

Energy Efficient Algorithms based on VM Consolidation for Cloud Computing: Comparisons and Evaluations

Qiheng Zhou¹, Minxian Xu^{*1}, Sukhpal Singh Gill², Chengxi Gao¹, Chengzhong Xu^{1,3}, and Rajkumar Buyya⁴

¹Shenzhen Institutes of Advanced Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

²School of Electronic Engineering and Computer Science, Queen Mary University of London, UK

³Faculty of Science and Technology, Macao University, China

⁴School of Computing and Information Systems, University of Melbourne, Australia

Abstract—Cloud Computing has revolutionized as a new paradigm for IT industry during the past decade and emerged the computing ability as the fifth utility. By leveraging the pay-as-you-go model, cloud computing enables to offer the resources dynamically for customers anytime. Drawing the attention from both academia and industry, cloud computing is viewed as one of the backbones of the modern economy. However, the high energy consumption of cloud data centers contributes to high operational costs and carbon emission to the environment. Therefore, the Green cloud computing is required to be promoted to ensure energy efficiency and sustainability, which can be achieved via energy efficient techniques. One of the dominant approaches is applying energy efficient algorithms to optimize resource usage and energy consumption. Currently, various virtual machine consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms have been proposed to reduce the energy of cloud computing environment, however, most of them are not compared comprehensively under same scenario, and their performance are not evaluated with same experimental settings. This makes the users hard to select the appropriate algorithm for their objectives. To provide insights for existing energy efficient algorithms and help researchers to pick up the most suitable algorithm, in this paper, we compare several state-of-the-art energy efficient algorithms in depth from multiple perspectives, including architecture, modelling and metrics. In addition, we also implement and evaluate these algorithms with the same experimental settings in CloudSim. The experimental results show the performance comparison of these algorithms with comprehensive results. Finally, the detailed discussions of these algorithms are provided.

Index Terms—Cloud Computing, Data Centers, Energy Efficient Algorithms, Virtual Machine Consolidation, QoS

I. INTRODUCTION

The emergence of cloud computing has contributed the computing resources as a new utility, like electricity and gas, and shaped the way that how IT resources can be used by customers. Since its emergence, cloud computing has developed rapidly into one of the backbones of modern economy. Consumers including government, research institutes and industrial enterprises have all embraced and benefited from cloud computing significantly. Cloud computing also enables new business to be established within short time, facilitates

the expansion of enterprise globally, accelerates the progress of scientific research, and promotes the creation of various models and applications. Cloud service providers are also offering a variety of cloud services for customers with on-demand access to resources based on the pay-as-you-go model [1] [2] [3].

The infrastructure of cloud computing is cloud data centers. Currently, the various cloud providers, including Amazon, Google, Microsoft, establish large-scale cloud data centers to fulfill the resources and services demands for customers. To ensure the availability and reliability, the cloud data centers are required to be running 24/7. Nowadays, the majority of data centers spread of 300-4500 square meters containing hundreds to thousands physical machines. A typical data center can consume up to 25,000 KWh per day. It is estimated that US data centers can consume 140 million kWh by 2020, which equals to 50 coal-based power plants. It is also claimed that the carbon footprint will reach 2-3% of global emission [4]. To relieve the huge energy consumption and carbon emission, energy efficient techniques are required to be applied in cloud data centers [5].

Virtualization technology is an important part of green cloud data centers to support energy efficiency via Virtual Machines (VMs) consolidation or VM migration¹, where a VM is the software implementation of a computer that running with operating system and applications. VM consolidation is referred as the process the VMs are allocated from one physical machine to another without affecting the execution of users' requests. Virtual machine consolidation has been identified as one of the dominant energy efficient solutions to reduce the energy consumption of cloud data centers [5] [6]. VMs are packed on fewer physical machines via consolidation, thus the idle physical machine can be turned off or switched to the low-power mode [7].

VM consolidation has been proven to be an effective approach to reduce data center energy consumption, and a vari-

^{*}Corresponding author: mx.xu@siat.ac.cn

¹In this paper, we use VMs consolidation and VM migration interchangeably

ous of energy efficient algorithms based on VM consolidation have been proposed. These algorithms aim to optimize the placement of VMs to reduce the energy consumption while ensuring other constraints, e.g. SLA violations. Due to the uncontrolled network traffic, it is hard to conduct experiments under large-scale environment and reproduce results. Therefore, running experiments with validated simulation toolkit is an acceptable and reasonable way. Simulation toolkit can be easily applied to construct large-scale environment and generate reproducible results [8].

In the existing cloud data centers simulation toolkits, CloudSim [9] is the most widely used one. CloudSim supports both system and behavior for cloud data centers, including physical machines, virtual machines, workloads and resource scheduling policies. The resource provisioning model is also generic so that it can be extended with ease and limited efforts. These attractive features have attracted users from hundreds of universities and research institutes, and some extended simulators complementing CloudSim have also been developed, e.g. CloudAnalyst [10] and NetworkCloudSim [11].

The motivation of this article was to clearly analyze the problem of rising energy consumption by providing a comparison of some state-of-the-art energy efficient algorithms in cloud data centers. This article was particularly motivated from the following facts:

- The need and demand for understanding existing VM-based energy efficient algorithms for cloud data centers.
- The proposed algorithms were evaluated in different scenarios and configurations, thus their advantage and disadvantage are not carefully examined.
- The need for selecting the best suitable algorithm based on different priorities.

In this paper, we select several VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithm and implement them in CloudSim. The evaluated algorithms are picked from prominent journals and have showed good performance in energy efficiency. The main **contributions** of this work are as follows:

- Offering a cross-sectional view of the investigated VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms, which are published in prominent journals or conferences.
- Implementing and evaluating the investigated algorithms under the same configurations in CloudSim.
- Discussing the advantages and disadvantages of the investigated algorithm to provide suggested algorithms for different scenarios.

The rest of the paper is organized as: we provide an overview on VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithm for cloud computing in Section 2. The investigated algorithms are introduced in Section 3. Section 4 discusses the modelling of the investigated algorithms, and the adopted metrics in the investigated algorithms are summarized in Section 5. Section 6 shows the performance comparison of the investigated algorithms. Finally, the conclusions and future research trends are given.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Surveys on Energy Efficient Algorithms in Clouds

A few articles have conducted surveys or taxonomies on energy efficient algorithms based on VM consolidation for cloud data centers. Mansouri et al. [12] introduced a survey on resource management in cloud environment, and discussed VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms from cloud management system level. Kuar et al. [2] presented a comprehensive survey for energy efficient scheduling approach in clouds, and compared some consolidation-based techniques, including VM consolidation-based approach. Orgerie et al. [13] conducted a survey on techniques for improving the energy efficiency for large-scale distributed systems, and surveyed on VM migration algorithms for Clouds. Gill et al. [5] proposed a taxonomy for sustainable cloud computing and introduced a taxonomy for VM consolidation-based algorithms without focusing on energy efficiency. Mann et al. [14] introduced a survey on VM allocation in cloud data centers from problems models and optimization algorithms perspectives. Ahmad et al. [15] conducted a survey on VM migration and server consolidation framework for cloud data centers, in which the commonalities and differences of investigated VM migration algorithms are highlighted.

However, these surveys and taxonomy focused on the comparison with high-level comparison of VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms without evaluating the performance under experimental environment. Thus, our work advances the previous work by evaluating the state-of-the-art algorithms not only from modelling perspective but also with experimental comparison. It also identifies the merits and demerits of investigated algorithms to provide suggestions for research in related area.

B. VM consolidation-based Energy Efficient Algorithms

Beloglazov et al. [16] proposed an energy-aware allocation algorithm of data center resources that focuses on VM scheduling named Modified Best Fit Decreasing (MBFD). Their objective is reducing the energy consumption of data centers while ensuring SLA. Mastroianni et al. [17] proposed energy efficient scheduling policy based on probabilistic procedures. Li et al. [17] presented a holistic VM scheduling algorithm capable of minimizing total data center energy consumption, including computing energy and cooling energy. Ranjbari et al. [18] introduced an algorithm based on learning automata for energy and SLA efficient consolidation for VMs in cloud data centers. Zhao et al. [19] proposed a power-aware and performance-guaranteed VM placement approach to balance the trade-offs between saved energy and guaranteed VM performance model. Chen et al. [20] presented an approach exploiting proactive and reactive methods to improve resource utilization and reducing energy consumption by considering uncertainty of cloud computing environment.

In the performance evaluation of these algorithms, the MBFD has been evaluated as the baseline, however, these algorithms are not compared and evaluated together, thus it is

hard to identify the performance of these VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms. In this paper, we aim to compare these algorithms in depth and evaluate them under the same configurations to show the performance comparison.

III. OVERVIEW OF THE INVESTIGATED ALGORITHMS




Fig. 1: Energy efficient scheduling based on VM consolidation

Fig. 1 shows the high-level architecture of VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms in cloud data centers. This architecture is generic and our investigated algorithms all conform it. The architecture mainly has 4 entities:

1. *Users*: Cloud users submit their requests to cloud, and the requests will be processed by cloud services.

2. *Energy efficient scheduler*: it can contain the following components to support the energy efficient scheduling and act as the interface between users and provisioned resources from service providers:

(a) *VM manager*: it tracks the resource usage of VMs and makes decisions on VMs behaviors, including when and where to consolidate the VMs. To achieve this objective, it requires the energy and SLA information from Energy Monitor and SLA monitor.

(b) *Energy Monitor*: it monitors the energy usage in the system caused by VMs and physical machines. It also provides information for the decisions of VM manager.

(c) *SLA Monitor*: it monitors how SLA is influenced by the operations in the system. It can also represent performance constraint when reducing energy consumption in the system.

(d) *Workloads Analyzer*: this component interprets users' requests and service requirement before processing them. The workloads can be distributed to different VMs based on resource characteristics.

3. *Virtual machines*: the workloads are deployed and executed on VMs. The VMs can be managed according to the incoming workloads with two phases: initial placement and VM migration. VMs are placed by initial placement algorithm to be allocated to physical machines initially. According to

workloads, the placement can be optimized via VM consolidation algorithm, thus the unused machines can be temporarily turned off or switched to low-power mode.

4. *Physical machines*: the infrastructure offers physical machines to provision virtualized resources to meet users' requests.

Based on the following criteria, we carefully select 5 state-of-the-art VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithms for our comparisons and evaluations:

- To make the comparison more persuasive, the algorithms were published in prominent journals or conferences, and the algorithms can be the representative of a category of algorithms.
- To ensure the evaluation results reproducible, the algorithms were implemented in CloudSim or can be easily evaluated in CloudSim.
- To make the algorithm comparable, the algorithms should have been evaluated with the same baseline.

In the following subsections, we will provide the overview of our investigated algorithms. Table I shows the comparison of the investigated algorithms based on different parameters such as application type, operational environment, objective function, scheduling mechanism, scheduling criteria, tools used and type of workloads and identified the merits and demerits of every algorithm.

A. MBFD

Modified Best Fit Decreasing (MBFD) [16] aims to reduce the energy consumption of data centers while ensuring SLA. It solves the VM initial placement phase by regarding it as a bin packing problem. MBFD is designed to assign the VMs to the hosts that produce the minimum incrementation of energy consumption. In the VM consolidation phase, the algorithm optimizes the VM allocation via consolidation for better energy efficiency, the target host is also selected as in the initial placement. The motivation of the proposed algorithm is due to the uncertainty of task lifecycles, some VMs are likely to host a over-provisioned of applications while others run with low resource utilization. Unbalanced workloads in cloud data center result in a severe waste of resources and performance degradation. The VM consolidation in this work is a proactive process and can be applied with heterogeneous workloads.

MBFD has been evaluated as the baseline for many VM consolidation-based energy efficient algorithm. Various recent algorithms were proposed to improve the performance of this algorithm. The advantage of this algorithm is that it considers the trade-offs between the reduced energy and SLA violation and it is easy to implement. The limitation is that it does not consider the holistic resource management, which is complemented by the recent research.

B. EcoCloud

EcoCloud [17] is a energy efficient scheduling policy based on probabilistic procedures. VM assignment and VM migration are the two phases in the algorithm. In the VM assignment phase, different from the MBFD introduced in the

TABLE I

Algorithm	Application Type	Operational Environment	Objective Function	Automatic Execution Mode	Power Model	Power Component	Scheduling Mechanism	Workloads	Merits	Demerits
MBFD [16]	Dynamic workloads (web service)	Distributed and Heterogeneous	To optimize energy consumption	Yes	Linear	CPU and memory	Dynamic Consolidation (Proactive)	Heterogeneous workloads	Reduced energy consumption and SLA violation rate	There is a need of holistic resource management
EcoCloud [17]	Dynamic workloads	Distributed and homogeneous	To improve consolidation of VMs	Yes	Linear	Memory and CPU	Bounouli-based scheduling (Proactive)	Planetlab workload traces	Evaluated the effect of power consumption on SLA violations	To investigate the impact of number of VM migrations on SLA violations
GRANITE [21]	Heterogeneous	Distributed	To investigate the temperature distribution of airflow and server CPU	Yes	Linear	Cooling, storage, memory, CPU and network	2D Computational Fluid Dynamics (CFD) modelling-scheduling (proactive)	Google datacenter trace logs	Minimizing total datacenter energy consumption (cooling and computing)	To improve accuracy, 2-dimensional CFD model can be enhanced to 3-dimensional CFD model
LOAD [18]	Dynamic workloads	Homogeneous	To optimize energy consumption, number of VM migrations and SLA violations	No	Linear	CPU	Learning automata based scheduling (proactive)	CPU utilization	Improved CPU utilization and reduced SLA violations and energy consumption	Under-utilization of resource is not considered
ACS [22]	CPU and memory-intensive workloads	Distributed and Heterogeneous	To investigate the relationship between energy consumption, VM migrations and QoS	No	Non-linear	CPU and, Memory	Ant colony optimization and (reactive)	Heterogeneous workloads	Reduced energy and VM migrations	The impact of VM migration on network bandwidth can be investigated to reduce power consumption further

previous section, the VM manager sends an invitation to a subset of all active hosts to obtain a list of hosts that accept the incoming VM. After receiving the invitation, the host performs a Bernoulli trial, which computes the value of overall assignment function to decide whether to accept a VM or not. The assignment function considers the resource utilization and utilization threshold, then calculates the probability to accept the incoming VM. If the trial succeeds, the host sends back a message to the manager. The manager collects all messages and selects one available host to allocate the incoming VM. The second part of EcoCloud is VM migration, which utilizes two Bernoulli trial based functions to handle the over-utilized and under-utilized situations separately. If the trial of under-utilized situation is successful, a randomly selected VM will be migrated. On the other hand, migrations with over-utilized will migrate the VM that decreases resource utilization to be lower than overload-utilized threshold. The target host to accept the VM is decided by another assignment function with slight modification of a parameter.

EcoCloud can be the representative algorithm aiming to reducing energy while minimizing VM migrations. The main advantage of EcoCloud is that the approach can reduce down-time duration and transmission bandwidth. Furthermore, hosts can make migration decisions by themselves, thus the pressure of VM manager is relieved. The limitation of this work is that it investigates the effect of power consumption on SLAs while the effects of VM migrations on SLAs is not evaluated.

C. GRANITE

GRANITE [21] is a holistic virtual machine scheduling algorithm capable of minimizing total data center energy consumption, including computing energy and cooling energy. This work considers Computer Room Air Conditioner as the only cooling devices and constructed their models. Based on server models and cooling models, GRANITE utilizes greedy algorithm to conduct the VM initial placement and dynamic migration. They assume that the users' resource demand can be predicted. In the initial placement stage, the greedy algorithm is applied in GRANITE for all VMs to select the host with least increment of total energy after the placement. The CRAC will be adjusted if the CPU temperature is above the threshold. In the dynamic VM consolidation stage, the algorithm aims to balance the workloads and cooling energy

consumption. The GRANITE defines a dynamic temperature threshold and checks host status. If the host temperature is above the temperature threshold, a set of VMs will migrated to other hosts. The target host selection for migration is same as the greedy algorithm in the initial placement stage.

GRANITE can present the algorithms that consider the holistic management of energy in cloud data centers. The core idea of the algorithm is similar to MBFD algorithm, while it considers cooling power, which leads to a more accurate and holistic scheduling results. The advantage of this work is that it combines the server status and data center thermal control to form the fine-grained energy efficient scheduling. However, the model accuracy can be improved by using 3-dimensional computational fluid dynamics model rather than 2-dimensional one.

D. LOAD

LOAD [18] is an algorithm based on learning automata for energy and SLA efficient consolidation of VMs in cloud data centers. The proposed algorithm considers user demanded resource to predict overloaded hosts. By preventing overloaded hosts and shutting down idle hosts, the proposed algorithm aims to save energy consumption of data centers. The learning automata-based overload detection enhances the VM consolidation by predicting CPU usage of hosts upon resource usage history. Each VM is equipped with one automata including 3 actions, increasing CPU utilization, reducing CPU utilization and no changing of CPU utilization. At the beginning, the 3 actions are with equal probability. After the beginning stage, the reward and penalty of learning automata will be updated based on environment. The automata selects one of the three actions in each iteration based on the probability. And in the next iteration, if the automata's decision is right, the action will be rewarded, otherwise, the action will be penalized. The learning automata is applied to estimate usage of VMs on host. If the estimation shows that the host may be overloaded, the VMs will be migrated and other VMs will be prevented to be migrated to the current host. The migrated destination is based on the BFD algorithm. The simulation results show that leveraging learning-based prediction can reduce energy consumption of data centers.

LOAD is a typical algorithm applying meta-heuristic algorithm, e.g. ant colony optimization, to optimize VM consolidation. This work advances the existing work by considering the

dynamically prediction for resource usage. But the limitation is that this work predicts the overloaded situations and does not handle the under-utilized situations.

E. ACS

ACS [22] is an online optimization meta-heuristic algorithm based on ant colony optimization and VM consolidation to achieve the near-optimal solution. Its objective is balancing the energy consumption, number of VM migrations and QoS concerning performance. In this approach, the authors formulate the energy efficient VM consolidation as multi-objective optimization problem to optimize multiple metrics simultaneously. To leverage ACO, the necessary entities, including pheromone updating rules and probabilistic decision rules are defined. If one solution has more pheromone trails, the VM has larger probability to be placed on host. ACS also has updating rules for local and global pheromone, which are applied in each iteration. In iterations, the local pheromone is updated by ant when they perform a movement. After all ant construct their solutions locally, the global pheromone update is conducted as the migration process, and only the dominated place will be kept. The process is repeated until it reaches the maximum iteration number.

ACS represents a set of meta-heuristic algorithms proposed to balance multiple objectives. The results based on simulations show that the proposed algorithm can reduce energy consumption and VM migrations while guaranteeing QoS. The performance can be further improved by investigating the impact of VM migration on network.

In summary, the investigated algorithms all follow the two-phase energy efficient scheduling process as shown in Fig 1. The investigated algorithms apply different techniques to optimize the placement of VMs. Most of the investigated algorithms focus on the optimization of VM consolidation phase except LOAD spends more efforts on the initial placement based on ant colony optimization. In the algorithm focusing on the VM consolidation optimization, MBFD applies heuristic algorithms based on bin-packing modelling, while EcoCloud utilizes probabilistic approach to find the host with highest probability to accept migrated VM. GRANITE considers energy and performance together by modelling cooling energy consumption and VM performance degradation. ACS applies meta-heuristic algorithm to find the optimized consolidation solutions.

IV. ARCHITECTURE AND MODELING

This section discusses the investigated algorithms from the architecture and modelling perspectives, and the algorithm complexity is also discussed.

A. MBFD

Architecture: The main four components of the green cloud architecture are: broker, green service allocator, Virtual Machines (VMs) and Physical Machines (PMs). Broker enables the user interaction module to submit the workloads and their QoS requirements from any geographical distribution

allocation. PM based hardware infrastructure creates virtualized resources (VMs). VMs are consolidated to fulfill the demand of workloads dynamically using DVFS. Green service allocator pertains the energy manager and VM manager to allocate the virtual resources to user workloads based on their requirements for their execution at runtime.

Model: Equation (1) defines the power model for this research work.

$$P(u) = k \times P_{max} + (1 - k) \times P_{max} \times u \quad (1)$$

where P_{max} is the maximum consumption of power while fully utilization of server; k is the small amount of power used by idle server; and u is the CPU utilization. The value of energy consumption E of a PM is defined in Equation (2). $u(t)$ is CPU utilization, which is a function of time.

$$E = \int_{t_2}^{t_1} P(u(t))dt \quad (2)$$

where t_1 is start time of Task T and t_2 is end time of Task T .

B. EcoCloud

Architecture: The architecture of EcoCloud contains two main probabilistic procedures: 1) VM assignment and VM migration. Based on the availability of CPU and RAM on different servers of cloud data centers, VM allocation is performed. EcoCloud allocates the VM to newly submitted application and sends an invitation to all the servers participated to find the best one to place this VM.

Model: Equation (3) defines the linear model used in this research for power consumption and it is expressed as:

$$P(u) = P_{idle} + (P_{max} - P_{idle}) \times u \quad (3)$$

where P_{max} is the maximum consumption of power while fully utilization of server; P_{idle} is the small amount of power used by idle server; and u is the CPU utilization.

C. GRANITE

Architecture: It comprises of three sub components such as workload manager, scheduling manager and cooling manager. Workload manager manages the workloads submitted by user and process for scheduling based on their requirements. Scheduling manager schedules the resources for execution of workloads while maximizing the performance of CDC and minimizes the consumption of energy. Cooling manager maintains the temperature of CDC and save cooling energy by performing VM placement and dynamic migration in an efficient manner.

Model: Equation (4) defines a linear power model to find the energy consumption of CDC, which is a combination of computing energy and cooling energy.

$$Energy = Energy_{computing} + Energy_{cooling} \quad (4)$$

D. LOAD

Architecture: The system architecture contains four sub-components such as user portal (to submit workloads), global manager (which is an intermediate between user portal and local manager), local manager (which manages the PMs and VMs, and it is controlled by a single global manager) and VM manager (which manages the virtual resources).

Model: Equation (1) is used to calculate the energy consumption for this research work, which represents the linear model of power and CPU utilization.

E. ACS

Architecture: In the architecture of ACS, two types of agent are included: local and global agents. The local agent is deployed in a host to solve the host status detection sub-problem by monitoring the host resource utilization. The global agent is responsible for supervising and optimizing the VM placement by taking advantage of the ACO-based algorithm.

Model: ACS uses the same power model as MBFD in Equation 2.

In summary, from architecture perspective, the investigated algorithms all adopt the layered architecture, and the layers can be mainly divided into three parts. The bottom layer is the resource provisioner, which provides the physical or virtual resources. The middle layer is the responsible for the energy efficient scheduling, which handles the VM management and provides the energy efficient scheduling algorithms. At the top layer, the users' request and optimization goals are configured.

From the modelling perspective, all algorithms adopted linear power model. As for power components, all algorithms include the CPU energy consumption, MBFD, EcoCloud and ACS consider the memory part, and GRANITE utilizes a more comprehensive model including storage, network and cooling.

Algorithm complexity analysis: MBFD, GRANITE and LOAD are based heuristic algorithms, and the complexity of them are all $M \times N$, where N is the number of hosts and M is the number of VMs. The complexity of EcoCloud equals to the number of hosts to accept VMs, which is N . Based on meta-heuristic with iterations, the complexity of ACS is $M \times A \times I$, where A is the number of ants that concurrently build their migration plans, and I is the number of iterations.

V. METRICS

For the objective of energy efficiency, the energy consumption is the major metric to be evaluated. However, the algorithms are also making trade-offs between the energy consumption and other metrics, such as SLA violations. In this section, we discuss the adopted metrics in our investigated energy efficient algorithms. Note that the investigated algorithms use some similar metrics while having some other additional metrics. Here we aim to cover the metrics applied in these algorithms and identify the differences between these metrics. Table II summaries the algorithms with their corresponding adopted metrics.

TABLE II: Metrics adopted in compared algorithms

Metrics	Optimization Objective	Adopted Algorithms
Total Energy Consumption	Minimization	All
SLA violation percentage	Minimization	All
VM migrations	Minimization	BMDP, LOAD, EcoCloud, ACS
Average SLA violation	Minimization	BMDP, LOAD, ACS
Number of active hosts	Minimization	EcoCloud, GRANITE

TABLE III: Workload of PlanetLab

Date	Number of VMs	Average utilization
2011-03-03	1052	12.31%
2011-03-06	898	11.44%
2011-03-09	1061	10.70%
2011-03-22	1516	9.26%
2011-03-25	1078	10.56%
2011-04-03	1463	12.39%
2011-04-09	1358	11.12%
2011-04-11	1233	11.56%
2011-04-12	1054	11.54%
2011-04-20	1033	10.43%

A. Metrics for energy efficiency

Total energy consumption: it is the total energy consumption consumed by physical machines in the data centers. It is derived from the power model in Equation (2).

B. Metrics for SLA

SLA violation percentage: it is the percentage of SLA violations events relatively to the total number of the processed time frame. The SLA violation is identified when a given VM cannot get the amount of MIPS as requested.

VM migration times: the number of migrations triggered by algorithm during the VM scheduling process.

Average SLA violation: It is the average CPU performance that has not been allocated to an application when requested, resulting performance degradation.

Number of active servers: it represents how many servers are running as active during the observation time. The value should be minimized, thus more idle serves can be switched into low-power mode.

In summary, we can notice several metrics have been adopted for evaluations by more than one algorithm, including total energy, SLA violation percentage, VM migrations, average SLA violations and number of active hosts. To make our evaluations more comparable from the metrics perspective, we plan to evaluate these metrics in the performance evaluations section.

VI. PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS

ACS-VMC should be added after finishing experiments. In this section, we conducted experiments to compare five algorithms we discussed above on different performance metrics. We also included two classical algorithms in our experiment, including THR using a static threshold to detect over-utilization and Interquartile Range (IQR) that computes a dynamic threshold for overload detection.

In our experiment, each server has two CPU cores with MIPS of 1880 or 2660, 4 GB of Ram and 1 TB of storage. We simulate the power consumption of each server based on

TABLE IV: Energy consumption at different CPU utilization

Server	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
HP ProLiant G4	86	89.4	92.6	96	99.5	102	106	108	112	114	117
HP ProLiant G5	93.7	97	101	105	110	116	121	125	129	133	135




Fig. 2: Performance comparison of algorithms under Random workload (Servers:VMs = 1:1)




Fig. 3: [2] Performance comparison of algorithms under Random workload (Servers:VMs = 1:1)




Fig. 4: Performance comparison of algorithms under Random workload (varying ratio of Servers:VMs(1:1, 1:1.25, 1:1.5, 1:1.75))

the power model of HP ProLiant ML110 G4 or HP ProLiant ML110 G5. We provide the energy consumption of the server in Table IV. Each VM is allocated with one CPU core with MIPS of 500, 1000, 1500 or 2500. And, we randomly generate VMs, allocating each VM one CPU core with MIPS of 500, 1000, 1500 or 2500, with RAM of 613, 870, 1740.

We first carry out several experiments under random workload. Then, to simulate the real cloud data center, we utilized the real workload data of the CoMon project provided by PlanetLab [23]. The workload includes CPU utilization data of thousands of VMs allocated to servers that are located in more than 500 places around the world. And the data is collected every five minutes for 10 days, which represents the workload in the real cloud environment. We present the core information about the workload in Table III.

We select four metrics to evaluate the performance of these algorithms, including Energy Consumption, SLA violation percentage, VM migration times and the number of active

hosts. These metrics are important and are also adopted in more than one algorithms we discussed before. The following part of this section will present the results of our experiment to compare the performance of different algorithms.

A. Random workload

The first part of this section focuses on the experiment result under Random Workload. We first create the same number of hosts and VMs. We change the lower utilization threshold from 0.1 to 0.5 and for each threshold, we randomly generate ten sets of workloads to conduct experiments. Figure 2 displays the results of the experiments under Random workload. LOAD performs the best on energy consumption, reducing power of 14.8% compared to MBFD. EcoCloud requires 431 migration times, which are much lesser than other algorithms. Similar to the energy consumption, LOAD decreases the number of active hosts. For SLA violation, these algorithms perform better when the lower threshold is set to be 0.5.




Fig. 5: Performance comparison of algorithms under PlanetLab workload




Fig. 6: [2] Performance comparison of algorithms under PlanetLab workload




Fig. 7: Performance comparison of algorithms under PlanetLab workload (number of servers: 800, 900, 1000, 1100))

We then fix the lower utilization threshold at 0.5 and configure the ratio of the number of servers to the number of VMs to be 1:1, 1:1.25, 1:1.5 or 1:1.75. For each ratio, we generate ten sets of workloads. The results of our experiments are shown in Figure 4. When the number of VMS rises, energy consumption increases. LOAD consumes 44.7 KWh when the ratio is 1.75, which achieves 7.4% compared to MBFD and THR. GRANITE requires 24.2 active servers on average when the ratio is 1.75 and performs worse than other algorithms. As shown in the figure, all newly proposed algorithms violate SLA more frequently than IQR.

B. PlanetLab workload

The second part of our experiments focus on the workload of PlanetLab. We first simulate a cloud data center with 800 servers and then conducted simulations with more servers. We set the static CPU utilization thresholds for overload detection, including lower utilization and higher threshold. Besides, we select a traditional VM selection policy called MM(Minimization of Migrations) for MBFD, LOAD, GRANITE, IQR to decide which VM should be migrated in the VM migration procedure.

We conducted several rounds of the experiment under varying lower CPU utilization thresholds. The lower CPU utilization threshold varies from 10% to 50%, and the interval

between the lower threshold and the higher threshold is fixed at 50%. Each data point plotted in Fig. 5 shows the mean of ten sets of data in the workload.

Figure. 7a shows the energy consumption data. The power reduces as the rise of the lower utilization threshold. As shown in the figure, **ACS** and LOAD consume lower energy under the same workload. LOAD utilizes a learning process to optimize the overload detection while **ACS** evolves to obtain an optimal decision of VM consolidation and thus reduces power. EcoCloud based on a probabilistic model consumes more energy consumption than MBFD because it keeps more servers to be active. GRANITE considers the total energy consumption of computing and cooling devices. But in our experiment, we only measure the energy consumption by the log of CPU utilization of physical servers, and GRANITE do not save the computing power very well.

The number of active hosts also represents the effect of scheduling. Since the mean CPU utilization of the workload is about 10%, a majority part of servers in the data center is under-utilized. Therefore, the energy-efficient algorithms attempt to minimize the number of active hosts, intending to prevent the energy wastage of idle servers. As shown in Fig. 7c, the result is similar with the data of power consumption.

The numbers of VM migrations are compared in Fig.

7b. EcoCloud achieves an apparent reduction in this metric and only needs 1321 migrations on average when the lower threshold is set to be 0.5. LOAD achieve some improvement on the number of and reduces 10% migrations compared with MBFD. ACS(). GRANITE acquires better results when the lower utilization threshold increases.

Fig. 7d shows the SLA violation percentage of different algorithms. The SLA violation percentage increases as the lower utilization threshold increases. As the figure shows, LOAD, MBFD perform worse on this metric. EcoCloud maintains a low violation percentage and thus ensures the quality of services.

Additionally, we plot four box plots for the experimental results under the parameter set(lower utilization threshold 50% and higher utilization threshold to 90%). These box plots intend to depict the performance data of these algorithms in 10 days. The box plots in Figure 6 show five numbers, including the minimum, first quartile, median, third quartile, maximum, to summary a set of data and indicate spread and skewness in the data. Besides, we plot the outliers with the star mark to show the data point differs significantly from the data set.

In figure 6a, we can see that LOAD and ACS perform better in energy saving. The mean energy consumption of LOAD is 167.2 KWh while the MBFD, EcoCloud, and GRANITE consume more than 180 KWh. Besides, the range between minimal and maximum represents the scheduling effectiveness of algorithms under the various workload. As shown in the figure, the results of GRANITE, THR, and IQR indicate a significant difference between different sets of workloads.

Figure 6c shows the average results of the number of active hosts. If the VMs are well-allocated to servers, the idle servers can be switched off and thus reduce energy consumption.

Figure 6b displays the box plot of VM migration times. Similar to the previous figure, EcoCloud focuses on this metric and keeps the number of VM migration under lower than 2000 under different workloads. Compared with MBFD, the newly proposed algorithms GRANITE, LOAD, ACO reduce the VM migration times.

The box plot for SLA violation percentage is presented in Fig 6d. Under this parameter set of utilization threshold, EcoCloud ensures SLA in a better way. Other algorithms do not achieve much improvement than MBFD. Although LOAD saves more energy, it performs worst in reducing SLA violations.

We then change the number of servers in the datacenter, from 800 to 1100. We conducted experiments for each configuration. The results are presented in Fig. 7. As the number of servers increases, we can see that LOAD still consumes less power. EcoCloud needs the least number of VM migration.(...)

VII. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this paper, we present a investigation on 5 state-of-the-art energy efficient algorithms based on VM consolidations for cloud data centers. We discuss and compare the algorithms from multiple perspectives, including ideas, architectures, modelling and algorithm complexity. We also implement these

algorithms in CloudSim. By conducting experiments under both random and real traces, the results show that these algorithms can efficiently reduce the energy consumption.

Based on our investigation, some future research directions are identified as below:

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported by the SIAT Innovation Program for Excellent Young Researchers.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Buyya, S. N. Srirama, G. Casale, R. Calheiros, Y. Simmhan, B. Varghese, E. Gelenbe, B. Javadi, L. M. Vaquero, M. A. S. Netto, A. N. Toosi, M. A. Rodriguez, I. M. Llorente, S. D. C. D. Vimercati, P. Samarati, D. Milojevic, C. Varela, R. Bahsoon, M. D. D. Assuncao, O. Rana, W. Zhou, H. Jin, W. Gentzsch, A. Y. Zomaya, and H. Shen, "A manifesto for future generation cloud computing: Research directions for the next decade," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 105:1–105:38, Nov. 2018. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3241737>
- [2] T. Kaur and I. Chana, "Energy efficiency techniques in cloud computing: A survey and taxonomy," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 1–46, 2015.
- [3] S. S. Gill, S. Tuli, M. Xu, I. Singh, K. V. Singh, D. Lindsay, S. Tuli, D. Smirnova, M. Singh, U. Jain, H. Pervaiz, B. Sehgal, S. S. Kaila, S. Misra, M. S. Aslanpour, H. Mehta, V. Stankovski, and P. Garraghan, "Transformative effects of iot, blockchain and artificial intelligence on cloud computing: Evolution, vision, trends and open challenges," *Internet of Things*, vol. 8, p. 100118, 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2542660519302331>
- [4] (2014) Data center energy: Reducing your carbon footprint — data center knowledge. [Online]. Available: <http://www.datacenterknowledge.com/archives/2014/12/17/undertaking-challenge-reduce-data-center-carbon-footprint>
- [5] S. S. Gill and R. Buyya, "A taxonomy and future directions for sustainable cloud computing: 360 degree view," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 104:1–104:33, Dec. 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3241038>
- [6] M. Xu, W. Tian, and R. Buyya, "A survey on load balancing algorithms for virtual machines placement in cloud computing," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 29, no. 12, pp. 4123–4138, 2017.
- [7] M. Xu and R. Buyya, "Brownout approach for adaptive management of resources and applications in cloud computing systems: A taxonomy and future directions," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 8:1–8:27, Jan. 2019. [Online]. Available: <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3234151>
- [8] W. Tian, M. Xu, A. Chen, G. Li, X. Wang, and Y. Chen, "Open-source simulators for cloud computing: Comparative study and challenging issues," *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory*, vol. 58, pp. 239 – 254, 2015, special issue on Cloud Simulation. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1569190X15000970>
- [9] R. N. Calheiros, R. Ranjan, A. Beloglazov, C. A. De Rose, and R. Buyya, "Cloudsim: a toolkit for modeling and simulation of cloud computing environments and evaluation of resource provisioning algorithms," *Software: Practice and Experience*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 23–50, 2011.
- [10] B. Wickremasinghe, R. N. Calheiros, and R. Buyya, "Cloudanalyst: A cloudsims-based visual modeller for analysing cloud computing environments and applications," in *2010 24th IEEE international conference on advanced information networking and applications*. IEEE, 2010, pp. 446–452.
- [11] S. K. Garg and R. Buyya, "Networkcloudsim: Modelling parallel applications in cloud simulations," in *2011 Fourth IEEE International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 105–113.
- [12] Y. Mansouri, A. N. Toosi, and R. Buyya, "Data storage management in cloud environments: Taxonomy, survey, and future directions," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1–51, 2017.
- [13] A.-C. Orgerie, M. D. d. Assuncao, and L. Lefevre, "A survey on techniques for improving the energy efficiency of large-scale distributed systems," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 46, no. 4, p. 47, 2014.

- [14] Z. Á. Mann, "Allocation of virtual machines in cloud data centers—a survey of problem models and optimization algorithms," *Acm Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 48, no. 1, p. 11, 2015.
- [15] R. W. Ahmad, A. Gani, S. H. A. Hamid, M. Shiraz, A. Yousafzai, and F. Xia, "A survey on virtual machine migration and server consolidation frameworks for cloud data centers," *Journal of network and computer applications*, vol. 52, pp. 11–25, 2015.
- [16] A. Beloglazov, J. Abawajy, and R. Buyya, "Energy-aware resource allocation heuristics for efficient management of data centers for cloud computing," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 755–768, 2012.
- [17] C. Mastroianni, M. Meo, and G. Papuzzo, "Probabilistic consolidation of virtual machines in self-organizing cloud data centers," *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Computing*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 215–228, 2013.
- [18] M. Ranjbari and J. A. Torkestani, "A learning automata-based algorithm for energy and sla efficient consolidation of virtual machines in cloud data centers," *Journal of Parallel and Distributed Computing*, vol. 113, pp. 55–62, 2018.
- [19] H. Zhao, J. Wang, F. Liu, Q. Wang, W. Zhang, and Q. Zheng, "Power-aware and performance-guaranteed virtual machine placement in the cloud," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 1385–1400, 2018.
- [20] H. Chen, X. Zhu, H. Guo, J. Zhu, X. Qin, and J. Wu, "Towards energy-efficient scheduling for real-time tasks under uncertain cloud computing environment," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 99, pp. 20–35, 2015.
- [21] X. Li, P. Garraghan, X. Jiang, Z. Wu, and J. Xu, "Holistic virtual machine scheduling in cloud datacenters towards minimizing total energy," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 1317–1331, 2018.
- [22] F. Farahnakian, A. Ashraf, T. Pahikkala, P. Liljeberg, J. Plosila, I. Porres, and H. Tenhunen, "Using ant colony system to consolidate vms for green cloud computing," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 187–198, March 2015.
- [23] K. Park and V. S. Pai, "Comon: a mostly-scalable monitoring system for planetlab," *ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 65–74, 2006.