. Chen, J.-C. Ju, and J. Huang, “A synthesizable AXI protocol checker for SoC integration,” in *2010 International SoC Design Conference (ISOCC)*, 2010, pp. 103–106.




Thomas Benz (Graduate Student Member, IEEE) received his B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in electrical engineering and information technology from ETH Zurich in 2018 and 2020, respectively. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree in the Digital Circuits and Systems group of Prof. Benini. His research interests include energy-efficient high-performance computer architectures, memory interconnects, data movement, and the design of ASICs.



Alessandro Ottaviano (Graduate Student Member, IEEE) received the B.Sc. in Physical Engineering from Politecnico di Torino, Italy, and the M.Sc. in Electrical Engineering as a joint degree between Politecnico di Torino, Grenoble INP-Phelma and EPFL Lausanne, in 2018 and 2020 respectively. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree in the Digital Circuits and Systems group of Prof. Benini. His research interests include real-time and predictable computing systems and energy-efficient processor architecture.



Chaoyun Liang (Graduate Student Member, IEEE) received the M.Sc degree in electronic engineering from University of Bologna, Italy and Technical University of Munich, Germany in 2023. She is currently pursuing a Ph.D degree with the Department of Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering, University of Bologna, Italy. Her main research interests are on-chip and off-chip communication.



Robert Balas (Graduate Student Member, IEEE) received his B.Sc. and M.Sc. degrees in electrical engineering and information technology from ETH Zurich in 2015 and 2017, respectively. He is currently pursuing a Ph.D. degree in the Digital Circuits and Systems group of Prof. Benini. His research interests include real-time computing, compilers, and operating-systems.



Angelo Garofalo (Member, IEEE) received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Bologna, Italy, in 2022. He is currently a Junior Assistant Professor (RTD-A) at the University of Bologna, Italy, and a postdoctoral researcher at ETH Zurich, Switzerland. His research focuses on reliable and time-predictable computing systems, heterogeneous edge AI architectures, and energy-efficient multi-core processors. He has published more than 30 peer-review papers and he is recipient of a best paper award at IEEE ISVLSI 2023.



Francesco Restuccia (Member, IEEE) received his Ph.D. degree from Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna Pisa, Italy, in 2021. Since 2022, he is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of California San Diego. His research interests include hardware security, safety, and timing predictability on heterogeneous platforms.



Alessandro Biondi (Member, IEEE) received his graduate (cum laude) degree in computer engineering from the University of Pisa, Italy, and his Ph.D. degree in computer engineering from Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna. He is an Associate Professor with the Real-Time Systems Laboratory, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna. His research interests include designing and implementing real-time operating systems and hypervisors, schedulability analysis, cyberphysical systems, synchronization protocols, and component-based design for real-time multiprocessor systems.



Davide Rossi (Senior Member, IEEE) received the Ph.D. degree from the University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy, in 2012. He has been a Post-Doctoral Researcher with the Department of Electrical, Electronic and Information Engineering “Guglielmo Marconi,” University of Bologna, since 2015, where he is currently an Associate Professor. His research interests include energy-efficient digital architectures.



Luca Benini (Fellow, IEEE) holds the chair of digital Circuits and systems at ETHZ and is Full Professor at the Università di Bologna. He received a PhD from Stanford University. His research interests are energy-efficient parallel computing systems, smart sensing micro-systems, and machine learning hardware. He is a Fellow of the IEEE, of the ACM, a member of the Accademia Europaea, and of the Italian Academy of Engineering and Technology.