High Performance Energy-Aware Cloud Computing: A Scope of Future Computing

Shailesh Saxena, Mohammad Zubair Khan, Ravendra Singh

Abstract: This publication discusses high-performance energy-aware cloud (HPEAC) computing state-of-the-art strategies to acknowledge and categorization of systems and devices, optimization methodologies, and energy / power control techniques in particular. System types involve single machines, clusters, networks, and clouds, while CPUs, GPUs, multiprocessors, and hybrid systems are known to be device types. Objective of Optimization incorporates multiple calculation blends, such as “execution time”, “consumption of energy” & “temperature” with the consideration of limiting power/energy consumption. Control measures usually involve scheduling policies, frequency based policies (DVFS, DFS, DCT), programmatic APIs for limiting the power consumptions (such as’ Intel- RAPL”, “NVIDIA- NVML”), standardization of applications, and hybrid techniques. We address energy / power management software and APIs as well as methods and conditions in modern HPEACC systems for forecasting and/or simulating power/energy consumption. Eventually, programming examples are discussed, i.e. programs & tests used in specific works. Based on our study, we point out some areas and there significant issues related to tools & technologies, important for handling energy aware computations in HPEAC computing environment.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding energy and power plays an increasingly important role in modern high-performance cloud computing systems. In near future, such exascale computing systems will develop which consume near about 20 MW of maximum power. On the basis of top performance-oriented ranking (https://www.top500.org/lists/top500/), and the ranking of supercomputers per watt efficiency (https://www.top500.org/green500/), Mass acceptance of GPUs has contributed to expand this balance for programs that can operate on such machines efficiently. Parallelization with programming in these hybrid systems must require achieving high efficiency, but there is an issue while it applies with multiple and many core computing. In place of scheduling policies, scaling policies (like DVFS, DFS & DCT) and power reducing APIs have become acceptable for both-CPU & GPU machines, servers as well as mobile lines as power and energy management approaches. Now we have power capping system like Slrum for job management in cluster, which allows idle nodes to be shut down and rebooted when required for reducing the power consumption through DVFS [29].

II. EXISTING LITERATURE

First of all, in the literature [67], the question of adequate energy and performance metrics was reviewed. Several survey associated with high-performance energy-aware computing are there and based on only the study of related techniques, but the environment and tools are also have the impact on energy aware computation. Which are missing in those surveys? So we also include these missing aspects in our review.

In [79] a study of recent data center and cloud were defined which indicate a wide range of energy-aware factors that are associated with computation in cloud environments. The researchers recommended a nomenclature regarding the optimization of power/energy in computing systems including different levels of abstraction and introducing energy-related works including energy model characterizing features of software and hardware both. So we expand this survey with new approaches, tools and represent a more streamlined review of the power/energy issues of today.

A segregates energy-aware computational approach for different computing environment (i.e. servers, clusters, data centers, grid and clouds) is address in [80]. But there is a lacks of description regarding the optimization parameters, techniques such as power capping and the analysis of API’s. We therefore include in our classification study of these performance metrics for optimization of techniques regarding the energy-aware regulation and measurements.

Work in [68] reviews the strategies based on software & hardware techniques for the energy-aware performance analysis as well as technologies of monitoring the energy of computation in HPEAC systems. However this paper does not review those strategies which evaluate and control the consumption of power/energy. It’s main objective is to accumulate the available monitoring strategies for power/energy. However, the review of existing tools in terms of cost, portability and consumer-friendly criteria is included in the paper. Subsequently, we reviewed the controlling policies of power/energy and include it in our review.
Work in [10] comprises an analysis of software technologies from a different point of view to boost energy efficiency in parallel computing; that is, it emphasizes on increasing the efficiency of parallel computing in term of energy. In it authors addresses the components like processor, memory & network in parallel computing and elements like load sharing and balancing algorithms.

A study of strategies for enhancing energy efficiency in distributed systems was addressed in [45] concentrating more on grids and clouds. As we reviewed that it does not include the study of potential optimization policies on the level of node(s) and cluster(s) or energy-conscious simulation of HPEAC systems. We therefore provide a comprehensive list of optimization parameters used by researchers in their works and also classify strategies according to environment and type of resources.

Computational frameworks of power & energy for elevated-performance of computing systems and its implementations are thoroughly explained in [11] with proper references of latest research of others. It discusses node architecture and includes models based on “CPUs”, “GPUs”, “Intel- Xeon Phis” and “FFPGAs”. There is an analysis of counter-based systems. We are more oriented on approaches and techniques as well as whole engineering systems that can use these models.

Energy efficient techniques are discussed in [66] for cluster environment, based on software and hardware level issues that might affect energy efficiency, power and resource management and dynamic scaling of voltage and frequency approaches. We also extend this study in our review through including all possible considered strategies.

A review in [30] regarding principles, strategies and architectures for the processing of energy-efficiency in ultra-scale structures was examined with hardware frameworks, power and energy consumption software mechanisms, energy-conscious planning, algorithmic energy characteristics and algorithmic modulation schemes. This review viewed as a supplementary for our research as it includes explanations of energy-conscious algorithms and algorithmic strategies that is not concentrating in our review but the positive side is we have a broader considerations of the metrics and methods define in it for energy efficiency in our review.

Current research on energy efficiency and processing of constrained energy approaches in HPEC computing systems in form of EXASCALE computing is discussed in [18]. In particular, it takes into account the 20 MW power cap for HPEC computing systems in future. This work also discusses various monitoring software of power such as “Watts Up? Pro”, vendor devices such as “Intel-RAPL”, “NVIDIA- NVML”, “AMD-APM”, “IBM- EnergyScale”, and finer grain tools: “PowerPack”, “Penguin PowerInsight”, “PowerMon & PowerMon2”[86] and “HDEEM-High Definition Energy Efficiency Monitoring”. This paper also address a detailed overview of specific approaches like DVFS on primarily level and monitoring tools. So we are extending the classification of energy approaches in our review with respect to types of systems, resources and optimization metrics.

In [46] authors address how to acclimate the tools of throughput measurement in parallel applications for energy efficiency, explicitly the “libadapt library” and “OpenMP wrapper”.

A review is provided in [47] of different techniques for energy savings with examination of their efficacy in a setting where failures take place. Reliability of energy costs is also considered in the review. A metric of energy-reliability is also suggested here that calculates the required energy to run an application in computing systems.

The research study addressed in [48] provides a structured approach for reviewing the research regarding the energy efficient computing technologies and the end-user software used for managing the components of cloud data centers like computing servers and network devices. The research also highlights current problems in cloud computing systems with the possibilities of future works in the same field. Our study is more concerned with HPEC computing strategies, so some points will be common in both the reviews.

Ultra-scale power monitoring strategies are address in [2]. The focus in this article is about the description of those approaches used in online power measurement, including a thorough study about their current state of computing performance. It also addresses the detailed description of designated tools & techniques with their usage and the possibilities of research in future. To fulfill our main aim about the study of efficient power/energy management, we also include the review of some simulation tools along with strategies and models used for power/energy management.

III. RESEARCH MOTIVATIONS

As per the study of available current research on the aspects of energy on computation, which affected the global environment as well as the performance of HPEC computing systems, our research can be seen as a latest and effected review of development in the same area. We include the description about the following aspects in our review -

- Analysis of available energy and power management APIs and Tools in HPEC computing.
- Different computing environments such as single computing, multiprocessing, cluster, grid, and cloud computing are considered.
- Assessment of different types of resources, including CPU machines, GPU machines and hybrid computing resources.
- Examination about the various optimization metrics of efficiency available in literature including the effect of power/energy and temperature.
- Recognition of different power saving optimization policies like scheduling policies, frequency based policies (DVFS, DFS, DCT) but also the new CPU and GPU power capping functionality, device optimization and hybrid approaches.
- Evaluation of applications used in energy-aware works for measurement and benchmarking.
- HPEC computing systems tools for predicting and simulating energy and power consumption.
- Reinterpretation of open field research problems based on the latest developments and outcomes.
In this study, we only emphasis on reviewing the methods and techniques for proper configuration, simulation and management of energy-aware processing based HPEAC computing systems. Here we are not address the designing aspect of new software/model/technique of power saving, we are only discussing the available APIs, tools and power saving policies that can be use by different researchers/users to develop/use the HPEAC computing applications. In this paper we also not include the study of hardware modifications or improvements in architecture to improve the power efficiency of HPEAC computing systems.

IV. POWER/ENERGY TOOLS FOR HPEACC SYSTEMS

The power/energy tools can be perceived in two category, first monitoring tools and second controlling tools. Some tools are used only to analysis the power/energy consumption in the HPEACC systems while others may allow to limiting the consumption of power/energy other than analyzing the consumption only. We also have some tools that used not only to limit the usage of power/energy, but also have a feature to alter the type of power/energy usage, such as device frequency. At last, there are many derived tools that wrap the above mentioned low-level drivers in a very smooth manner.

The paper [18] provided a comprehensive survey of existing tools for energy / power management. Here we suggest a distinctly different list selecting the most important tools that can be obtained in 2019 and filling out a few holes that the sample above lacks.

4.1. Power Monitoring Tools- our study says that researchers’ already start uses some external meters like devices “Watts Up?Pro” for measuring the consumption of power/energy during computation, when they start focusing on energy efficiency with other performance parameter like execution time, resource utilizations etc. The big advantage of such external devices is that it tracks real power/energy consumption. While these devices cannot able to report the component wise (CPU, GPU and memory etc.) consumption of power/energy.

4.2. Power Controlling Tools- As study said about different implicit techniques and tools that empower us to regulate the usage of power/energy in any computing system. Dynamic voltage and frequency scaling (DVFS) quite often dealt with separately as DVS and DFS has become one strategy that enables us to minimize both voltage and frequency of the computing resources in order to mitigate power/energy usage but subsequently it also degrade the efficiency of computation. DVFS technique works in both (CPUs and GPUs) computing devices. In [60], authors address discrepancies of DVFS usage either in CPU or GPU.

Another technique address in [12] that can lead to power/energy savings is DCT i.e dynamic concurrent throttling and concurrent packing. Reducing the number of resources for any application through reducing the threads define in an application program like OpenMP, we are able to control the power consumption and performance of the application.

4.3. Hybrid Tools- Various tools and hardware are also available for manage the power efficiency in both manners; controlling the power/energy consumption as well as monitoring the usage of power in the systems. In the appendix of [18], authors describe such tools in detail. Some of them are identified as: RAPL (Intel), ADM (AMD), NVML(NVIDIA) and Energy Scale. In [7] some additional tools like C-based programming library (NVML) and a command line utility nvidia-smi included in the list. These tools are supported most of the computing systems like Tesla, Quadro, Titan, and GRID lines. The summarize details of such tools along with their usage references are described in Table 1.

| Tool           | Vendor  | Resource | References | Description                                                      |
|----------------|---------|----------|------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|
| RAPI           | Intel   | CPU      | [21-24]    | Used for performance vs maximum power measurements              |
| APM            | AMD     | CPU      | [25]       | Developers guide describing the capability of the AMD TDP power cap |
| Energy Scale   | IBM     | CPU      | [26]       | Overview on POWER7 power management capabilities                 |
| NVML / nvidia-smi | NVIDIA | GPU      | [18]       | Discussion on differences of using DVFS on CPU                    |

4.4. Extended Tools. We also have some command line interfaces used to evaluate the performance of the computing environments like Performance Application Programming Interface (PAPI) which is still being developed since its release and address first time in paper[88], and has recently been expanded by providing access to the RAPL(Intel) and NVML(NVIDIA) libraries via the PAPI interface[3], in addition to processor quality counters.

In [8] an another open source library tool designed by INTEL named Processor Counter Monitor (PCM) is address which is also a command line utility similar to PAPI interface. It also compiles output counters and allows tracking of power/energy through the interface of RAPL.

In [20] PUPiL “Performance under Power Limits” is address as a hybrid application which include both hardware & software solution to extracting benefits of reducing the consumptions of power/energy. This tries to control both DVFS and core allocation, use of sockets, use of memory and hyper threading. Quite a technique has been contrasted to raw RAPL power capping by authors, and PUPiL is in pursuit of the outcomes achieved.

Score-P [21], supposed for the assessment and successive optimization of HPEAC computing applications, which also allow for the assessment of energy-aware strategies. It shows how clock frequency on the SuperMUC network, affects execution time of finite-element during operations with minimum consumption of power/energy. As result says, energy-optimal settings save 2% energy but increase the execution time by 14%, while time-optimal settings save 14% execution time on the value of 6% increment in the consumption of power/energy.
The power limiting strategies have become available in form of a cap-set [9] as a user-friendly command-line utility, since the release of Ubuntu 18.04 LTS. It is also based on RAFL(Intel), therefore it is said that its usefulness is only for Intel processors. This permits a power cap to be set for each of the required domains like - PP0, PP1, PKG and DRAM.

V. CLASSIFICATION OF HPEAC COMPUTING OPTIMIZATIONS

In this paper we categorize existing literature in a number of aspects, including the following key parameters:

ComputingEnvironment- What type of computing environment like cluster, grid & cloud with how many computing devices like single or multiple have an impact on optimization of HPEACC systems?

Resources- Which types of computers or computing resources, especially processing units like CPU(s), GPU(s) or hybrid (CPU+Accelerator) computing resource(s), are also considered for optimization. There are several works in the literature that represent all identified computing environments and resources (Table 2).

PerformanceMetric(s)- some parameters like energy consumption, power limitation, execution time and temperature, called performance metric(s) are also being optimized for better results (Table 3). During the review of literature we found that many research papers try to reducing the consumption of power/energy during computation but on the other hand they compromise with rest of the performance impact. It can be accomplished by applying power/energy reduction techniques on application phases. There are very few studies concerned with network and memory elements. Automatic profiling and concurrent implementations of hybrid computing systems have been missing.

Methods of Power/Energy Controlling- How the utilization of computing resources are optimized through selection of resource, scheduling of resources, controlling CPU with low level frequency, CPUs / GPUs Power limiting at application level or modification on application level (Table 4).

The literature defines the frequency, computing core [13], memory disk and network links [53] as regards system components that can be regulated in terms of power and energy. Finally, Energy-Efficient-Ethernet that is refers as EEE [57], can also convert the devices works on physical layer into the low mode devices, save the power up-to even 70%. It also describe that in many realistic situations the technological overhead is negligible. The MREEF method considered under [38] points out measures to automate the identification of system stages, process definition, classification, system estimation and the reconfiguration to minimize energy consumption.
## Table 2: Types of Computing Environment & Resources

| Reference | Description | Computing Environment | Computing Resource |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| [33]      | A platform based on ARM Cortex A9, 4, 8, and 16 core architectures | Single Computing | Multicore CPU |
| [34]      | Scheduling kernels on a GPU and frequency scaling | Single Computing | GPU/Accelerator |
| [35]      | A chip with k cores with specific frequencies is considered, and chips with 36 cores are simulated | Single Computing | Multicore CPU |
| [36]      | Finding best application configuration and settings on a GPU | Single Computing | GPU/Accelerator |
| [37]      | Server-type NVIDIA Tesla K20 m/K20c GPUs | Single Computing | GPU/Accelerator |
| [38]      | Exploration of thermal-aware scheduling for tasks to minimize peak temperature in a multicore system through selection of core speeds | Single Computing | Multicore CPU |
| [39]      | Comparison of energy/performance trade-offs for various GPUs | Single Computing | GPU/Accelerator |
| [40]      | Server multicore and manycore CPUs, desktop CPU, mobile CPU | Single Computing | Multicore/Manycore CPU |
| [41]      | Single CPU under Linux kernel 2.6–11/ Single-core Pentium-M (32-bit) in a off-the-shelf laptop | Single Computing | Single CPU |
| [42]      | Intel Xeon Phi KNL 7250 processor with 68 cores, flat memory mode | Single Computing | Manycore CPU |
| [43]      | Exploration of execution time and energy on a multicore Intel Xeon CPU | Single Computing | Multicore CPU |
| [44]      | Task scheduling with thermal consideration for a heterogeneous real-time multi-processor system-on-chip (MPSoC) system | Multiprocessing | Multiple CPU |
| [30]      | Presents a hybrid approach PU2RL (Performance under Power Limits)—a hybrid software/hardware power capping system based on a decision framework going through nodes and making decisions on configuration, considered for single and multiapplication scenarios (cooperative and oblivious applications) | Multiprocessing | Multiple CPUs |
| [45]      | With notes specific to clusters | Multiprocessing | Multiple CPUs |
| [14]      | Systems with 2 socket Westmere-EP, 2 socket Sandy Bridge-EP, and 1 socket Ivy Bridge-HE CPUs | Multiprocessing | Multiple CPUs |
| [46]      | Dual-socket server with two Intel Xeon CPUs Scientific Programming 5 | Multiprocessing | Multiple CPUs |
| [47]      | Proposes integration of power limitation into a job scheduler and implementation in SLURM | Cluster Computing | Multiple CPUs |
| [48]      | Proposes the enhanced power adaptive scheduling (EPAS) algorithm with integration of power-aware approach into SLURM for limiting power consumption | Cluster Computing | Multiple CPUs |
| [49]      | Multicore CPUs as part of a node and cluster on which an MPI application runs but focusing on states of processes running on CPUs, i.e., reducing power consumption of CPUs on which processes are idle or perform I/O operations | Cluster Computing | Multicore CPUs |
| [50]      | Proposes DVFS-aware profiling that uses design time profiling and nonprofiling approach that performs computations at runtime | Cluster Computing | Multiple CPUs |
| [51]      | Split compilation is used with offline and online phases, results from the offline-phase passed to runtime optimization, grey box approach to autotuning, and assumes code annotations on a cluster with Intel Xeon CPUs and MICs | Cluster Computing | Hybrid |
Table 2: Types of Computing Environment & Resources (Continued…)

| Reference | Description                                                                 | Computing Environment | Computing Resource          |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------|
| [52]      | Proposes a runtime library that performs power-aware optimization at runtime and searches for good configurations with DFS/DCT for application regions Sandy Bridge and Haswell Xeon CPUs | Cluster Computing      | Multicore CPU                |
| [53]      | Approaches for modeling, monitoring, and tracking HPC systems using performance counters and optimization of energy used in a cluster environment with consideration of CPU, memory, disk, and network | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [54]      | Proposed an energy-saving framework for a cluster with ranking and correlating counters important for improving energy efficiency which related to runtime, system, CPU, and memory power | Cluster Computing      | Single/Multicore CPU         |
| [55, 56]  | Energy savings on a cluster with Sandy Bridge processors                      | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [57]      | With consideration of disk and network scaling                                | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [58]      | Possibly 2 multiprocessor systems, including disk, memory, processor, or even fans | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [24]      | Analysis of performance vs power of a 32-node cluster running a NAS parallel benchmark | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [59]      | A procedure for a single device (a compute node with                          | Cluster Computing      | Single/Multi                 |
| [60]      | Homogeneous multicore cluster                                                 | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [61]      | Cluster with CPUs                                                             | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [62]      | Computer system with several nodes each with                                 | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [63, 64]  | Cluster with several nodes each with multicore CPUs                           | Cluster Computing      | Multicore CPUs               |
| [65]      | Cluster with several nodes with CPUs                                          | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [66, 67]  | Cluster in a data center                                                       | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [68]      | Sandy Bridge cluster                                                          | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [69]      | Cluster with InfiniBand                                                        | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [70]      | Overprovisioned cluster which can run a certain                              | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [71]      | Cluster with 1056 Dell PowerEdge SC1425 nodes                                 | Cluster Computing      | Multiple CPUs                |
| [72]      | A cluster with 9421 servers connected by InfiniBand                            | Cluster Computing      | GPU/Accelerator              |
| [73]      | A cluster or collection of clusters allowed in the model and implementation    | Grid Computing         | Hybrid                       |
| [74]      | Implementations of hierarchical genetic strategy-based grid scheduler and algorithms evaluated against genetic algorithm variants | Grid Computing         | Multiple CPUs                |
| [75]      | Meant for cloud storage systems/ GPUs used for generation of parity data in a RAID | Cloud Computing        | GPU/Accelerator              |
| [76]      | Related to assignment of applications to virtual and                          | Cloud Computing        | Multiple CPUs                |
| [77]      | Used as IaaS for computations                                                  | Cloud Computing        | Multiple CPUs                |
| Reference | Description                                                                 | Execution Time | Power Limit | Energy Consumption | Temperature |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| [73]      | Minimization of application running time with an upper bound on the total power consumption of compute devices selected for computations | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [47]      | Shows benefit of power monitoring for a resource manager and compares results for fixed frequency mode, minimum power level assigned to a job, and automatic mode with consideration of available power. | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [30]      | Performance under power cap, timeliness, and efficiency/weighted speedups are considered | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [48]      | Execution time vs maximum power consumption per system considered, consideration of system utilization, power consumption profiles, and cumulative distribution function of the job waiting time. | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [52]      | Application slowdown vs power reduction and optimization of performance per Watt | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [24]      | Analysis of performance vs power limit configurations                        | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [42]      | Analysis of performance vs power limit configurations                        | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [62]      | Analysis of performance/execution time vs power limit configurations         | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [68]      | Turnaround time vs cluster power limits                                      | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [46]      | Consideration of impact of power allocation for CPU and DRAM domains on performance when power capping | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [70]      | Optimization of the number of nodes and power distribution between CPU and memory in an overprovisioned HPC cluster | ✓              | ✓           |                    |             |
| [33]      | Task partitioning and scheduling, heuristic algorithm task partitioning, and scheduling TPS based on task partitioning compared to Min-min and PDM | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [38]      | Finding such core speeds that tasks complete before deadlines, and peak temperature is minimized | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  | ✓           |
| [67]      | Thermal aware task scheduling algorithms are proposed for reduction of temperature and power consumption in a data center, and job response times are considered | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [44]      | Minimization of energy consumption of the system with consideration of task deadlines and temperature limit | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [66]      | Workload placement with thermal consideration and analysis of cooling costs vs data center utilization | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [34]      | Concurrent kernel scheduling on a GPU+ impact of frequency scaling on performance and energy consumption | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [45]      | Dynamic core and uncore tuning to achieve the best                            | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [57]      | Trade-off between performance (measured by execution time) and energy consumption (with consideration of disk and network scaling) | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [14]      | Trade-off between performance and energy consumption                         | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
Table 3: Performance Metric (Continued…)

| Reference | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Execution Time | Power Limit | Energy Consumption | Temperature |
|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| [74]      | Bijective optimization task with make-span and average energy consumption                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [50]      | Joint optimization of value (utility) and energy, consideration of jobs with dependent tasks, profiling, and nonprofiling-based approaches                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [51]      | Performance and energy efficiency, focus on application autotuning, and framework                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [58]      | Keeping performance close to initial and make energy saving                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [53]      | Performance vs energy consumption, trade-off, impact of detection, and recognition thresholds on energy consumption and execution time                                                                                                                                                                                                     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [75]      | Maximization of performance and minimization of energy consumption at the same time shown for the proposed GPU-RAID compared to a regular Linux-RAID                                                                                                                                                                                      | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [39]      | Exploration of trade-offs between performance and energy consumption for various GPUs                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [76]      | Simultaneous minimization of energy and execution time                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [77]      | Minimization of energy consumption (kWh) while maintaining defined QoS (percentage of SLA violation)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [59]      | Minimization of energy consumption (J) while keeping a minimal performance influence                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [42]      | Analysis of execution time vs energy usage for various power limit configurations, using DDR4 or MCDRAM memories                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [60]      | Pareto optimal solutions incorporating performance and energy taking into account functions such as speed of execution vs workload size and dynamic energy vs workload size, and optimal number of processors is selected as well                                                                                           | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [63, 64]  | Consideration of impact of DCT and combined DVFS/DCT on execution time and energy usage of hybrid MPI/OpenMP applications and controls execution of OpenMP phases with the number of threads and DVFS level based on prediction of phase execution time with event rates                                                                 | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [65]      | Minimization of energy delay product of MPI applications in a transparent way through reduction of CPU performance during MPI communication phases                                                                                                                                                                                               | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [43]      | Exploration of execution time and energy of parallel OpenMP programs on a multicore Intel Xeon CPU through various strategies involving various loop scheduling ways, chunk sizes, optimization levels, and thread counts                                                                                           | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [69]      | Minimization of energy used at the cost of minimal performance loss and proposes energy-aware MPI (EAM) which is an application oblivious MPI runtime that observes MPI slack to maximize energy efficiency using power levers                                                                                                                     | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [72]      | Providing a default configuration for an acceptable power-performance trade-off, with additional policies implied for a specific computing                                                                                                                                                                                                  | ✓              | ✓           | ✓                  |             |
| [49]      | Energy minimization with no impact on performance                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | ✓              |             |                    |             |
| [35]      | Energy minimization at the cost of increased execution time, integer linear programming-based approach in order to find a configuration with the number of cores minimizing energy consumption                                                                                                                                                       |                |             | ✓                  |             |
Table 3: Performance Metric (Continued…)

| Reference | Description                                                                                                                                                                                                 | Performance Metric |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| [55, 56]  | Energy minimization at the cost of increased execution time, achieving energy savings while running a parallel application on a cluster through DVFS and frequency minimization during periods of lower activity: intranode optimization related to inefficiencies of communication, intranode optimization related to nonoptimal data, and computation distribution among processes of an application | ✓                  |
| [54]      | A what-if prediction approach to predict energy savings of possible optimizations, and the work focuses on identification of a set of performance counters for a power and performance model                                                                                     | ✓                  |
| [36]      | Finding an optimal GPU configuration (in terms of the number of threads per block and the number of blocks)                                                                                                   | ✓                  |
| [37]      | Minimization of energy after an application has finished through frequency control                                                                                                                          | ✓                  |
| [40]      | Energy minimization at the cost of increased execution time through power capping for parallel applications on modern multi and manycore processors                                                                 | ✓                  |
| [41]      | Energy minimization with low-performance degradation (aiming up to 5%)                                                                                                                                       | ✓                  |
| [61]      | Energy minimization of MPI programs through frequency scaling with constraints on execution time, linear programming approach is used, and traces from MPI application execution are collected                                     | ✓                  |
| [36]      | Finding an optimal GPU configuration (in terms of the number of threads per block and the number of blocks)                                                                                                   | ✓ ✓                |

Table 4: Energy/Power Controlling Methods.

| Reference | Description                                                                 | Selection of devices | Scheduling | DVFS/DFS/DCT | Power Capping | Application Optimizations |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| [73]      | Selection of devices in a cluster or collection of clusters such that maximum power consumption limit is followed + data partitioning and scheduling of computations | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [35]      | Selection of cores for a configuration minimizing energy consumption        | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [75]      | Using GPUs for optimization/generation of parity data                       | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [39]      | Selection of best GPU architectures in terms of performance/energy usage point of view | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [58]      | Specific scheduling and switching off unused cluster nodes                 | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [33, 71]  | Task partitioning and scheduling                                            | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
| [44]      | A two-stage energy-efficient temperature-aware task scheduling algorithm is proposed: in the first stage, dynamic energy consumption under task deadlines and in the second stage temperature profiles of processors are improved | ✓                      |            |              |               |                          |
### Table 4: Energy/Power Controlling Methods. (Continued…)

| Reference | Description                                                                 | Selection of devices | DVFS/DFS/DCT | Power Capping | Application Optimizations |
|-----------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| [76]      | Application assignment to virtual and physical nodes of the cloud            |                      |              |               |                          |
| [66]      | Workload placement in a data center                                         |                      |              |               |                          |
| [68]      | Proposal of RMAP—a resource manager that minimizes average turnaround time for jobs provides an adaptive policy that supports overprovisioning and power-aware backfilling |                      |              |               |                          |
| [49]      | For MPI applications with the goal not to impact performance                |                      |              |               |                          |
| [47]      | Uniform frequency power-limiting investigates results for the fixed frequency mode, minimum power level assigned to a job, and automatic mode with consideration of available power |                      |              |               |                          |
| [45]      | Core and uncore frequency scaling of CPUs                                   |                      |              |               |                          |
| [55, 56]  | Minimization of energy usage through DVFS on particular nodes               |                      |              |               |                          |
| [52]      | DVFS, DCT                                                                    |                      |              |               |                          |
| [14]      | DVFS, DCT                                                                    |                      |              |               |                          |
| [37]      | Control of frequency on a GPU                                               |                      |              |               |                          |
| [41]      | DVFS with dynamic detection of computation phases (memory and CPU bound)     |                      |              |               |                          |
| [59]      | DVFS with a posteriori (using logs) detection and prioritization of computation phases (memory and CPU bound) |                      |              |               |                          |
| [61]      | Sysfs interface is used                                                      |                      |              |               |                          |
| [63, 64]  | DCT, combined DVFS/DCT                                                       |                      |              |               |                          |
| [65]      | Sysfs interface                                                              |                      |              |               |                          |
| [72]      | Setting the frequency according to the established computing center policies |                      |              |               |                          |
| [24]      | Using Intel RAPL for power management                                        |                      |              |               |                          |
| [40]      | Using Intel RAPL for analyzing energy/performance trade-offs with power capping for parallel applications on modern multi- and manycore processors |                      |              |               |                          |
| [42]      | Using PAPI and Intel RAPL                                                    |                      |              |               |                          |
| [62]      | Using Intel RAPL                                                             |                      |              |               |                          |
| [46]      | Using Intel’s power governor tool and Intel RAPL                             |                      |              |               |                          |
| [54]      | Theoretical consideration of optimizations of an application that results in improvement of performance characteristics |                      |              |               |                          |
| [36]      | Finding an optimal GPU configuration (in terms of the number of threads per block and the number of blocks) |                      |              |               |                          |
| [53, 57]  | Control of CPU frequency, spinning down the disk, and network speed scaling  |                      |              |               |                          |
| [43]      | Exploration of various loop scheduling ways, chunk sizes, optimization levels, and thread counts |                      |              |               |                          |
| [30]      | Software + RAPL, the proposed PUPIL approach combines hardware’s fast reaction time with flexibility of a software approach |                      |              |               |                          |
| [48]      | Scheduling/software + resource management (including RAPL), the proposed algorithm takes into account real power and energy consumption |                      |              |               |                          |
In Table 5, we take three of the main factors described in Tables 2-4 and correlate them to illustrate current work in the form of measurements, methods of managing power/energy and sort of appliance. This correlating of factors is providing a strong basis of description the recent trends in research into HPEAC computation as well as to indentify the transparent fields of further study.

Although most of the literature discussed focuses on efficiency and power or energy management during program execution, pre or post execution situations can also be called. In fact, after the application on a GPU has been ended the study in [35] considers the post-execution scenarios. In a case like this, energy consumption can be minimized relative to the normal scenario by means of imposed frequency controls. The tables take information into consideration.

1. Prediction Based Simulation of Power/Energy Consumption in HPEAC Systems -

Several Tools are available for predict the future need of power/energy in HPEAC computing systems and simulate it for increase the performance of computing. The comparative summary of such types of tools is present in Table 6.

Grid-S-Sim[81] is a simulator specially design to simulate the performance of scheduling policies in grid computing environment with the proper utilization of computing resources and their energy.

The DCworms [65] extension provides additional plugins in a built data center for temperature and usage of power/energy. This simulator is able to work on three types of approaches for energy saving modeling: (i) static approach with various power-level modes, (ii) dynamic approach in which energy consumption depends on the load of resources at run time, and (iii) application specific approaches which can be used for advanced model tuning. On the comparison of actual hardware implementation with the simulations results of these approaches, we found a very high correlation in actual HPEAC computing system and it simulation for both power and thermal models[43].

Modeling Efficiency, Reliability and Power consumption of multilevel parallel HPC Systems using CPUs and GPUs (MERPSYS[17]) enables hierarchic modeling and testing of a given program for the grid, cluster or single machinery architecture. The platform includes the flexible system and task specifications for simulating power consumption and running time (Java scripts defined by using the web simulator interface). Typical SMPI and DAC (Divide and Conquer) software [26] were used to test this simulator.

CloudSim [82] is a platform devoted to simulating behavior, following an IaaS architecture, of a cloud or a server federation. The platform helps you to model all core cloud elements, including physical devices, VM distribution, cloud sector, network properties and complex workflows. The findings of the simulation help the data centre's in - allocation of services, QoS and measurement of energy consumption. CloudSim is used by scientific and industry analysts, such as HP Laboratories in the United States.

SimGrid[58] is a multi-faceted, multi-faceted and modular event modeling system for grid environments. Two styles of APIs, such as MPIs from industry analysts, such as HP Laboratories in the United States.

SimGrid extension [17] requires energy consumption for parallel HPC network implementations with multimedia device DVFS technology.

Table 4: Energy/Power Controlling Methods. (Continued…)

| Reference | Description | Energy/Power control method |
|-----------|-------------|----------------------------|
| [34]      | Concurrent kernel execution + DVFS | ✓  ✓ | ✓ |
| [50, 74]  | Scheduling + DVFS | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [38]      | Scheduling + DVFS for minimization of temperature and meeting task deadlines | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [51]      | Scheduling jobs and management of resources and DVFS | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [77]      | Selection of the resources for a given user request, with VM migration and putting unused machines in the sleep mode | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [60]      | Workload distribution + DVFS-based multiobjective optimization | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [69]      | Polling, interrupt-driven execution (relinquishing CPU and waiting on a network event), DVFS power levels | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| [70]      | Selection of nodes in an overprovisioned HPC clusters and Intel RAPL | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
GENSim [78] simulator is used to simulate the data centers under the modeling of mixed task feed, both for web based activities and batch activities.

The method was used for energy consumption calculation with both brown and green energy being used to speed up the current computations of batch processing under that period of time when renewable energy predicted at peak. It is also used to calculate power consumption. The test results were tested with a real hardware test bed made up of a set of cloud servers centered on the CPU (Intel Nehalem)[76].

For HPEAC computing model, combinations of OMNet++ tools with INET [72] were used, in which energy algorithms were tested in the programming process. This took into consideration the individual cluster setup and simulated the clients request about 400 jobs. The conduct of the key server modules, including the departure of inactive nodes, was evaluated. The outcomes of the simulation were contrasted with the results found in real environment.

A comprehensive system to test data center power consumption is given by GDCSim[83] (Green data center Simulator). This method allows for study of geometries of data centres, task features, network resources forecasting and optimization algorithms. This facilitates both the thermal analysis of the resource management system in different physical conditions (use of CFD) and the energy efficiency analyzes. The simulator has been used to estimate the scheduling and the workload in the Internet data center in a HPC context.

A cloud simulator, which offers a energy consumption model for different architectures of a data centre, has been provided by GreenCloud[77]. The architecture includes basic elements of the networks for workload: storage, connectivity, convergence and core network equipment including switches (like L2 & L3) and routers that run at different speed of networks such as an Ethernet of 1, 10 and 100 Giga byte.

| Performance Metric | Device | Selection of devices/scheduling | DVFS/DFS/DCT | Power capping | Application optimization | Hybrid |
|--------------------|--------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Performance/execution time with power limit | 1x CPU | [52] | [24, 42] | | | |
| | Nx CPU | [68] | [47] | [46, 67] | [30, 48, 70] | |
| | GPU | | | | | |
| | Hybrid | [73] | | | | |
| Performance/execution time/energy minimization + thermal aware | 1x CPU | [33] | | [38] | | |
| | Nx CPU | [44, 66, 67] | | | | |
| | GPU | | | | | |
| | Hybrid | | | | | |
| Performance/execution time/value + energy optimization | 1x CPU | [58] | [59] | [42] | [43] | [77] |
| | Nx CPU | [76] | [14, 45, 63–65, 72] | [53, 57] | [60, 69, 74] | |
| | GPU | [39, 75] | | [34] | | |
| | Hybrid | | | [51] | | |
| Energy minimization | 1x CPU | [35] | [41, 49] | [40] | [54] | |
| | Nx CPU | [55, 56, 61] | | | | |
| | GPU | | | [37] | | |
| | Hybrid | | | [36] | | |
| Product of energy and execution time | 1x CPU | | | | | |
| | Nx CPU | | | | | |
| | GPU | | | | | |
| | Hybrid | | | | | |
Table 6: Prediction or Evaluation Simulators for Power/Energy Consumption in HPEAC system.

| Simulators                  | Computing Environment | Reference | Description                                                                 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| GSSim/DCworms               | Grid                  | [80, 81]  | A scheduler simulation concerning performance and energy consumption for complex grid architectures |
| MERPSYS                     | Grid/cluster          | [82, 83]  | Used to simulate the energy consumption of a cluster compute nodes          |
| CloudSim                    | Cloud                 | [84]      | Used for simulation of VM provisioning in a cloud environment                |
| SimGrid                    | Grid                  | [85]      | Focused on its versatility and scalability                                  |
| GENSim                     | Cloud                 | [86]      | Used to simulate green energy prediction                                    |
| OMNet++, INET              | Cluster               | [58]      | Used for simulation of switching off the unused nodes in a cluster          |
| GDCSim                     | Data center           | [87]      | Used for holistic evaluation of HPC and Internet data centers               |
| GreenCloud                  | Data center           | [88]      | Used for evaluation of cloud data centers with various infrastructure architectures |
| TracSim                    | Cluster               | [89]      | Used for maximizing the performance for a given power cap                  |
| ASKALON                    | Cloud                 | [90]      | Used for cloud simulation with a given power cap                           |
| Energy-aware HyperSim-G    | Grid                  | [74]      | Used for assessment of energy-aware scheduling algorithms                   |
| GPU design space exploration | GP GPU               | [39]      | Dedicated for multiobjective GP GPU evaluation and selection               |
| Sniper + McPAT              | CPU                   | [35]      | Used for multicore CPU energy-aware simulation                             |

The simulator implements DVFS and DNS in simulation of power management with the numerous workload characteristics that are built into the specified model of data center. It also presents different examples that estimate the consumption of energy under 2-layer and 3-layer DC systems, including a high-speed (100 GB) Ethernet version of interconnection.

TracSim[27] is an high performance cluster simulator with a fixed capacity of power/energy usage that can’t be increased because of limitation about cooling as well as the connections of electrical signals. Another theory is that some organizations need less electricity. Some can use more space for energy consumption. In order to simulate different approaches about determine the accurate level of power consumption, it applies various programming policies. Experiments have shown that this approach can give best results in a particular environment, i.e. high performance cluster computing at LANL (Los Alamos National Laboratory), and in most instances the average simulation findings are correct at 90 percent.

Authors of [28] proposed a hybrid combination of 3 methods that provide the entire device with a special power limit on the InfraS (IaaS) platform for an integrated event-based cloud Simulation. The elements of the simulator are, (i) ASKALON [99] used to describe the workflow, (ii) DISSECT-CF[84] describe the functionalities of cloud environment, and (iii) Ground-Sim [44], simulate the experiment according to proposed models/ algorithms. For the performance evaluation, it focused on the workflows simulation with the implementation of real trace. Given the complex solution it was efficient and scalable.

In order to test genetic-based planning algorithms used within a grid setting, the energizer HyperSim-G simulator [74] was used. A simple HyperSim-G simulation package defined in [93] is used as a base for this method. It utilized the DVFS technique in simulation of power management policies and conducted different experiments to show that grid schedulers are systematically evaluated the minimization of energy and performance.

Project GP GPU space exploration is suggested in [50], which offers a method to test GP GPU systems for multi-objective uses specifically in the field of medical computations or processing of large industry based applications. The analysis is carried out the different evaluation parameters, such as Performance, Energy Consumption and Evaluation Capacity of modeled devices at real time. The main objective of this simulator (follows a distributed framework) is to supports a range of GPUs, in the setup of heterogeneous cloud elements. A realistic
streaming test was taken to verify the approach and a small error level was found (in contrast to actual systems below 4 percent) in the worst case.

Langer et al. introduced in [67] a study on minimizing energy consumption in the multi-core chips for two specific HPEC benchmark. They described an optimal configuration based on integer linear programming that also solved different heuristics. The simulation follows the Sniper program [85] to improve the precision of the simulations to increase efficiency. The McPAT Framework [91] has been strengthened to the simulators to provide energy-sensitive space for multicored computing. It also able to simulate dynamic changes, short-circuit and leak power modeling.

VI. SCOPE OF RESEARCH UNDER HPEC -

At last, based on our analytical study of research in high efficiency computing with energy consciousness, we can point out the following research fields that seem crucial for further progress in the same area:

(1) Table 1 presents the range of HPEC tools used for power/energy management, shows the need to API’s unification with vendors or supplier, so that we easily choose the effective power-aware API suitable for HPEC computing systems (multi-core machines like CPUs/GPU/Accelerator) to support the maximum parameters related to power/energy saving for increase the computing performance.

(2) Table 6 presents the precision and usability of the simulators used for prediction based simulation according to the specific computing environments and resources described in Table 2, and used metrics, show that further development of, possibly empirical, performance-energy models for a wide range of CPU and GPU architectures for various types of applications is required including performance (power limit) functions, availability for runtime usage as well as simulator environments.

(3) As per Table 5, we can identified several directions of research in the field of HPEC computing in which further development is still required:

(i) Power/Energy saving techniques for hybrid computing systems (i.e. CPU+Accelerator).

(ii) Optimization of power/energy saving strategies with the target of minimizing the consumption of energy as well as execution time

(iii) About the hybrid energy strategies, used for minimizing both energy consumption as well as energy-time.

(4) Finally, the analysis shown in Table 4 about the strategies of energy controlling, gives us the following conclusions:

(i) It is required to develop any tool which has the ability of automatic configuration of HPEC computing system for achieving the best computational performance with less energy consumption. While there are some strategies for some specific type of applications but there is a lack of such general tools, do adjustment in the variation of APIs. These tools can also be used the proposed model(s) to implement the “performance-energy” profile of the computation.

(ii) Self/Automatic tuning of the HPEC computing device for hybrid (CPU + accelerator) resources and efficiency at runtime, in which the excess of computations can be calculated by power / energy limits, not only at the time of the computation.

(iii) During the validation of existing strategies of power/energy management, it is also essential to achieve the technical up-gradations and quality improvements. For example- validation of (ADM) TDP Power Cap tool or the (IBM) Energy Scale functionality.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE SCOPE-

In the article, we study about the APIs/Tools/Simulators used for the energy controlling and management in HPEC computing systems, which include state of art about CPUs and GPUs, and introduced power/energy consumption modeling methods and/or simulation throughout HPC systems. We explored techniques, control methods, standards for optimization, and sample programming, as well as metrics for state of the art energy efficient computing work. In specific, approaches have been proposed for structures like workstations, servers, networks and clouds utilizing different computer hardware such as multi- and multi-core CPU and GPU. Evaluation included output duration, energy consumption, and temperature variations used. The possible solution covers scheduling and DVFS / DFS / DCT control methods, power capping and task optimization as well as alternative strategies. Finally, open areas for future research in this field have been presented and recommendations.
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