

Treehouse: A Case For Carbon-Aware Datacenter Software

Thomas Anderson¹, Adam Belay², Mosharaf Chowdhury³, Asaf Cidon⁴, and Irene Zhang^{1,5}

¹University of Washington, ²MIT, ³University of Michigan, ⁴Columbia University, ⁵Microsoft Research

Abstract

The end of Dennard scaling and the slowing of Moore’s Law has put the energy use of datacenters on an unsustainable path. Datacenters are already a significant fraction of worldwide electricity use, with application demand scaling at a rapid rate. We argue that substantial reductions in the carbon intensity of datacenter computing are possible with a software-centric approach: by making energy and carbon visible to application developers on a fine-grained basis, by modifying system APIs to make it possible to make informed trade offs between performance and carbon emissions, and by raising the level of application programming to allow for flexible use of more energy efficient means of compute and storage. We also lay out a research agenda for systems software to reduce the carbon footprint of datacenter computing.

1 Introduction

The pressing need for society to address global climate change has caused many large organizations to begin to track and report their aggregate greenhouse gas emissions, both directly caused by their operations and indirectly caused through energy use and by supply chains [5]. However, there are no standard *software* mechanisms in place to track and control emissions from information technology (IT). This lack of visibility is especially acute where multiple applications share the same physical hardware, such as datacenters, since carbon emissions today can only be accounted for at the server or processor chip level, not at the software and application level.

In aggregate, datacenters represent a large and growing source of carbon emissions; estimates place datacenters as responsible for 1-2% of aggregate worldwide electricity consumption [31, 51]. Given rapidly-increasing demand for computing and data analysis [46, 59], continual improvements are needed in the carbon efficiency of computing to keep the climate impact of computing from skyrocketing [31, 51, 52]. The end of Dennard scaling means that exponential improvements in energy efficiency are no longer an automatic consequence of Moore’s Law. Over the past few years, various




Figure 1: Application demands for energy is growing faster than energy efficiency improvements we can achieve. Treehouse takes a software-centric approach to reduce this gap.

technologies have been introduced to improve matters—for example, server consolidation and improvements in power distribution. However, these steps will not be enough going forward (Figure 1).

For cloud datacenter operators, a popular option is to construct datacenters in locations with inexpensive, renewable power generation. Although a step forward, this is unlikely to be a complete solution for several reasons. First, hardware manufacturing, assembly and transportation, as well as the construction and maintenance of the datacenter itself, are all energy and greenhouse gas intensive. In fact, chip manufacturing alone is responsible for about a third of the lifecycle greenhouse gas emissions of a modern datacenter [27]. Second, edge computing—placing computing near customers—is increasingly popular as a way to improve application responsiveness; these smaller scale datacenters are often located in or near cities without access to dedicated green power sources.¹ Power is often much slower to provision than other parts of IT; for example, provisioning interstate power lines to access remote green energy often requires many years of advance planning. Finally, many companies continue to operate their own on-premise datacenters; any solution must work for those deployments as well.

We propose Treehouse, a project whose goal is to

¹For example, about a half acre of solar panels, plus batteries, are needed to fully power a single 24x7 server rack [3].

build the foundations for a new software infrastructure that treats energy and carbon as a first-class resource, alongside traditional computing resources like compute, memory, and storage. Today, developers have almost no way to know how their engineering decisions affect the climate. The goal of Treehouse is to enable developers and operators to understand and reduce greenhouse gases from datacenter sources. We target all datacenter environments, including cloud, edge computing, and on-premise environments.

We identify three new foundational abstractions necessary to enable developers to optimize their carbon footprint: (1) energy provenance, a mechanism to track energy usage, (2) an interface for expressing applications' service-level agreements (SLAs) to allow operators to trade off performance and carbon consumption, and (3) μ functions, a fungible fine-grained unit of execution that enables more efficient hardware utilization. We also lay out a research agenda to develop mechanisms for reducing carbon footprint by: (1) reducing software bloat, (2) interchanging computational resources, (3) interchanging memory resources, and (4) energy-aware scheduling policies.

Beyond our direct research agenda, we hope our efforts can inspire the broader software systems community to focus much more on datacenter carbon reduction.

2 Foundations for Energy-Aware Datacenter Software

Application developers today have few tools at their disposal to write energy and carbon-efficient applications. First, they have no good way to account for the amount of carbon their applications are emitting. In addition, it is not clear what the carbon implications would be of particular design choices (e.g., shifting their application from a dedicated server to a shared server, or moving their storage from disk to flash). While many cloud users do optimize for lower cloud costs, cost does not equate to energy usage. For example, while an HDD is much cheaper to run than an SSD, it is far more energy intensive. Similarly, for computationally intensive applications, FPGAs can often provide only a small integer factor speedup relative to CPUs, but a factor of 10-70 improvement in energy efficiency [50].

Second, from the standpoint of the operator (e.g., the cloud provider or a devops engineer in an on-premises data center), even if they have some understanding of the energy consumption of particular hardware resources (e.g., servers), reducing the carbon footprint of a workload will often reduce performance. The datacenter operator does not typically know when it would be appropriate to make that tradeoff, and so the common practice is to optimize infrastructure energy use only when

it would have negligible impact on performance, regardless of whether the performance matters to a particular application.

Third, software applications today are typically provisioned in a static set of bundled resources, which make it difficult to optimize for lower energy usage. For example, virtual machines or containers typically come pre-allocated with a set of CPU cores, memory capacity, and network and disk bandwidth. As modern datacenter applications typically exhibit bursty and unpredictable patterns at the microsecond-scale, this bundling of resources causes applications to be inefficient and energy-wasteful.

In this section, we introduce a set of abstractions that we believe will lay the foundations for solving these problems, to allow developers to track and optimize the energy and carbon footprints of their applications.

2.1 Energy Provenance

In order to track and account for carbon emissions at the software level, we need the ability to measure the *energy provenance* of each application. We use the term provenance to denote both the direct and indirect energy usage of a particular application. For example, an application not only directly consumes energy when it is running user-level code, but it also consumes energy in the operating system, in storage devices, and in the network interface system, in storage devices, and in the network interface and switches along its path when it is communicating with a remote server, as well as the energy used on its behalf at the remote server.

Since it is difficult to directly measure the lifecycle energy provenance of individual applications through hardware mechanisms alone, we believe it will be necessary to construct a supervised machine learning model to estimate the energy provenance of the application, given its resource usage. The input (or features) of the model will be metrics that are easily measured in software, including the network bandwidth (for switches and network interface cards), bytes of storage and storage bandwidth (for memory and persistent storage) and accelerator cycles, as well as the type and topology of hardware the application runs on. The model could be trained and validated by carefully measuring in a lab environment how these performance metrics affect system-level energy usage. Armed with accurate single-node energy provenance estimates, we plan to annotate data center communication, such as remote procedure calls (RPCs), much as cloud providers annotate RPCs with debugging information today [21]. These lifecycle per-application energy estimates, combined with estimates of the carbon intensity of power generation in each location, would give developers the needed visibility into the impact of their design decisions. This is a necessary first step to enlisting the developer community in achieving computational energy and carbon efficiency.

2.2 Exposing Application-Level SLAs

Another barrier to energy-efficient computing is that optimizations that improve energy efficiency often hurt performance. Disabling processor boost mode; moving less frequently used data from high power memory to much lower power non-volatile memory or solid-state storage; turning off underutilized memory chips; moving computation from power-hungry general purpose processors to more efficient dedicated hardware accelerators; powering down a fraction of the network core when it is not needed—these steps save energy but very often come at the cost of worse system and application performance.

For application code, provided we address energy provenance, the application developer can decide on the right tradeoff that meets user performance expectations in the most energy-efficient manner possible. These types of optimizations are harder for systems code because it currently lacks any direct knowledge of application intent. Traditionally, system designs have been evaluated in terms of response times and throughput, but to achieve this designers have been willing to use all available resources regardless of the energy cost. Thus, while these designs are often optimal for performance, they sacrifice carbon efficiency.

To address this challenge, we aim to provide a way for application developers to convey to systems code their tolerance (and/or desire) for energy-saving optimizations. This is the equivalent of eco-mode when driving a car. Together with provenance data to track the energy impact of using different resources, the system designer and operator can make informed choices as to how to schedule and place workloads. Once system code can optimize its behavior along the energy-performance Pareto curve, application developers can make informed choices to meet their users’ carbon reduction goals.

To this end, we believe we need to develop a new interface to expose application-level performance constraints (Service Level Agreements, or SLAs) to systems software. This will enable a new class of energy-aware systems-level optimizations. For highly latency-sensitive operations, it may still make sense to use the highest-performance solutions, even at high energy cost. But where there is available slack in user expectations, we can use that flexibility to choose the most energy-efficient solution consistent with meeting user needs.

There is a large body of work on shifting long-running batch jobs (e.g., MapReduce-style analytics) to a cleaner sources of energy [15–17, 34, 35, 42, 47]. These type of tasks are the extreme end of the SLA spectrum (depicted in Figure 2), and typically operate at time scales of hours or even days. This provides enough slack to shift them to geographically-remote datacenters or to different times of the day, to take advantage of spatial or temporal availability of clean energy (e.g., wind and solar). Our focus




Figure 2: Treehouse focuses on reducing the carbon footprint for tasks with sub-second SLAs. Due to these latency constraints, the energy optimizations available are those within the same datacenter. Prior work has considered relocating batch jobs (e.g., analytics) to datacenters with greener sources of power, or to greener periods of the day.

is on energy optimizations that can also apply to applications with much tighter SLAs, at the millisecond and even single-digit microsecond scale. For these applications, it isn’t feasible to move the work to remote datacenters or to periods of off-peak electricity generation.

2.3 μ functions

Despite the fact that many applications have highly dynamic resource usage, cloud applications today are often provisioned for peak resource usage in coarse-grained and static ways. For example, a virtual machine, container, or even serverless compute engine will be provisioned statically, with, say, 4 cores, 32 GB of memory, etc., for seconds, minutes and hours at a time, while application demand varies at much finer time-scales.

This leads to a high degree of resource stranding—compute, memory, and storage that is only lightly utilized, but which cannot be used for other applications. Although many hardware devices have low power modes, these are only of partial benefit. Even at low load, power consumption is often half of the high load case [11], in addition to the environmental impact of fabricating devices that on average sit idle. Power efficiency per unit of application work is maximized when system software keeps resources fully utilized.

Further, the most energy efficient option is to avoid doing work that wasn’t needed in the first place. Existing datacenter software stacks are bloated, with layers of functionality added over time and kept for programmer speed and convenience rather than refactored down to their essential purpose. In the old era of Dennard scaling, inefficient layering could be addressed with time—every year, faster and more energy-efficient computers would become available to hide the impact of software bloat. With the end of Dennard scaling, however, keeping old, inefficient software layers adds up.

We believe we need a new abstraction to address both software bloat and resource stranding. First, we need a lightweight way to provision resources at much finer time scales, choosing the most energy efficient option that meets each application’s SLA. Second, to achieve

high utilization, we need to aggregate application resource demands more effectively.

A New Abstraction for Fungible Compute Modern datacenter applications are distributed at extremely fine granularities. For example, each user-facing HTTP request received by Facebook or Twitter spawn requests to dozens of microservices that lead to thousands of individual RPCs to servers. As datacenter networks get faster and in-memory microservices become more efficient (e.g., by using kernel-bypass), datacenter servers can increasingly process and respond to requests in microseconds [12].

To accommodate microsecond-scale datacenter applications, we need a new programming model with fine-grained resource allocation and low provisioning overheads. It must be efficient enough to make adjustments at the microsecond-scale, so it can respond to sudden workload changes [29, 44]. Reflecting its microsecond scale, we call this abstraction for general-purpose fine-grained application provisioning *microfunctions*. Microfunctions represent a large enough time scale to do useful work (i.e., a few thousand cycles), while being fine-grained enough to balance resource usage quickly as shifts in load occur.

We plan to use an RPC-based API for μ functions, including an interface for the user to define SLAs, as well as an energy or carbon budget. We also see foresee opportunities to further increase efficiency through computation shipping between μ functions, allowing us to improve locality and reduce data movement [36, 61]. Dynamically deciding when to move data or computation will also enable new efficiency vs. performance tradeoffs. Building upon the recent trend toward microservices, we envision that full applications can be constructed by partitioning their components into fine-grained units and running them as independent μ functions.

FaaS (Function-as-a-Service) or serverless frameworks, such as AWS Lambda [1] share a similar notion by allowing developers to express their jobs and get billed at the granularity of individual function invocations. However, FaaS still operates on top of statically allocated resource containers, making it difficult to bin pack the right combination of functions—in the face of variable resource usage—to achieve high utilization. Some cloud providers compensate by overcommitting functions to containers, but this leads to inconsistent per-function performance [60]. In addition, FaaS suffers from software bloat and high function startup times. The “cold start” problem, in particular, can cause FaaS to take hundreds of milliseconds or more to invoke a function [55]. This timescale is many orders of magnitude too coarse to achieve balance during fine-grained shifts in resource demand, while incurring far higher energy over-

head than is necessary. Finally, FaaS is only designed to operate on a specific type of compute and memory (namely, CPU and DRAM), and cannot take advantage of more energy efficient options such as accelerators (e.g., GPUs, FPGAs, NICs) and heterogeneous forms of memory (e.g., persistent memory).

Our goal for μ functions is to provide a *lightweight* function abstraction, which is *decoupled from any static grouping of resources*, such as a container or a VM. Instead, we aim to make μ functions completely fungible, consuming resources on-demand as they are needed, with the ability to run on heterogeneous computing resources.

Micro-Second Scale Performance In order to exploit fine-grained variations in resource usage and concurrency, we plan to support microsecond-scale invocations of μ functions, an improvement of several orders of magnitude over existing serverless systems. We must tackle two research challenges to spawn μ functions this quickly.

First, the cold start problem must be addressed to speed up invocations on machines that have not recently executed a particular function. One barrier is the high initialization cost of existing isolation mechanisms. For example, even after sophisticated optimizations, Amazon’s Firecracker still requires at least 125 milliseconds to start executing a function environment [6].

Second, we must ensure that μ function invocations themselves can start extremely quickly. A major barrier to fast function invocation in existing FaaS systems is that they rely on inefficient RPC protocols built on top of HTTP. In addition, existing FaaS systems require a complex tier of dedicated load balancing servers [6], which leads to significant delays.

Resource Disaggregation Resource disaggregation poses a solution to the fixed bundling of resources (in servers, virtual machines or containers). While microsecond resource allocation helps to minimize the resources stranded by overprovisioning, it does not solve the problem of bin packing application resource allocations onto servers, leaving some resources still stranded. Disaggregating resources reduces resource stranding at the cost of added latency. For applications whose SLAs are designed to tolerate slightly longer latencies, disaggregation enables the system to allocate exactly the amount of compute, memory and storage each application requires at the moment, from a shared pool. This allows idle resources to be powered off to save energy without compromising application-level SLAs.

There has been some progress on disaggregating resources, particularly on disaggregating storage [9, 10, 23]. However, some resources, such as memory and CPU, are




Figure 3: Depiction of the Treehouse scheduler. The scheduler takes as its input the energy provenance of each function, the state of the different hardware resources as well as the function’s SLA. It then schedules the functions in the most energy-efficient way, while still meeting their SLAs, across the different clusters of disaggregated resources.

still primarily consumed locally on monolithic servers. While there is a large body of research on trying to disaggregate these resources [7, 8, 22, 26, 38, 54, 56], significant challenges remain for real-world adoption, including: security [57], isolation [63], synchronization [43] and fault tolerance [40]. These challenges are exacerbated especially in low-latency (i.e., microsecond-scale) settings that are our focus.

Design Questions A key design question is whether to build μ functions on top of Linux, and whether μ functions need to be able to support POSIX. While running μ functions on top of Linux may make it easier for existing applications to transition to μ functions, it comes at a high cost. In particular, Linux adds significant overhead to I/O operations, and it is not the natural interface for writing a distributed application across disaggregated resources. We plan to pursue in parallel both research directions: (a) incrementally adapt Linux to be more lightweight, as well as (b) pursue a clean-slate non-POSIX OS design. We describe these efforts in Section 3.1.

2.4 Summary

To conclude, our three foundational abstractions would allow developers to define μ functions that can operate on fungible resources at microsecond time-scales. Developers would define SLAs for these μ functions, allowing the cloud operator to navigate the energy-performance Pareto curve. Finally, the energy provenance of these μ functions would be tracked and accounted for at all times.

This process is depicted in Figure 3, where the Treehouse scheduler (described in §3.4) collects as input the energy provenance and the SLA of the μ functions, and schedules them on the resource at a time that would still meet their SLA while minimizing overall energy usage.

3 Research Agenda

We now describe a specific agenda that builds upon the Treehouse foundational abstractions to reduce datacenter energy consumption, by allowing software systems to make energy-aware decisions.

3.1 Minimizing Software Bloat

Inefficient software layers can be found in system-level building blocks shared across applications, including data movement, data (un)marshalling, memory allocation, and remote procedure call handling. In a cluster-wide profiling study at Google, it was found that these common building blocks consume about 30% of all cycles; the Linux kernel, including thread scheduling and network packet processing, consumes an additional 20% of all cycles [32]. In other words, shared software infrastructure is significant enough to account for almost half of all CPU cycles available in a typical datacenter.

We propose two steps to address software bloat. The first step is to continue optimizing the many layers of the IT software stack that we have inherited. Many of these layers were designed for systems where I/O took milliseconds to complete. We need a fundamental redesign of the software stack for fast I/O (networking and storage) devices.

One direction is to use Linux as a control plane for backward compatibility, but allow applications efficient direct access to I/O [13, 53]. Widely-used bypass technologies include RDMA and DPDK [58] for network bypass as well as Optane and SPDK [28] for storage bypass. Although more work is needed to understand how best to integrate these technologies with the kernel, studies have shown that operating system overheads can be slashed while still providing traditional kernel functions such as centralized scheduling, file system semantics, and performance isolation [37, 49, 62]. A complementary approach is to move user-defined functions written in a type-safe language into the Linux kernel, to allow customization closer to the hardware [18, 24, 48, 64].

A longer-term solution is to offload parts of the data path to more powerful and lower-energy I/O hardware. For example, both Amazon and Microsoft Azure offload to hardware the packet re-writing needed for cloud virtualization [20, 33]. This minimizes the energy cost of the added abstraction. We need to extend this approach to other layers of the systems stack to truly reduce the software energy drain from management systems. For example, we are designing an open-source, reconfigurable hardware networking stack to reduce energy use of frequently used operating system and runtime functions.

Ultimately, we believe we will need a new energy-optimized operating system kernel and runtime system for datacenters architected to take advantage of energy-




Figure 4: Pareto frontier of energy usage-vs-tail latency for interchangeable memory options. For example, DRAM and SSD are located at the opposite corners in this tradeoff space, but the relationships between alternatives may not always be linear.

efficient hardware acceleration. This may be either as a clean-slate design or by incrementally replacing parts of the Linux kernel [41]. By raising the level of abstraction from POSIX to μ functions, we make it easier to support these more radical designs.

3.2 Interchangeable Compute

Datacenter applications are often designed to take advantage of a specific type of compute engine. Traditional applications typically assume they are running on CPUs, while many machine learning applications rely on accelerators like GPUs, TPUs, and FPGAs, with new options emerging every month. In many cases, an application’s energy consumption can be significantly reduced, while still meeting its SLA, if the application used a different less energy-intensive computing resource.

For example, FPGAs are often much more energy efficient than CPUs on the same computation. However, for highly dynamic workloads with tight timing limits, CPUs are often used instead because they can be quickly configured and/or reallocated as demand changes. We believe we can obtain the best of both worlds by making it possible to run μ functions in hybrid mode—using CPUs to meet transient and short-term bursts with FPGAs used to meet the more stable and predictable portion of the workload. Because FPGAs, like CPUs, are at their peak energy efficiency at full utilization, this means transparently scaling FPGAs up and down much like we do today for CPUs. To reduce engineering costs of maintaining multiple implementations, we aim to develop an intermediate representation (IR) that can be converted to run on a broad spectrum of accelerators (e.g., similar to what TVM [14] does for machine learning); cloud customers will then be able to tradeoff between agility and energy efficiency as they see fit.

3.3 Interchangeable Memory

Similar to interchangeable compute devices, DRAM, NVRAM, SSD, and HDD can all be interchanged to some degree: while DRAM is volatile, in many use cases non-volatility is not a strict requirement. Each offers a different operating point in the tradeoff between energy efficiency and tail latency, as shown schematically in Figure 4. Even within a particular technology, there are often energy tradeoffs, such as in the choice between single and multi-level cell encodings on SSDs.

Another trend is towards microsecond-scale networks, such as CXL and RDMA. This can allow memory resources to be more effectively disaggregated, reducing both the cost and energy waste of resource stranding. Combined with high-performance storage technologies, such as 3D XPoint (e.g., Intel Optane SSD [2]) or SLC NAND (e.g., Samsung Z-SSD [4]) which offer microsecond-scale access times, significant amounts of energy (and carbon) can be saved by shifting data that is currently stored on DRAM to lower-power nearby storage.

We propose to design a *general-purpose* system that interchanges memory for lower power storage, without affecting the application’s SLAs while staying within an energy budget. Such a system would need to automatically identify which data should sit in DRAM, and which part in storage, based on the μ function’s timeliness constraint, its read and write access patterns, and its access granularity. In addition, we can also employ intelligent caching and prefetching to mask reduced DRAM use [45].

3.4 Energy-Aware Scheduling

So far, we have separately considered interchangeable compute and interchangeable memory resources. For the most part, we have also assumed that the total energy consumption is given as a constraint for those optimizations. However, any realistic application requires both computation and storage. We need to consider how to find the Pareto frontier of an application’s energy-performance curve by co-optimizing both sets of interchangeable resources in a disaggregated environment, while taking energy sources and μ function SLAs into account.

Given that a μ function can run on multiple interchangeable compute devices and the computation device may have choices to use one of the many storage mediums, one direction would be extending well-known multi-commodity flow-based resource allocation formulations [19, 30, 39] for determining the best combination of interchangeable resources to use. Figure 5 gives a simple example. There are μ functions from three applications: A_1 , A_2 , and A_3 (three commodities with different colors), each of which can run on one of the five compute




Figure 5: An example multi-commodity flow-based formulation for cost-performance optimization at time t .

resources ($R_1 \dots R_5$) with different – already-profiled and known – speedups. At time t , each μ function can read and write pertinent data (e.g., A_1 needs three objects A_{11} – A_{13}) from/to two interchangeable storage devices (the availability of data for reading can be captured by the presence/absence of edges between a compute device and corresponding data in that storage medium). Now one can represent the problem of optimizing for total energy consumption for these simple μ functions as the sum of all edge costs for each μ function (with appropriate constraints to avoid oversubscribing each compute device) – minimizing the total cost across all μ functions will ensure that the overall energy consumption is minimized. By appropriately setting the costs of the edges and objective functions, we can consider trading off energy consumption for application performance and vice versa. The primary challenge of such optimization-based approaches is the speed at which we can determine placements—a few microseconds may not be enough. Approximation- and/or memoization-based are more likely to succeed.

What we highlighted so far deals only with assignments of μ functions to interchangeable compute and memory/storage at a particular time instant. However, one-shot device assignment is just the beginning of the scheduling problem; we must also schedule μ functions over time without violating their SLAs. The key here will likely be to take advantage of deadline-based and altruistic scheduling solutions [25] to effectively leverage available slack. We can consider dividing time into fixed-length scheduling windows, pack μ functions with smaller slack within the current window, and push μ functions with larger slack into future windows. This would maximize our ability to convert application flexibility over timeliness into lower energy and carbon use.

4 Conclusion

The end of Dennard scaling and the slowing of Moore’s Law has led to an inflection point with respect to the impact the computing industry on the world’s ecology. Computing is still a small fraction of global energy use, but we can no longer count on automatic advances in the energy-efficiency of computing to compensate for the rapid upward spiral in computing demand. To continue to reap the benefits of computing without endangering the planet, we need to treat energy efficiency as a first class design goal. The Treehouse project aims to address this challenge by building tools that help application developers understand the implications of their design decisions on energy and carbon use, by adapting interfaces to make timeliness requirements explicit to allow for informed system-level tradeoffs of energy versus time, and by reducing the energy cost of commonly used abstractions. More broadly, we believe that the systems software research community can and must play a constructive role in reducing the impact of computing on the planet, as we make the transition to abundant carbon-free energy over the next few decades.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Simon Peter for suggesting Figure 1. This work is supported by grants from the National Science Foundation (2104243, 2104292, 2104398, and 2104548), VMware, and Cisco Systems.

References

- [1] AWS Lambda. <https://aws.amazon.com/lambda/>.
- [2] Intel Optane SSD 9 Series. <https://www.intel.com/content/www/us/en/products/memory-storage/solid-state-drives/consumer-ssds/optane-ssd-9-series.html>.
- [3] National renewable energy laboratory: Land use by system technology. <https://www.nrel.gov/analysis/tech-size.html>.
- [4] Samsung Z-SSD. <https://www.samsung.com/semiconductor/ssd/z-ssd/>.
- [5] Greenhouse gas corporate accounting and reporting standard. <https://ghgprotocol.org/corporate-standard>, 2021.
- [6] A. Agache, M. Brooker, A. Iordache, A. Liguori, R. Neugebauer, P. Piwonka, and D. Popa. Firecracker: Lightweight virtualization for serverless applications. In *USENIX NSDI*, pages 419–434, 2020.

- [7] M. K. Aguilera, N. Amit, I. Calciu, X. Deguillard, J. Gandhi, S. Novaković, A. Ramanathan, P. Subrahmanyam, L. Suresh, K. Tati, R. Venkatasubramanian, and M. Wei. Remote Regions: A simple abstraction for remote memory. In *USENIX ATC*, 2018.
- [8] E. Amaro, C. Branner-Augmon, Z. Luo, A. Ousterhout, M. K. Aguilera, A. Panda, S. Ratnasamy, and S. Shenker. Can far memory improve job throughput? In *ACM EuroSys*, 2020.
- [9] Amazon. Amazon Elastic Block Store. <https://aws.amazon.com/ebs/>.
- [10] Amazon. Amazon Web Services. <https://aws.amazon.com/s3/>.
- [11] L. A. Barroso and U. Hözlze. The case for energy-proportional computing. *Computer*, 40(12):33–37, 2007.
- [12] L. A. Barroso, M. Marty, D. A. Patterson, and P. Ranganathan. Attack of the killer microseconds. *Commun. ACM*, 60(4):48–54, 2017.
- [13] A. Belay, G. Prekas, A. Klimovic, S. Grossman, C. Kozyrakis, and E. Bugnion. IX: A protected dataplane operating system for high throughput and low latency. In *USENIX OSDI*, pages 49–65, 2014.
- [14] T. Chen, T. Moreau, Z. Jiang, L. Zheng, E. Yan, H. Shen, M. Cowan, L. Wang, Y. Hu, L. Ceze, et al. TVM: An automated end-to-end optimizing compiler for deep learning. In *OSDI*, pages 578–594, 2018.
- [15] Y. Chen, S. Alspaugh, D. Borthakur, and R. Katz. Energy efficiency for large-scale MapReduce workloads with significant interactive analysis. In *ACM EuroSys*, pages 43–56, 2012.
- [16] Y. Chen, A. Ganapathi, and R. H. Katz. To compress or not to compress-compute vs. io tradeoffs for mapreduce energy efficiency. In *ACM SIGCOMM Workshop on Green networking*, pages 23–28, 2010.
- [17] D. Cheng, P. Lama, C. Jiang, and X. Zhou. Towards energy efficiency in heterogeneous Hadoop clusters by adaptive task assignment. In *IEEE ICDCS*, pages 359–368, 2015.
- [18] P. Enberg, A. Rao, and S. Tarkoma. Partition-aware packet steering using XDP and eBPF for improving application-level parallelism. In *Proceedings of the 1st ACM CoNEXT Workshop on Emerging in-Network Computing Paradigms*, pages 27–33, 2019.
- [19] S. Even, A. Itai, and A. Shamir. On the complexity of time table and multi-commodity flow problems. In *16th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 184–193. IEEE, 1975.
- [20] D. Firestone, A. Putnam, S. Mundkur, D. Chiou, A. Dabagh, M. Andrewartha, H. Angepat, V. Bhanu, A. Caulfield, E. Chung, H. K. Chandrappa, S. Chaturmohta, M. Humphrey, J. Lavier, N. Lam, F. Liu, K. Ovtcharov, J. Padhye, G. Popuri, S. Raindel, T. Sapre, M. Shaw, G. Silva, M. Sivakumar, N. Srivastava, A. Verma, Q. Zuhair, D. Bansal, D. Burger, K. Vaid, D. A. Maltz, and A. Greenberg. Azure accelerated networking: SmartNICs in the public cloud. In *USENIX NSDI*, 2018.
- [21] R. Fonseca, G. Porter, R. H. Katz, and S. Shenker. X-trace: A pervasive network tracing framework. In *USENIX NSDI*, 2007.
- [22] P. X. Gao, A. Narayan, S. Karandikar, J. Carreira, S. Han, R. Agarwal, S. Ratnasamy, and S. Shenker. Network requirements for resource disaggregation. In *OSDI*, 2016.
- [23] Y. Gao, Q. Li, L. Tang, Y. Xi, P. Zhang, W. Peng, B. Li, Y. Wu, S. Liu, L. Yan, F. Feng, Y. Zhuang, F. Liu, P. Liu, X. Liu, Z. Wu, J. Wu, Z. Cao, C. Tian, J. Wu, J. Zhu, H. Wang, D. Cai, and J. Wu. When cloud storage meets RDMA. In *NSDI*, 2021.
- [24] Y. Ghigoff, J. Sopena, K. Lazri, A. Blin, and G. Muller. Bmc: Accelerating memcached using safe in-kernel caching and pre-stack processing. In *USENIX NSDI*, pages 487–501, 2021.
- [25] R. Grandl, M. Chowdhury, A. Akella, and G. Ananthanarayanan. Altruistic scheduling in multi-resource clusters. In *USENIX OSDI*, pages 65–80, 2016.
- [26] J. Gu, Y. Lee, Y. Zhang, M. Chowdhury, and K. G. Shin. Efficient memory disaggregation with Infiniswap. In *NSDI*, 2017.
- [27] U. Gupta, Y. G. Kim, S. Lee, J. Tse, H.-H. S. Lee, G.-Y. Wei, D. Brooks, and C.-J. Wu. Chasing carbon: The elusive environmental footprint of computing, 2020.
- [28] Intel Corporation. Storage performance development kit. <http://www.spdk.io>.

- [29] C. Iorgulescu, R. Azimi, Y. Kwon, S. Elnikety, M. Syamala, V. R. Narasayya, H. Herodotou, P. Tomita, A. Chen, J. Zhang, and J. Wang. PerfIso: Performance isolation for commercial latency-sensitive services. In H. S. Gunawi and B. Reed, editors, *USENIX ATC*, pages 519–532, 2018.
- [30] M. Isard, V. Prabhakaran, J. Currey, U. Wieder, K. Talwar, and A. Goldberg. Quincy: fair scheduling for distributed computing clusters. In *ACM SOSP*, pages 261–276, 2009.
- [31] N. Jones. How to stop data centres from gobbling up the world’s electricity. *Nature*, 561(7722):163–167, 2018.
- [32] S. Kanev, J. P. Darago, K. M. Hazelwood, P. Ranganathan, T. Moseley, G. Wei, and D. M. Brooks. Profiling a warehouse-scale computer. In D. T. Marr and D. H. Albonese, editors, *ACM ISCA*, pages 158–169, 2015.
- [33] A. Kaufmann, S. Peter, N. K. Sharma, T. Anderson, and A. Krishnamurthy. High performance packet processing with FlexNIC. In *ACM ASPLOS*, pages 67–81, 2016.
- [34] K. Kim, F. Yang, V. M. Zavala, and A. A. Chien. Data centers as dispatchable loads to harness stranded power. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, 8(1):208–218, 2016.
- [35] A. Krioukov, C. Goebel, S. Alspaugh, Y. Chen, D. E. Culler, and R. H. Katz. Integrating renewable energy using data analytics systems: Challenges and opportunities. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin*, 34(1):3–11, 2011.
- [36] C. Kulkarni, S. Moore, M. Naqvi, T. Zhang, R. Ricci, and R. Stutsman. Splinter: Bare-metal extensions for multi-tenant low-latency storage. In A. C. Arpaci-Dusseau and G. Voelker, editors, *USENIX OSDI*, pages 627–643, 2018.
- [37] Y. Kwon, H. Fingler, T. Hunt, S. Peter, E. Witchel, and T. Anderson. Strata: A cross media file system. In *ACM SOSP*, Oct. 2017.
- [38] A. Lagar-Cavilla, J. Ahn, S. Souhlal, N. Agarwal, R. Burny, S. Butt, J. Chang, A. Chaugule, N. Deng, J. Shahid, G. Thelen, K. A. Yurtsever, Y. Zhao, and P. Ranganathan. Software-defined far memory in warehouse-scale computers. In *ASPLOS*, 2019.
- [39] T. N. Le, X. Sun, M. Chowdhury, and Z. Liu. AlloX: Compute allocation in hybrid clusters. In *ACM EuroSys*, pages 31:1–31:16, 2020.
- [40] Y. Lee, H. A. Maruf, M. Chowdhury, A. Cidon, and K. G. Shin. Mitigating the performance-efficiency tradeoff in resilient memory disaggregation. *CoRR*, abs/1910.09727, Oct 2020.
- [41] J. Li, S. Miller, D. Zhuo, A. Chen, J. Howell, and T. Anderson. An incremental path towards a safer os kernel. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Hot Topics in Operating Systems*, HotOS ’21, page 183–190, 2021.
- [42] Z. Liu, M. Lin, A. Wierman, S. H. Low, and L. L. Andrew. Greening geographical load balancing. *ACM SIGMETRICS Performance Evaluation Review*, 39(1):193–204, 2011.
- [43] T. Ma, M. Zhang, K. Chen, Z. Song, Y. Wu, and X. Qian. AsymNVM: An efficient framework for implementing persistent data structures on asymmetric nvm architecture. In *ACM ASPLOS*, pages 757–773, 2020.
- [44] M. Marty, M. de Kruijf, J. Adriaens, C. Alfeld, S. Bauer, C. Contavalli, M. Dalton, N. Dukkupati, W. C. Evans, S. Gribble, N. Kidd, R. Kononov, G. Kumar, C. Mauer, E. Musick, L. E. Olson, E. Rubow, M. Ryan, K. Springborn, P. Turner, V. Valancius, X. Wang, and A. Vahdat. Snap: a microkernel approach to host networking. In *ACM SOSP*, pages 399–413, 2019.
- [45] H. A. Maruf and M. Chowdhury. Effectively Prefetching Remote Memory with Leap. In *USENIX ATC*, 2020.
- [46] E. Masanet, A. Shehabi, N. Lei, S. Smith, and J. Koomey. Recalibrating global data center energy-use estimates. *Science*, 367(6481):984–986, 2020.
- [47] L. Mashayekhy, M. M. Nejad, D. Grosu, Q. Zhang, and W. Shi. Energy-aware scheduling of mapreduce jobs for big data applications. *IEEE transactions on Parallel and distributed systems*, 26(10):2720–2733, 2014.
- [48] S. Miller, K. Zhang, M. Chen, R. Jennings, A. Chen, D. Zhuo, and T. Anderson. High velocity kernel file systems with Bento. In *USENIX FAST*, pages 65–79, Feb. 2021.
- [49] A. Ousterhout, J. Fried, J. Behrens, A. Belay, and H. Balakrishnan. Shenango: Achieving high CPU efficiency for latency-sensitive datacenter workloads. In *USENIX NSDI*, pages 361–378, 2019.
- [50] P. Patel, K. Lim, A. Martinez, T. Anderson, J. Nelson, and I. Zhang. Fungible computing as a service. <https://treehouse-research.github.io/>.

- [51] F. Pearce. Energy hogs: can world’s huge data centers be made more efficient? *Yale Environment*, 360, 2018.
- [52] M. Pesce. Cloud Computing’s Coming Energy Crisis. *IEEE Spectrum*, 2021.
- [53] S. Peter, J. Li, I. Zhang, D. R. K. Ports, D. Woos, A. Krishnamurthy, T. Anderson, and T. Roscoe. Arakis: The operating system is the control plane. In *USENIX OSDI*, pages 1–16, 2014.
- [54] Z. Ruan, M. Schwarzkopf, M. K. Aguilera, and A. Belay. AIFM: High-performance, application-integrated far memory. In *USENIX OSDI*, pages 315–332, Nov. 2020.
- [55] M. Shahrad, R. Fonseca, Í. Goiri, G. Chaudhry, P. Batum, J. Cooke, E. Laureano, C. Tresness, M. Russinovich, and R. Bianchini. Serverless in the wild: Characterizing and optimizing the serverless workload at a large cloud provider. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.03423*, 2020.
- [56] Y. Shan, Y. Huang, Y. Chen, and Y. Zhang. LegoOS: A disseminated, distributed OS for hardware resource disaggregation. In *USENIX OSDI*, 2018.
- [57] A. K. Simpson, A. Szekeres, J. Nelson, and I. Zhang. Securing RDMA for high-performance datacenter storage systems. In *USENIX HotCloud*, July 2020.
- [58] The Linux Foundation Projects. Data plane development kit. <https://www.dpdk.org/>.
- [59] A. Vahdat. Coming of Age in the Fifth Epoch of Distributed Computing. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=27zuReojDVw>.
- [60] L. Wang, M. Li, Y. Zhang, T. Ristenpart, and M. M. Swift. Peeking behind the curtains of serverless platforms. In *USENIX ATC*, pages 133–146, 2018.
- [61] J. You, J. Wu, X. Jin, and M. Chowdhury. Ship compute or ship data? why not both? In *USENIX NSDI*, pages 633–651, 2021.
- [62] I. Zhang, J. Liu, A. Austin, J. Stephenson, and A. Badam. I’m not dead yet! the role of the operating system in a kernel-bypass era. In *ACM HotOS*, April 2019.
- [63] Y. Zhang, Y. Tan, B. Stephens, and M. Chowdhury. Justitia: Software multi-tenancy in hardware kernel-bypass networks. In *USENIX NSDI*, 2022.
- [64] Y. Zhong, H. Wang, Y. J. Wu, A. Cidon, R. Stutsman, A. Tai, and J. Yang. BPF for Storage: An Exokernel-Inspired Approach. In *ACM HotOS*, 2021.