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Abstract—New pricing policies are emerging where cloud providers charge resource provisioning based on the allocated CPU frequencies. As a result, resources are offered to users as combinations of different performance levels and prices which can be configured at runtime. With such new pricing schemes and the increasing energy costs in data centres, balancing energy savings with performance and revenue losses is a challenging problem for cloud providers. CPU frequency scaling can be used to reduce power dissipation, but also impacts VM performance and therefore revenue. In this paper, we firstly propose a non-linear power model that estimates power dissipation of a multi-core PM and secondly a pricing model that adjusts the pricing based on the VM’s CPU-boundedness characteristics. Finally, we present a cloud controller that uses these models to allocate VMs and scale CPU frequencies of the PMs to achieve energy cost savings that exceed service revenue losses. We evaluate the proposed approach using simulations with realistic VM workloads, electricity price and temperature traces and estimate energy savings of up to 14.57%.

Index Terms—Cloud computing, energy efficiency, geo-distributed clouds, electricity price, performance-based pricing, multi-core.

1 INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure-as-a-service is the fastest growing segment of the cloud services market according to a 2013 Gartner report [1] (with a 42.4% annual growth rate) and new performance-based pricing models are being introduced by cloud providers like ElasticHosts [2] and CloudSigma [3] that radically change the cloud computing revenue models and require new cloud control approaches. In performance-based pricing, the cost of VM provisioning is based on the selected CPU frequency along with the allocated amount of RAM and the use of other resources, and the VM’s performance can be modified by choosing from a range of CPU frequencies and matching prices – even at runtime. This approach mainly targets users who potentially need a lower performance level and would prefer a proportionally scaled price.

On the other hand, cloud providers are interested in minimizing the energy costs required to operate data centres. Data centers correspond to over 2% of the total electricity consumed in the US [4] and the ICT sector’s global CO₂ emissions have surpassed those of aviation [5]. The problem of energy efficiency becomes even more challenging in geographically-distributed data centres where the energy costs are influenced by dynamic local factors, such as real-time electricity prices [6] and temperature-dependent cooling [7]. We refer to these factors as geotemporal inputs. A power management action commonly used to reduce energy costs is CPU frequency scaling [8]. Potential energy savings can be estimated based on geotemporal inputs. CPU frequency scaling actions, however, also cause service revenue losses in performance-based pricing. Hence, the goal of this paper is to find cloud control approaches that balance energy savings and service revenue losses caused by CPU frequency scaling in performance-based pricing.

Cloud control solutions relying on CPU frequency scaling exist, e.g. [9], [10], but only consider fixed VM pricing where the trade-offs of energy savings and performance-based VM pricing are not considered. The currently existing clock frequency governors available at the operating system level that adjust CPU clock frequency according to workload changes have proven to be inefficient in responding to the required VM performance level [11], [12].

Other open challenges are that modern physical machines have multiple CPU cores with complex utilisation-to-power-dissipation models. Additionally, besides the traditional CPU architecture like Intel’s, smartphone-technology-based ARM CPU architectures are emerging in large scale cloud platforms [13], [14] with significantly different power models. Finally, the performance impact of the clock frequency may also vary between different workloads [15]. For example, CPU-bound workloads are more sensitive to the reduction in frequency, while the performance of I/O-bound workloads is less affected. The sensitivity of the workload to CPU frequency reduction is called the workload’s CPU-boundedness $\beta$ following the approach in [16]. A cloud control solution has to model and consider such environments to be of practical relevance.

In this paper, we introduce a compound cloud control model which considers all the mentioned factors representative of modern cloud systems. We combine: (1) Realistic power modelling accounting for multi-core, Intel and ARM architectures; (2) Energy cost calculation based on geotemporal inputs; (3) Performance-based VM pricing; (4) Variable VM CPU-boundedness that determines the performance impact of CPU frequency scaling.

To describe real-world power dissipation behaviour, we developed a non-linear power model based on real experiments performed on multi-core Intel and ARM CPU architectures representative of modern data center infrastructures [13], [14]. As we show, on such power models, traditional race-to-idle approaches [17], [18] are no longer valid, which also motivates the cloud control method we introduce in this paper.
To tackle varying VM workloads, we propose a novel perceived-performance pricing scheme for determining the VM price based on the application-level performance. This scheme allows energy-aware cloud control that treats VMs differently based on the actual impact that CPU frequency scaling will have on their workload performance, considering their measured CPU-boundness.

To address the data center energy consumption and performance-based VM revenue trade-offs, we introduce the Best Cost Fit Frequency Scaling (BCFFS) cloud controller. The controller was adapted for new power models and pricing data from our initial work in [19]. The controller we propose uses our multi-core power model for ARM and Intel CPU architectures in an energy calculation method that factors in geotemporal inputs from multiple geo-distributed data centers. To account for performance-based VM pricing. ElasticHosts [2] and CloudSigma [3] price data was used to model their behaviour and precisely compute the effects of each CPU frequency level. The BCFFS cloud controller then combines both models in a two-phase algorithm, where firstly VMs are allocated between geo-distributed data centers and subsequently CPU frequencies are set for each PM where energy savings exceed service revenue losses.

The controller and the models were mapped onto the Philharmonic simulator [20]. Simulations with a wide range of scenarios are used to estimate the energy savings and service revenue stemming from our cloud control approach. The results obtained by the BCFFS cloud controller are compared and evaluated using two baseline controllers [21] and historical traces of real-time electricity prices [22] and temperatures [20]. The VM CPU-boundness values used in the simulation are distributed according to the PlanetLab [23] dataset of VM CPU usage. The results indicate that energy savings up to 14.57% without significant service revenue reductions can be achieved using the BCFFS cloud controller.

We structure the paper by first examining the related work in the following section. We then introduce in more details the challenges of frequency scaling in multi-core computers and the inefficiencies of existing control approaches in Section 2. This serves as a motivation for our detailed multi-core power model for Intel and ARM CPU architectures in Section 3. We then highlight the economical aspects of frequency scaling in cloud computing by explaining emerging VM pricing schemes and propose our own perceived-performance pricing scheme in Section 5. We combine the power and pricing models to devise a cloud controller that geographically distributes VMs and applies frequency scaling on PMs in Section 6. In Section 7, we present the evaluation methodology and comment on the most significant obtained results. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 8.

2 RELATED WORK

Analysing geotemporal inputs to optimise distributed systems was studied previously. Network routing in content delivery networks is adapted for real-time electricity pricing (RTEP) in [24] with reported savings of up to 40% of total electricity costs. Job placement based on geotemporal inputs for map-reduce jobs is researched in [25] and for computational grids based on both RTEP and cooling in [26], [27]. Geotemporal inputs as a basis for scaling CPU frequencies or as a counter-balance to performance-based pricing has not been researched prior to our work.

Frequency scaling is the focus in many studies with the aim to reduce power consumption by decreasing the CPU frequency [9], [16], [28]. The cloud scheduler in [28] sorts and allocates the incoming jobs to VMs based on the user service level agreement (SLA)s. The minimum resource requirements are allocated to each VM and the CPU frequencies of the PMs with low load are reduced so that resource wastage is minimised without affecting the performance of the executing jobs. In [9], the proposed scheduler allocates the queued VMs to PMs, while reducing the CPU frequencies at runtime so that VM performance requirements can be met, preferring PMs that operate at lower frequencies. As opposed to related work, our proposed controller scales the CPU frequencies taking into account the workload CPU-boundness while controlling the impact of frequency reduction on the provider’s profit. The impact of frequency scaling on workload performance has been investigated in many studies [8], [16], [29]. In [8], the authors investigate the power-performance characteristics of systems with frequency scaling capabilities and introduce a metric to determine energy-efficient performance points to operate the system. This is also the focus in [29], investigating the impact of frequency scaling on workload performance for different HPC workloads in order to achieve energy-performance trade-offs.

Although dynamic voltage & frequency scaling (DVFS) cloud controllers have been proposed before [30], [31], [32], [33], our adaptive approach scales the operating frequencies based on the VM CPU-boundness and the impact frequency reduction has on the provider’s gross profit under performance-based pricing. Also, in most papers multi-core modelling is not considered or is simplified as a linear combination of the number of cores used. The clock frequency of the systems used in cloud platforms are usually modelled according to its dynamic power as a product of the clock frequency and the core voltage. In contrast to such systems, we focus on adopting a more accurate multi-core power model; still simple enough to be integrated in real systems. The model accounts for real-world influences more accurately such as the heat dissipation influencing the static power significantly [34].

The literature has shown many power models and approaches to model the power dissipation in computer systems [17], [35], [36], [37], [38], [39]. Most models are constructed bottom-up from physical characteristics on top of which practical aspects such as frequency scaling is applied. The dynamic power dissipation is expressed in many examples [40], [41], [42] as the relation \( f \cdot v^\alpha \) where \( f \) is the clock frequency, \( v \) is the core voltage and \( \alpha \) is a constant used to comply with the real platform as close as possible.

As the dynamic power dissipation can be expressed accurately with this simple bottom-up formula, the ever growing static power proves more difficult. The leakage current causing the static power is expressed in [43] as a relationship between transistor gate width, thermal voltage and architectural parameters such as the insulation material. Moreover, leakage is also caused by electron tunnelling through the insulator. This means that a bottom-up modelling of static power is significantly more difficult. We instead used a top-down view of the power model, purely based on real-world experiments, which provides a more realistic view of the complete system including cores, buses, memories, temperature, operating system influence and other software.

3 CHALLENGES OF MULTI-CORE FREQUENCY SCALING

In this section we introduce the main challenges inherent to multi-core frequency scaling of PMs with multiple CPU cores and motivate our power model and subsequently frequency control
approach. We show that neither operating system CPU governors, nor traditional race-to-idle approaches provide optimal energy efficiency because of inaccurate decision making.

### 3.1 Limitations of Current Frequency Governors

The currently used power management system in Linux operating systems is handled by the frequency governors, which alter the CPU clock frequency based on a predefined policy. Even though the intention is to reduce the clock frequency when performance is not needed, the approach suffers from limitations.

The metric used to determine the clock frequency in the governors is the system workload. The workload is expressed as a ratio between an active CPU and an idle CPU over a given time window, which is illustrated in Fig. 1 as two time windows: one with 90% load and one with 10% load.

Workload, however, does not represent the performance, or "real work done" of an application, but mainly the activity level of the CPU. This means that as long as the CPU is loaded, the performance requirement is recognised as insufficient and the clock frequency is increased to the maximum even though the actual performance is sufficient on a moderate clock frequency.

### 3.2 Energy Inefficient Execution

Using workload as the metric for power management decisions often results in race-to-idle scenarios [17], [18], in which the workload is executed as fast as possible in order to obtain an idle system. This execution principle was considered an energy efficient method of executing workload in previous generation single-core microprocessors, because the minimisation of the execution time caused minimal energy consumption.

This is demonstrated in Fig. 2 which shows the total power dissipation for a single-core ARM Cortex-A8 processor using different clock frequencies. As seen in the figure, the highest clock frequency (720 MHz) results in roughly 1.4W of power dissipation. When scaling down the frequency roughly 3x (250 MHz), the power dissipation is only reduced by 2x (0.7W), which means that the total energy consumption may be lower when executing at a higher clock frequency.

However, using more recent microprocessors with higher clock frequencies and multiple cores, the power dissipation has increased exponentially – this has reduced the energy efficiency of the race-to-idle principle because the cost in power is greater than the savings in execution time [11], [12], [18]. Fig. 3 shows the relative performance-to-power ratio of four different modern platforms. All of the four platforms show an exponential profile, which means that the power dissipation required to operate on the highest clock frequencies is higher than the relative performance gain of the platform. The race-to-idle principle should therefore not be used for energy efficient execution.

### 3.3 Energy Efficient Execution

In order to not race-to-idle, a performance driven execution should be used instead of a workload driven execution [11], [12], [18]. By monitoring the actual performance of an application and adjusting the clock frequency accordingly, the energy efficiency can be improved.

Benchmarks were executed on a quad-core ARM platform with an Exynos 5410 SoC using the default ondemand governor and the modified performance driven power manager. By using the ondemand governor, the decoder decodes the frames as quickly as possible since the decoding task increases the workload, and the clock frequency is consequently increased. As the frame buffer is filled, the decoder is idle until the frame buffer is emptied by the video display. By instead decoding at the same frame rate as the video display is using (25 FPS), the clock frequency can be reduced to an intermediate clock frequency for the whole execution while still providing the required video quality.

The power dissipation was measured by internal power sensors for both power managers and the result is shown in Fig. 4 (more details can be found in [11]). The power dissipation of executing the video decoder using the ondemand governor is shown as the upper, black line and the performance driven power manager is shown as the lower, blue line. Since the standard ondemand governor increases the clock frequency while workload is present,
most of the execution demands the highest clock frequencies, which causes excess power dissipation as seen in Fig. 4 (upper, black line). By matching the decoding framerate to the output framerate (of 25 frames per second (FPS)), lower clock frequencies are providing enough performance to decode the frames at the intended phase of 25 FPS, and the power is significantly reduced seen in Fig. 4 (lower, blue line).

We intend to bring the performance driven clock frequency scaling using multi-core hardware from CPU level to the cloud level consisting of many parallel machines. The difference is a much more diverse execution platform with additional parameters such as VM migration, network I/O and variable electrical cost models. A power model capable of reflecting such details is needed to get an accurate cost model of the cloud system.

4 Multi-Core Power Model

In this section we show how we modelled the behaviour of multi-core CPU power dissipation, accounting for both the CPU frequency and the number of active cores for generic multi-core systems. Such a power model allows us to determine what performance level to execute at, depending on the performance requirements, which is one of the key parts of our cloud controller.

As the power characteristics of modern multi-core CPUs are highly non-linear [12], a non-linear model should be created to accommodate as accurately as possible to the real-world power dissipation. The model should also not be computationally heavy to introduce unnecessary overhead.

4.1 ARM and Intel Architectures in the Cloud

Aside from the popular Intel architecture used as a typical server platform, the architecture based on ARM processors made popular through wide usage in smartphones is currently also being investigated for use in servers. ARM processors are much more energy efficient than Intel processors, though their maximum CPU frequency capacity is lower, potentially increasing the necessary number of servers and therefore the communication overhead. The Mont Blanc EU project [13], [14] was devoted to determine whether this approach is valid for large scale cloud platforms. Companies like Calxeda already ship ARM based server machines and Lenovo is pushing its NextScale [14] platform with the motivation to increase the performance-per-watt ratio by focusing on possibly more energy efficient architectures.

We therefore included the ARM architecture in our evaluation as a viable candidate for investigating the effects of performance-based frequency scaling in order to provide a comparison to the Intel architecture.

4.2 Power and Energy Consumption Model

For our cloud controller, we created an ARM and an Intel power consumption model. The ARM model was created by reading internal power sensors on an Exynos 5410 board, and the Intel model by using an external measurement device connected directly to the ATX socket on the motherboard. Both models were used in the evaluation, but we describe our modelling procedure with a higher focus on the ARM model for brevity. The same procedure we describe in this section is also applicable to the Intel model (or any other derived model).

We used a similar methodology as the work in [12] to derive the power model, where the model was created by stressing the system to full capacity using all combinations of the clock frequencies and all number of cores. Our power measurements for stressing the ARM board is shown in Fig. 5. Naturally, more cores and a higher clock frequency cause a higher power dissipation.

The power measurements were then used as basis for a two dimensional plane fitting algorithm, in order to build a mathematical expression of the multi-core system and its power dissipation. We used a least-squares algorithm [45] provided in Matlab to obtain the polynomial of the form:

$$P_f(q, c) = p_{00} + p_{10}q + p_{01}c + p_{20}q^2 + p_{11}qc + p_{30}q^3 + p_{21}q^2c$$

(1)

which is a function of the clock frequency \((q)\) and number of cores \((c)\) used. Fig. 6 shows the analytical representation of the power dissipation and the data points obtained from Fig. 5 for the ARM platform. The clock frequency and the number of cores used are represented as discrete steps from 1 to 11 and from 1 to 4 respectively. The plane shown in Fig. 5 was fitted to the data values using the obtained parameters shown in Table 1. The same method was used for the Intel platform, and other parameters were then obtained.

By comparing the model to the measurements, a maximum deviation of 18.7% was obtained and an average deviation of 6.4% compared to the experimental data, which we considered feasible for our cloud controller evaluation.
The idle power was modelled similarly to Eq. (1) but without the core component \( c \) as:

\[
P_{idle} = p_0 + p_1 q + p_2 q^2 + p_3 q^3 \tag{2}
\]

where \( q \) is the clock frequency step and the \( p \)-parameters are identical to the fitted parameters in Table 1.

### 4.3 I/O based power dissipation

The power dissipation of a PM varies depending on the CPU utilisation of the machine, which is dependent of the I/O usage of the workload. A CPU-boundedness parameter (\( \beta \)) is therefore used to model the portion of the execution which consists of low intensity I/O operations. The parameter may range between 0 and 1 to represent workloads of different CPU-boundedness properties with values close to 0 corresponding to I/O intensive workloads and values close to 1 corresponding to CPU-bound workloads. The value of \( \beta \) normalises the ratio between low intensity I/O bound and high intensity CPU bound instructions in the workload.

The power model was therefore extended to account for the CPU utilisation based on the VM CPU-boundedness of the executing workload. To do so, the CPU utilisation \( u \) is expressed as:

\[
u = \frac{\gamma_{core}}{\text{core}_{\text{active}}} \tag{3}
\]

where \( \gamma_{core} \) is a power ratio depending on the VM CPU-boundedness \( \beta \) and \( \text{core}_{\text{active}} \) represents the number of the currently used cores of the PM.

Similarly to the basic power model (Eq. 1), the power dissipation was evaluated on the same platform with different \( \beta \) in order to train the model. The experiments were run using the Berserk benchmark on a single active core (to avoid any lack of scalability from using multiple cores and get the pure effect of only the I/O). The Berserk benchmark is an open source application.

1. https://github.com/philharmonic/berserk

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( p_{00} )</th>
<th>( p_{01} )</th>
<th>( p_{10} )</th>
<th>( p_{11} )</th>
<th>( p_{20} )</th>
<th>( p_{21} )</th>
<th>( p_{30} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>0.03559</td>
<td>0.2243</td>
<td>-0.00318</td>
<td>0.03137</td>
<td>0.000438</td>
<td>0.00711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( p_0 )</th>
<th>( p_1 )</th>
<th>( p_2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.362</td>
<td>2.798</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 6. A mathematical representation of the power values in Fig. 5 using surface fitting methods.

Fig. 7. Measurements of power dissipation based on I/O expressed as a ratio \( \beta \). The model is expressed as a second degree polynomial that we developed for stressing the CPU cores at various CPU-boundedness ratios \( \beta \). The workload itself is a CPU-intensive task – repeated recursive calculation of Fibonacci numbers executed on all available CPU cores. By passing different \( \beta \) parameters to the benchmark, proportional ratios of the workload are deferred to a remote server, making the work more or less CPU-bound for monitoring purposes. For example for a value of \( \beta \) equal to 0, all the work is sent to and received from a remote server via the network, making the task fully I/O-bound. For a value of \( \beta \) equal to 1, all the work is executed locally, resulting in a CPU-bound task.

The explored I/O ratios (\( \beta \) values) were selected in the range \([0.0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.0]\) where 0.0 indicates total I/O blocking and 1.0 indicates no I/O (a fully CPU-intensive workload). The CPU (in this case the ARM architecture) was executing at 1600 MHz for all measurements (we show the behaviour of the model at different CPU frequencies in the following experiment), and the measurement results are shown in Fig. 7 as the data values.

A one-dimensional curve fitting technique was used to model the power ratio \( \gamma_{core} \) as a second degree polynomial:

\[
\gamma_{core} = \frac{p_0 \beta^2 + p_1 \beta + p_2}{P_{max}} \tag{4}
\]

where \( \beta \) is the CPU-boundedness of the core, \( P_{max} \) is the maximum power dissipation of a core and the obtained function parameters are listed in Table 2. The curve in Fig. 7 shows the model of the \( \gamma_{core} \) function.

The accuracy of the \( \gamma_{core} \) function at different CPU frequencies was evaluated in another experiment. We executed the Berserk benchmark with the same \( \beta \) parameters at clock frequencies 1600MHz, 1200MHz and 800MHz. Both the measurement data and the model for each experiment is shown in Fig. 8 in which the circles are measurement points. The maximum difference between the data and the model was 10.59% and the average difference was 4.32%, which we considered as acceptable for our cloud controller evaluation.
To combine all of the presented model components, the power dissipation $P$ of a PM in the cloud system was modelled as:

$$P = P_{idle} + (P_f - P_{idle})a$$

(5)

where $P_{idle}$ is the idle power expressed in Eq. 2 $P_f$ is the active power expressed in Eq. 1 and $a$ is the utilisation modelled in Eq. 3 based on the I/O activity parameter $\beta$. The model to compute the power dissipation of a PM in the cloud system was based on the approach proposed in [7], where PM’s power dissipation is linearly related with its CPU utilisation. The model was extended to take into account the active power dissipation of the currently used cores of the PM at the operating frequency and the CPU-utilisation of the cores based on the VM CPU-boundedness $\tilde{\beta}$.

### 4.4 Energy Calculation

With the multi-core, frequency-dependent power model, we now present the details of electricity cost calculation based on geotemporal inputs. This conversion of power dissipation to a monetary value is crucial for comparing potential energy savings with revenue losses under performance-based VM pricing that we explore in the next section.

The power model so far was expressed for instantaneous values, but to express the energy costs to the cloud provider we need to add a time dimension to account for geotemporal inputs and actions like frequency scaling. Therefore, we time-stamp the expressions that change as time progresses, so for example $P_i$ is the power dissipation for a PM at time $t$ (as it depends on the current CPU frequency $f$). We define an observed time period of $N$ equidistant time stamps in the range from $t_0$ to $t_N$, denoted $[t_0, t_N]$.

Cooling overhead based on local temperatures is derived from the power signal of each PM at its corresponding data center location. To do so, the model for computer room air conditioning using outside air economisers from [7] was applied. Cooling efficiency is expressed as partial power usage efficiency (PUE) $pPUE_{dc,t}$ at data center $dc$ at time $t$, which affects the power overhead based on the following formula:

$$P_{tot,t} = P_i + P_{cool,t} = pPUE_{dc,t} \cdot P_t(pm)$$

(6)

where $P_{cool,t}$ is the power necessary to cool the physical machine, and $P_{tot,t}$ stands for the combined cooling and computation power. For each data center location $dc$, there is a time series of temperature values $T_{dc,t} : t \in [t_0, t_N]$. The dynamic value of $pPUE_{dc,t}$ is modelled as a function of temperature $T$ to match hardware specifics as:

$$pPUE_{dc,t} = 7.1705 \cdot 10^{-5} T_{dc,t}^2 + 0.0041 T_{dc,t} + 1.0743$$

(7)

These power signals are then integrated over time and combined with fixed or real-time electricity prices (both models are explored in the evaluation) for the corresponding data center location to compute the total energy cost $C_{en}$ of every individual PM.

$$C_{en} = \frac{t_N - t_0}{N} \sum_{t=0}^{N-1} P_{tot,t} e_{dc,t}$$

(8)

The integration is approximated using the rectangle numerical integration method. At each $dc$ location, there is a time series of electricity prices $\{e_{dc,t} : t \in [t_0, t_N]\}$.

### 5 PERFORMANCE-BASED VM PRICING

After covering the detailed components that make up energy costs in modern multi-core physical machines, in this section we continue analysing the economical side of cloud computing by looking at VM pricing. Concretely, we cover state of the art performance-based VM pricing schemes used by providers such as ElasticHosts and CloudSigma where the user pays for the VM proportionally to the allocated CPU frequency. We then show on a practical experiment that these schemes do not account for properties like the CPU-boundedness of the VM’s workload and its effect on quality of service (QoS) in the price calculation. To address such drawbacks, we present our own perceived-performance VM pricing scheme as a next step in performance-based pricing, adapted for both Intel and ARM architectures. Having models for both the energy costs and VM revenue accounting for frequency scaling on multi-core PMs will allow us to explain our cloud controller in the next section.

#### 5.1 Emerging Performance-Based Pricing

Cloud Providers

In the performance-based pricing model used by several cloud providers, each user is charged on a per-time-unit basis (e.g. hourly) depending on the provisioned resources and their characteristics. The overall cost includes the cost for CPU provisioning, the allocated amount of RAM and the use of other resources, e.g. storage. Such a pricing scheme is offered by several providers, such as ElasticHosts [2] and CloudSigma [3], that allow the provisioning of different CPU frequency and core quantities, calculating the total CPU capacity allocated for the final invoice.

This enables users to choose between equivalent combinations of frequencies and number of virtual CPU cores that incur same CPU provisioning costs [2].

Based on the performance-based pricing scheme offered by ElasticHosts and CloudSigma, we fitted a pricing model that describes the behaviour of both schemes, similarly to the work in [46] where the ElasticHosts pricing scheme was initially modelled and analysed. In our obtained model, the price charged for CPU provisioning changes linearly with the total requested CPU capacity, as CPU capacity can be customised for different selected CPU frequencies and number of cores. Also, we extended the model to describe the RAM allocation. As VMs may have different RAM capacity requirements, the price varies according to the selected RAM size. Finally, the cost for other resources used is considered
to be fixed in the model as it is not the focus in this work. Hence, the price $C_{\text{vm}}$ of each VM at frequency $f_{\text{cpu}}$ is computed as:

$$C_{\text{vm}} = C_{\text{base}} + C_{\text{CPU}} \sum_{cpu_{\text{vm}}} \left( \frac{f_{\text{cpu}} - f_{\text{base}}}{f_{\text{base}}} \right) + C_{\text{RAM}} \frac{\text{RAMsize}}{\text{RAMsize}_{\text{base}}}$$

(9)

where $C_{\text{base}}$ is the price of the VM at minimum capacity, i.e., a CPU at minimum frequency $f_{\text{base}}$. $C_{\text{CPU}}$ and $C_{\text{RAM}}$ are cost weights used to generate the VM price for different CPU and RAM capacities. By replacing these variables with actual constants (presented later in the evaluation), the prices for configurations offered by ElasticHosts or CloudSigma can be approximated.

5.2 Workload Heterogeneity Implications

While the performance-based pricing model offered by ElasticHosts and CloudSigma enables the cloud provider to balance energy savings with the revenue losses from actions such as CPU frequency scaling, it ignores the impact of VM workload characteristics. We illustrate this in an empirical experiment we have performed to show how operating CPU frequency may affect workload performance in a different way depending on the application’s CPU boundedness ($\beta$) characteristics.

We executed the Berserk benchmark (already explained in Section 4.3) on one local server with a remote_ratio parameter indicating the portion of the work to offload to a different, remote server. The rest of the tasks were executed locally. Both servers had the same Quad-core 2.6 GHz AMD Opteron 4130 processor. The remote_ratio parameter therefore controlled the workload’s CPU boundedness, as we could control if the task was more CPU-bound (i.e., a low remote_ratio) or more I/O-bound where they would wait on the results to arrive from a network resource (i.e., a high remote_ratio). We calculated the CPU boundedness parameter $\beta$ as inversly proportional to remote_ratio. This approach enabled us to set arbitrary workload CPU boundedness. The experiment was run for six equidistant $\beta$ values between 0 and 1.

To also measure the effects CPU frequency scaling has in this context, we executed each of the workload characteristics on all five CPU frequency levels (applied both locally and to the remote server) that our server offered using the ‘cpufrequtils’ tool (the scripts we developed are included together with the Berserk benchmark). We collected the duration of the benchmark under each of the workload CPU boundedness $\beta$ and server CPU frequency combination.

The results are shown in Fig. 9. As can be seen, the execution time of an application with high CPU-boundedness ($\beta$) increases significantly when using a lower frequency and remains mostly unaffected for application with a lower CPU-boundedness ($\beta$ close to 0). Using the current performance-based pricing for CPU provisioning, like ElasticHosts and CloudSigma, a low frequency for jobs with low CPU boundedness would result in significantly lower revenue for the provider, even though the application performance would not be greatly affected. This was the main motivation for our perceived-performance pricing scheme that we present in the following section.

5.3 Perceived-Performance Pricing

As mentioned earlier, performance-based pricing, used by cloud providers like ElasticHosts and CloudSigma, does not consider the impact of frequency reduction on VM performance. To do so,
(becoming constant for $\beta = 0$), which matches the workload behaviour from the experiment described earlier.

It is assumed that resources are charged on an hourly basis. The total service revenue is computed by adding the per-hour provisioning cost of Eq. 3 for each VM served, allowing us to compare it with the frequency-based energy costs from Section 4.4.

5.4 Prices for Different Architectures

As mentioned in Section 4.1 besides using Intel architectures with ElasticHosts and CloudSigma pricing, in our work we are also interested in analysing the new pricing models on ARM architectures. Since the performance of an ARM-based CPU is significantly lower than the Intel, the price was scaled according to this factor. The authors in [47] evaluated the ARM Cortex-A15 against a Haswell i5 executing high efficiency video coding (HEVC) decoding tasks and obtained a 6x performance advantage for the Intel. Similarly, the authors in [14] evaluated a Sandy-Bridge based Xeon and a Cortex-A15 using various benchmarks, with roughly an 8x performance advantage for the Intel. Finally, a set of scientific benchmarks was used in [48] with both a Cortex-A15 CPU and a Sandy-Bridge based high-end i7 CPU. The results indicated that the i7 performed roughly 16x better than the ARM.

Based on these numbers, and by using one ARM Cortex-A15 CPU and one Sandy-Bridge based high-end i7, we normalised the performance values to the clock frequency of both platforms in order to match with the cost model of the cloud provider. We assumed a 11x performance advantage for the Intel architecture, and therefore we assumed a 11x cost reduction in the cloud service when using the ARM platform.

6 Cloud Controller Description

Having described both the multi-core, geographically-dependent energy consumption model used to compute the energy costs from operating the cloud and the perceived-performance pricing scheme used to compute the revenue from VM provisioning, in this section we explain our cloud controller. The cloud controller balances both of these cost-related components to obtain a quantitative comparison of energy saving and revenue loss trade-offs, which can be addressed as an optimisation problem. In other words, both cost-related components addressed in this paper are used to determine the actions invoked by the cloud controller.

We describe the BCFFS cloud controller that determines the VM migration and frequency scaling actions to be triggered in order to achieve energy cost savings that exceed the revenue losses. As these two control actions – VM migration and CPU frequency scaling – are mutually orthogonal, they are considered as two complementary actions in order to optimise the allocation and configuration of VMs to PMs. Hence, the two actions are examined in the algorithm separately as two stages, firstly migrating the VMs to PMs and then scaling the CPU frequencies of the PMs to achieve further energy cost savings. During the VM migration stage, the controller migrates VMs to PMs so that resource utilisation is maximised while preferring more economical locations in terms of electricity and cooling costs. Then, the controller reduces the CPU frequencies of the PMs iteratively as long as the energy cost savings exceed the service revenue losses. The algorithm is invoked periodically to trigger appropriate actions. In a real cloud system the algorithm could be automatically invoked by new VM arrivals or threshold violations of geotemporal inputs, e.g. a temperature increase of 1 C. Next, the two stages of the algorithm are described in more detail.

6.1 VM Migration Stage

During the first stage, the controller allocates newly requested VMs or reallocates VMs from underutilised hosts using migration based on the power overhead and the geotemporal input parameters of the PMs. As the underlying bin packing problem of VM allocation is NP-hard, we propose a heuristic polynomial time algorithm.

The VM migration stage pseudo-code is shown in Alg. 1. The algorithm initially marks for allocation all the newly requested VMs (line 3) and for reallocation all VMs that run on underutilised hosts (line 4), considering hosts as underutilised if their utilisation falls below a provider-defined threshold, as discussed in [49]. The selected VMs (line 5) are then migrated (or initially placed), prioritising VMs larger in their resource requirements (e.g. more required RAM, CPU cores), which are more difficult to fit (line 5). Then, the available PMs are divided into active and nonactive lists depending on their state (suspended or not). PMs in the inactive list are sorted (line 9) so that larger PMs are preferred to smaller machines (in order to minimise the idle power overhead) and data centers with lower combined electricity price and cooling overhead cost are prioritised based on the geotemporal input prices model presented in Section 4.4. The PM that will act as a vm host is selected by sorting active so that almost full PMs are utilised first, preferring PMs at lower-cost locations in case of ties (line 12). When the vm does not fit on any of the active PMs, the next PM from inactive is activated (line 20). Again, PM sorting assures that data centers will be selected based on the current geotemporal inputs (Section 4.4). When a host PM is found, the VM is placed or migrated to it (line 23) and the algorithm continues with the next VM.

Algorithm 1 VM Migration Stage.

Ensure: Allocate or migrate VMs per geotemporal inputs.

1: procedure VM MIGRATION STAGE
2: $to\_alloc \leftarrow$ empty list
3: append all VMs newly requested to $to\_alloc$
4: append VMs from all underutilised PMs to $to\_alloc$
5: sort $to\_alloc$ by resource requirements decreasing
6: for $vm \in to\_alloc$ do
7: \hspace{1em} $active \leftarrow$ all PMs where at least one VM is allocated
8: \hspace{1em} $inactive \leftarrow$ all PMs where no VMs are allocated
9: \hspace{1em} sort inactive by capacity decreasing, cost increasing
10: \hspace{1em} $mapped \leftarrow$ False
11: \hspace{1em} while not mapped do
12: \hspace{2em} sort active by capacity decreasing, cost increasing
13: \hspace{2em} for $pm \in active$ do
14: \hspace{3em} if $vm$ fits $pm$ then
15: \hspace{4em} $mapped \leftarrow$ True
16: \hspace{4em} break loop
17: \hspace{2em} end if
18: \hspace{2em} end for
19: \hspace{2em} if not mapped then
20: \hspace{3em} pop inactive[0] and append it to active
21: \hspace{3em} end if
22: \hspace{2em} end while
23: \hspace{1em} perform a placement/migration of vm to pm
24: end for
25: end procedure
Algorithm 2 Frequency Scaling Stage.

Ensure: Reduce CPU frequencies while energy savings exceed revenue losses.
1: procedure FREQUENCY SCALING STAGE
2: reset frequency of ∀pm ∈ active to f_{max}
3: for pm ∈ active do
4: \( f \leftarrow f_{\text{max}} \) \textbf{▷} Start the loop at max frequency
5: revenue\_cur \leftarrow \text{get\_revenue}(pm, f_{\text{io}\_\text{apply}}) \textbf{▷} Service revenue, ∀vm ∈ pm
6: en\_cost\_cur \leftarrow \text{get\_en\_cost}(pm, f_{\text{io}\_\text{apply}}) \textbf{▷} Energy cost of the pm
7: while \( f > f_{\text{min}} \) do
8: \( f \leftarrow f - f_{\text{step}} \)
9: revenue\_new \leftarrow \text{get\_revenue}(pm, f) \textbf{▷} Revenue for the new frequency
10: en\_cost\_new \leftarrow \text{get\_en\_cost}(pm, f) \textbf{▷} New energy cost
11: revenue\_loss \leftarrow revenue\_cur - revenue\_new
12: en\_savings \leftarrow en\_cost\_cur - en\_cost\_new
13: if en\_savings > revenue\_loss then
14: revenue\_cur \leftarrow revenue\_new
15: en\_cost\_cur \leftarrow en\_cost\_new
16: decrease\_feasible \leftarrow True
17: f_{\text{io}\_\text{apply}} \leftarrow f \textbf{▷} Update currently selected frequency
18: else
19: \textbf{break}
20: end if
21: end while
22: if decrease\_feasible then
23: apply f_{\text{io}\_\text{apply}} to pm
24: else
25: remove from active ∀ pm ∈ PMs s.t. pm has higher mean β_{pm} and lower el. price and temperature than pm
26: end if
27: end for
28: end procedure

6.2 Frequency Scaling Stage

Having allocated the VMs to PMs, the CPU frequencies of the PMs are adjusted in the next stage. We assume that each host can operate between a minimum and maximum frequency, \( f_{\text{min}} \) and \( f_{\text{max}} \) respectively. The appropriate CPU frequencies are selected based on both the geotemporal inputs and the workload characteristics, by considering their overall impact on the cost components presented in Sections 4 and 5. To do so, a PM’s CPU frequency is reduced only when energy savings from the reduction in the CPU frequency exceed the revenue losses under perceived-performance pricing. The algorithm is described in Alg. 2. From a high level, the CPU frequency of each PM is initially set to its maximum frequency \( f_{\text{max}} \) (line 3). Then, the algorithm iterates through the list of active PMs (line 4) to determine the most efficient CPU frequency for each one, analysing the range of the available CPU frequencies (line 10). Note that the actions determined in each step do not have to be executed physically before the procedure halts where the final PM frequencies are determined.

To pick the best CPU frequency, the cost-related components for the current PM are calculated for the previously determined and the next lower frequency (lines 11–13). The components include the service revenue from the VMs allocated to the current PM and the PM’s energy cost based on the multi-core power model and energy cost calculation presented in Section 4. Whenever the consideration of the lower CPU frequency results in energy cost savings which exceed the subsequent revenue loss, the new frequency is chosen for the current PM (line 19) and the algorithm continues to the next lower available frequency (line 10). The procedure in the inner loop terminates when the revenue losses exceed the respective energy savings (line 25). If no frequency reduction occurred for the PM (\( \text{decrease\_feasible \ stays \ False} \)), the procedure will remove PMs with higher average \( \beta \) and lower electricity price and temperature (line 31) before continuing. The idea is that such PMs may incur even lower energy savings and higher revenue losses, hence they can be omitted from the analysis to prune the search space.

7 Evaluation

In this section we evaluate the presented cloud controller in a simulation that we first describe as part of the evaluation methodology. We then proceed with presenting the simulation results showing the impact of our cloud controller with a focus on different environment factors.

7.1 Methodology

The BCFFS method is evaluated in a simulation of 2k VMs based on real traces of geotemporal inputs and VM CPU-boundedness values. The goal of the evaluation is to show the cost savings attainable using our approach, the impact on service revenue and to analyse the dependence on external factors, such as electricity prices and VM workloads. The simulations were executed on our open source Philharmonic simulator framework [50]. A simulation in Philharmonic consists of iterating through the timeline, collecting the currently available electricity prices and temperatures, as well as the incoming VM requests. The simulated controller is called to determine cloud control actions, such as VM migrations or PM frequency scaling. The applied actions are used to compute the resulting energy consumption and electricity costs based on our cost model from Section 4.

To compute the energy costs of the simulated geographically-distributed cloud, we consider a use case of six data centers. A dataset of real-time electricity prices described in [22] and temperatures from the Forecast [51] web service were used. The data center locations used in the simulation (Fig. 11) were selected to resemble Google’s deployment. Due to lack of RTEP data for the four non-US cities, the electricity prices were synthetically generated from the data known for other US cities – the time series were shifted based on the time zone offsets and a difference in annual mean values was added in order to resemble local values. Additionally, a scenario with fixed electricity prices over time.

![Fig. 11. Cities used as data center locations in the simulation.](image-url)
TABLE 3
Infrastructure parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>PMs</th>
<th>VMs</th>
<th>$f_{min}$</th>
<th>$f_{max}$</th>
<th>$f_{step}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARM</td>
<td>2k</td>
<td>2k</td>
<td>0.8 GHz</td>
<td>1.8 GHz</td>
<td>100 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>2k</td>
<td>2k</td>
<td>2.6 GHz</td>
<td>3.4 GHz</td>
<td>200 MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

is considered in the evaluation, using the mean values for each location.

TABLE 4
Pricing model parameters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pricing Model</th>
<th>$C_{base}$</th>
<th>$C_{CPU}$</th>
<th>$C_{RAM}$</th>
<th>$RAM_{size}^{base}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ElasticHosts</td>
<td>0.027 $/h$</td>
<td>0.018 $/h$</td>
<td>0.025 $/h$</td>
<td>1 GB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CloudSigma</td>
<td>0.0045 $/h$</td>
<td>0.0017 $/h$</td>
<td>0.004 $/h$</td>
<td>1 GB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The simulator was set up using the infrastructure parameters shown in Table 3. The table shows two architecture types: ARM and Intel. Their respective performance characteristics were derived from the real specifications, such as minimum CPU frequency $f_{min}$, maximum CPU frequency $f_{max}$ and the absolute frequency increase or decrease step $f_{step}$. The parameters we fitted for the pricing models in Section 5 to calculate hourly VM prices based on the pricing schemes offered by ElasticHosts and CloudSigma are shown in Table 4. The cost of other resources which is not the focus in this work, e.g., disk, was considered to be fixed. Due to space restrictions, we show results for both CPU architectures and both pricing schemes only in sections where we compare the effects of these respective factors on the attainable energy and cost savings. Other presented results are limited to the ARM architecture and the CloudSigma pricing scheme, which proved to be more promising for the application of our method, as will be shown later.

Each run simulated the cloud system for seven days of operation (168 h) with an hourly step size (1 h). The step size was chosen based on the available datasets of geotemporal inputs. However, note that different time intervals and triggering events, e.g., thresholds in geotemporal input changes or new VM arrivals could invoke the cloud controller in production environments. The characteristics of each resource considered in this work, namely the number of CPU cores and the amount of RAM, were uniformly distributed. Heterogeneous VMs were assumed with 1 or 2 CPU cores and RAM capacity ranging between 8 and 16 GB RAM in order to model different VM requests and prices. Each PM consists of 1–4 CPU cores and 16–32 GB RAM to model specification diversity. For each VM, the boot time and duration were varied using a uniform distribution to generate random values within the simulation time and distribute delete events over the simulation period and range the utilisation of the resources.

The CPU-boundedness of each VM was modelled based on the CPU usage traces from the PlanetLab dataset [23]. The dataset includes CPU usage traces of 1024 VMs. The data was collected every five minutes throughout a day. To generate realistic VM CPU-boundedness values in the simulation, the average CPU usage of each VM in the dataset was calculated and mapped to a $\beta$ value. From the generated dataset of $\beta$ values, an exponential distribution was fitted. The distribution is shown in Fig. 12. The figure also includes the empirical histogram of the traces normalised to an area of 1. The $\beta$ values of the VMs used in the simulation were generated based on this model.

We consider two baseline controllers for results comparison. The best fit decreasing (BFD) algorithm developed in [21] is a cloud controller that migrates VMs, dynamically adapting to user requests. The second baseline controller, best cost fit (BCF), is a variant of the BCFFS controller that applies VM migration based on geotemporal inputs, but does not consider frequency scaling. The BCFFS controller allows us to quantify the improvement brought by CPU frequency scaling in isolation.

The remainder of the section presents individual results for the different simulation scenarios we performed to compare the energy and cost savings and the performance implications from applying the proposed cloud controller approach. The parameters specified earlier are used in all of the experiments, unless otherwise stated.

7.2 Cloud Controller Evaluation

We begin by showing the cloud controller evaluation and comparison to the baselines for the Intel architecture. Fig. 13 includes the aggregated results for the achieved energy costs and service revenue, which are significant with a drop of less than 0.3%, compared to the BFD baseline. This is because the frequency scaling algorithm presented in the previous section does not scale frequencies if the revenue loss exceeds the energy cost savings.

7.3 Architecture Impact

Having shown the results for the Intel architecture, we now show results for the same simulation, only this time using the ARM power model, presented in Section 4.2. This allows us to...
7.4 Dynamic CPU frequency analysis

To explore the frequencies \( f \) assigned to VMs dynamically during the simulation and compare them with the VMs’ CPU boundness \( \beta \), we counted the number of occurrences of each \((\beta, f)\) combination for every VM and time slot. This data is illustrated as a bivariate histogram in Fig. 15 with the number of occurrences shown on a logarithmic scale. Darker areas indicate a higher number of frequency occurrences for the respective \((\beta, f)\) combination. It can be seen that the occurrences of CPU frequencies assigned based on each VM’s CPU boundedness match the areas where VM prices are high, based on the perceived-performance pricing model from Fig. 10. The area with high \( \beta \) and low \( f \), where prices would be the lowest, contains no occurrences. The darkest areas of the graph with a high number of occurrences represent the balance between energy savings and profit losses, which is in line with the controller requirements that energy cost savings should be maximised, but not exceeded by revenue losses.

7.5 Provider Pricing Impact

In this set of experiments we evaluated and compared the performance of the algorithms for different pricing models in order to investigate the impact of the pricing model on the savings from using the proposed approach. Fig. 16 presents the results for the CloudSigma and ElasticHosts cloud providers. As can be seen, higher energy cost savings are possible for the CloudSigma pricing scheme (14%) than for the pricing offered by ElasticHosts (2%). This is because CPU provisioning offered by CloudSigma is charged at a lower price resulting in service revenue being closer to the energy costs. As a result, energy savings gain comparatively more weight in the revenue-energy balancing performed by the cloud controller. Since our method applies better to cloud providers like CloudSigma, we used their pricing scheme in all the other simulation scenarios.

7.6 Pricing Model Impact

In this experiment we compared the savings obtained by using different pricing models. These include the perceived-performance pricing model proposed in Section 5.3 and performance-based pricing offered by the current providers. The results are presented...
in Fig. 17. It can be seen that using performance-based pricing does not lead to energy savings, as the reduction in prices is high compared with the energy costs. As a result, CPU frequency scaling is not feasible. On the other hand, using perceived-performance pricing, savings are possible as CPU frequency reduction does not lead to substantially reduced service revenues.

7.7 Electricity Cost Variation
As not all cloud providers may have access to real-time electricity pricing, in this set of experiments we evaluate the performance of the proposed controller under fixed electricity pricing. In Fig. 18 scenarios for fixed and variable electricity prices are compared to investigate the impact of electricity pricing on the energy savings obtained using the BCFFS controller. The BCFFS controller achieves better performance under variable electricity pricing reducing the energy costs by exploiting runtime information and adapting the cloud configuration according to the electricity price changes within the day. However, cost savings of 10% (compared to the BFD baseline) that are still significant are achieved for the fixed electricity cost scenario.

7.8 Variation of Parameter β
Fig. 19 shows the results for VMs with fixed CPU-boundedness properties. The aim is to evaluate the impact of different workloads on energy cost savings under the proposed controller and identify workload types where our approach is more beneficial. To do so, simulations using the same set of PMs and VM requests were used, while VM CPU-boundedness properties were varied between 0.0 to 0.4. The results are omitted for larger values of β, where savings are limited due to the impact on application performance. The energy savings achieved by the BCFFS controller decrease gradually while approaching higher values of CPU-boundedness (β). Between a β of 0.0 and 0.2 there is a substantial increase in energy cost as even a small reduction in frequency results in high energy cost savings that exceed the revenue losses. For higher values of β, the savings are limited due to the impact on application performance. As a result, the BCFFS controller achieves the best results for I/O-bound workloads where application performance is not greatly affected by the reduction in frequency.

8 Conclusion
As the demand for cloud platforms increases and as the workload becomes more diverse, a one-fit-all pricing policy does not only provide poor flexibility to the user, but is also not energy efficient. To keep up with the rapid evolution in information infrastructure, a more flexible way of controlling cloud systems must be provided to both satisfy the user and minimize the energy costs.

We have presented a flexible cloud control approach capable of system-level resource management to fit the performance guarantees requested by the user and minimise energy waste by scaling CPU resources on demand. Our cloud controller is driven by a model which covers realistic aspects of real-world cloud platforms. Geotemporal inputs such as real-time electricity pricing and temperature-dependent cooling affecting a geographically-distributed cloud provider have been modelled together with a multi-architecture, multi-core power model based on real experiments and used in the Philharmonic cloud simulator to estimate operational costs and the VM service revenue. Several scenarios were examined and two baseline methods were used resulting in energy cost savings of up to 14.57% for ARM and up to 10.06% for Intel architectures.

The lessons learned from our research can be applied to cut costs in data centers. For example, a cloud provider with an $12M annual electricity bill providing VMs on ARM infrastructure at prices similar to CloudSigma for mostly I/O intensive workloads can save around $1.7M, assuming no frequency scaling was previously used. Even if not all ideal factors are satisfied, e.g. the VM prices are in the ElasticHosts range, around $750k savings can be achieved for a larger cloud provider with a $38M annual energy bill (estimated in [24]).

Our results show that energy costs can be significantly reduced without noticeably impacting the service revenue by scaling the CPU frequencies of the PMs according to the hosted VM characteristics. We have shown that this method applies better to some cloud providers like CloudSigma, where service revenue is closer to energy costs. Savings can be achieved for fixed electricity pricing, but RTEP pricing allows higher energy savings. For our method, ARM architectures are more suitable than Intel, and more I/O-intensive workloads allow for higher savings than CPU-intensive workloads.

As part of our future work, we would like to investigate approaches where the VM migration cloud controller stage also considers the workload CPU-boundedness characteristics in order to maximise the energy savings from using perceived-performance pricing.
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