

Erick Butler POLETTTO  
Ricardo Alexandre FIORELLI

*Data Center Energy Efficiency: Analysis  
and Test of Energy Consumption  
Benchmark Tools*

Milan – IT

Academic Year 2007-2009

Erick Butler POLETTI  
Ricardo Alexandre FIORELLI

*Efficienza Energetica dei Data Center:  
Analisi e Verifica dei Tool di Benchmark  
dei Consumi*

Tesi di Laurea

Orientator: Prof.ssa Chiara FRANCALANCI

LAUREA SPECIALISTICA IN INGEGNERIA INFORMATICA  
DIPARTIMENTO DI ELETTRONICA ED INFORMAZIONE (DEI)  
POLITECNICO DI MILANO

Milan – IT

Anno Accademico 2007-2009



# *Acknowledgements*

To professor Chiara Francalanci for her advice and guidance in this research as well as the extraordinary experiences throughout the work.

To professor Paolo Giacomazzo, for the great ideas and enthusiastic comments. Also, for the well given critics in the early stage of the research project.

To Francesco Merlo, for the great help in the final stages of the project and for the guidance for the production of this document.

To our friends Pedro Kayatt, Jobson Wadi, Rafael Sbampato, Rodrigo Roriz, Xenia Itikawa, Sarp Erdag, Lais Paixao, Guilherme Matiussi, Rafael Vilella, Lucas de Marchi, Emilio Rosseto, Rafaella Martins, Helio Omoto and Cristina Chang who provided their time in order to make possible the field benchmarking and power measurements.

**Erick** To my family, who have always provided support and guidance. To my parents Annie and Marcos, who have taught me to act with tranquility and balance. To my brothers Henry, William and my sister Mariana, for always cheering me up. And to my friends, whom I hold very dear and which have always been by my side.

**Ricardo** To my father, for always having something to support me. To my mother and sister Priscilla, for taking a long trip from Brazil just to participate in my discussion. To my other sister Lilian, who wishes she could have come. To my girlfriend, for being an amazing person always.

*“It’s the only home we know. Yet everyday, we take the earth for granted.  
Everytime we leave the lights on, we are doing the earth harm.  
When we forget to turn off our computers, energy is also wasted.  
But together we can help make the world a greener place, one simple act at a time.  
Because when it comes to the environment, small changes can make a world of  
difference.”, **The “Power To Change” manifest***

# *Glossary of Abbreviations*

|       |  |
|-------|--|
| ALU   | Arithmetic Logic Unit                      |
| CIO   | Chief Information Officer                  |
| CPU   | Central Processing Unit                    |
| DDR   | Double-Data Rate                           |
| FPU   | Floating Point Unit                        |
| HVAC  | heating, ventilating, and air conditioning |
| HDD   | Hard-disk Drive                            |
| ICT   | Information and Communcation Technology    |
| LTO   | Linear Tape-Open                           |
| MFD   | Multi Function Devices                     |
| MPN   | Manufacturer Part Number                   |
| OS    | Operational System                         |
| PC    | Personal Computer                          |
| PDU   | Power Distribution Unit                    |
| PSU   | Power Supply Unit                          |
| RAID  | Redundant Array of Inexpensive Disks       |
| ROI   | Return on Investment                       |
| ROM   | Read-Only Memory                           |
| SaaS  | Software as a Service                      |
| SDRAM | Synchronous Dynamic Random Access Memory   |
| SAN   | Storage-Area Networks                      |
| TCO   | Total Cost of Ownership                    |
| VM    | Virtual Machine                            |
| VPN   | Virtual Private Network                    |

# *Abstract*

Since the last few years cost of energy has become an important part of Data Centers total cost of ownership. This has lead organizations worldwide to recognize the importance of a green strategy as a means to save energy. This study was conducted in order to catalog computer components related data by means of benchmarking and web research. To that end a component database was designed and then the power-related data obtained from the used benchmarking tools was validated with the use of direct measurements. The data acquired for composing this database of components was obtained from different sources, which were both a benchmarking tool and the web. The benchmarking tool provided information about component performance and power consumption. After that, a web crawler was used to assign each component an unique key and to provide additional information about them. This work provided a database of components which can be used to support a green ICT methodology by allowing the identification of the most adequate and power-efficient components. It provides for the individuation of energy consumption critical spots in a data center and allows comparisons between several components, which may both be used in data center design.

# *Contents*

## **List of Figures**

## **List of Tables**

|          |  |       |
|----------|--|-------|
| <b>1</b> | <b>Introduction</b>                                | p. 14 |
| 1.1      | Motivation . . . . .                               | p. 14 |
| 1.2      | Definition of the problem . . . . .                | p. 16 |
| 1.2.1    | Thesis Statement . . . . .                         | p. 16 |
| 1.3      | Solution Strategy . . . . .                        | p. 17 |
| 1.4      | Structure . . . . .                                | p. 17 |
| <b>2</b> | <b>State of the Art</b>                            | p. 18 |
| 2.1      | Green ICT or Green Computing . . . . .             | p. 18 |
| 2.1.1    | Strategies for Applying a Green Solution . . . . . | p. 19 |
| 2.2      | Computer Energy Management Categories . . . . .    | p. 19 |
| 2.2.1    | Machine Configuration . . . . .                    | p. 20 |
| 2.2.2    | Policies / Tools / Labels . . . . .                | p. 23 |
| 2.2.3    | Thin Client Architectures . . . . .                | p. 24 |
| 2.2.4    | Servers and Virtualization . . . . .               | p. 27 |
| 2.2.5    | Data Storage . . . . .                             | p. 32 |
| 2.2.6    | Power Architectures . . . . .                      | p. 34 |
| 2.2.7    | Data Center Infrastructure . . . . .               | p. 36 |



|  |       |
|--|-------|
| <b>3 Methodology</b>   | p. 39 |
| 3.1 Overview . . . . .   | p. 39 |
| 3.2 Research Design . . . . .                                  | p. 40 |
| 3.3 Energy Management and Benchmarking Tools . . . . .         | p. 42 |
| 3.3.1 SiSoftware SANDRA . . . . .                              | p. 42 |
| 3.3.2 Energy Measurement Instrument . . . . .                  | p. 43 |
| 3.3.3 WebSPHINX - A Personal, Customized Web Crawler . . . . . | p. 44 |
| 3.3.4 CPU-Z . . . . .  | p. 44 |
| 3.4 Data Processing and Analysis . . . . .                     | p. 44 |
| 3.4.1 Measures . . . . .                                       | p. 44 |
| 3.4.2 Components Database . . . . .                            | p. 45 |
| 3.4.3 Manufacturer Specifications . . . . .                    | p. 46 |
| <b>4 Analysis and Results</b>                                  | p. 47 |
| 4.1 Analysis . . . . .   | p. 47 |
| 4.1.1 Component's Database . . . . .                           | p. 47 |
| 4.1.2 Overview . . . . .                                       | p. 50 |
| 4.2 Results . . . . .  | p. 51 |
| 4.2.1 Data preparation . . . . .                               | p. 51 |
| 4.2.2 Analysis of results . . . . .                            | p. 53 |
| <b>5 Conclusions</b>   | p. 57 |
| 5.1 Perspectives and Future Developments . . . . .             | p. 59 |
| <b>References</b>  | p. 60 |
| <b>Appendix A – List of SiSoftware Sandra Modules</b>          | p. 62 |
| <b>Appendix B – Comparison Tape Drives</b>                     | p. 65 |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Appendix C – List of Other Energy Management Tools</b> | p. 67     |
| C.1 Power To Change . . . . .                             | p. 67     |
| C.2 PlateSpin - Recon . . . . .                           | p. 67     |
| C.3 APC Virtualization Energy Cost Calculation . . . . .  | p. 67     |
| <br><b>Appendix D – Database of Components</b>            | <br>p. 69 |
| D.1 SANDRA Benchmark Table Schema . . . . .               | p. 69     |
| CPU Benchmarks . . . . .                                  | p. 69     |
| .NET Benchmarks . . . . .                                 | p. 69     |
| Storage Benchmarks . . . . .                              | p. 75     |
| Java Benchmarks . . . . .                                 | p. 75     |
| Memory Benchmarks . . . . .                               | p. 75     |
| Network Connection Benchmarks . . . . .                   | p. 80     |
| D.2 Measurement Tables . . . . .                          | p. 81     |
| D.3 Database Schema . . . . .                             | p. 84     |

# *List of Figures*

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
| 1  | Power Consumption for Hard-drives . . . . .                           | p. 22 |
| 2  | Normalized Excel Subtotals Task Response Times . . . . .              | p. 25 |
| 3  | Normalized PDF Subtotals Task Response Times . . . . .                | p. 26 |
| 4  | Examples of Blade Servers . . . . .                                   | p. 28 |
| 5  | Examples of Rack Servers . . . . .                                    | p. 29 |
| 6  | Installed Base of Virtualized and Non-Virtualized Servers . . . . .   | p. 31 |
| 7  | Illustration of Virtualization Applied to a Physical Server . . . . . | p. 32 |
| 8  | Conventional AC architecture efficiency . . . . .                     | p. 35 |
| 9  | Rack-level DC architecture efficiency . . . . .                       | p. 35 |
| 10 | Facility-level DC architecture efficiency . . . . .                   | p. 36 |
| 11 | Power Consumption per Number of Servers in the Rack . . . . .         | p. 36 |
| 12 | Footprint Reduction for a 35 kW Heat Load . . . . .                   | p. 37 |
| 13 | Economic Cross-over of Annualized Charges Air-cooled to Water-cooled  | p. 37 |
| 14 | The Experimental Design Process . . . . .                             | p. 41 |
| 15 | Energy Measurement Instrument . . . . .                               | p. 43 |
| 16 | Database Schema . . . . .   | p. 85 |

# *List of Tables*

|    |   |       |
|----|---|-------|
| 1  | Power Consumption: RAM . . . . .  | p. 21 |
| 2  | Energy used by Monitors . . . . .                                       | p. 22 |
| 3  | Energy used by a standard computer . . . . .                            | p. 23 |
| 4  | Energy Recommendation to an Energy-Efficient Printer . . . . .          | p. 24 |
| 5  | Performance Results for Excel Subtotals Calculation . . . . .           | p. 25 |
| 6  | Performance Results for PDF Compression Subtotals Calculation . . .     | p. 26 |
| 7  | PC and thin client power consumption . . . . .                          | p. 27 |
| 8  | Power consumption for several servers, excluding cooling and redundancy | p. 29 |
| 9  | Performance and Power Dissipation for Processors - Java Benchmark .     | p. 33 |
| 10 | Tape Drive Power Costs . . . . .  | p. 34 |
| 11 | Disk Array Power Costs . . . . .  | p. 34 |
| 12 | Life Cycle Costs of Water-cooled and Air-cooled Solutions . . . . .     | p. 38 |
| 13 | SANDRA Table Analysis (example with five computers) . . . . .           | p. 45 |
| 14 | Energy Measurement Device Table Analysis (example with five computers)  | p. 45 |
| 15 | Example of Table Generated by WebSPHINX . . . . .                       | p. 46 |
| 16 | Measures with Processor in <i>idle</i> state . . . . .                  | p. 52 |
| 17 | Measures with Processor <i>Fully Stressed</i> . . . . .                 | p. 53 |
| 18 | Processor Specifications' Results . . . . .                             | p. 54 |
| 19 | Results for Processor in <i>Idle</i> State . . . . .                    | p. 55 |
| 20 | Results for Processor <i>Fully Stressed</i> . . . . .                   | p. 56 |
| 21 | Comparison (SDLT and DLT Tape Drives) - Capacities and Transfer Rates   | p. 65 |
| 22 | Access times for several tape drives . . . . .                          | p. 65 |

|    |  |       |
|----|--|-------|
| 23 | Comparison Between LTO Tape Drives Capacities and Transfer Rates . | p. 66 |
| 24 | Energy Consumption of CPU . . . . .                                | p. 69 |
| 25 | Characteristics of the CPU organized by the Model . . . . .        | p. 70 |
| 26 | CPU's characteristics organized by Stepping . . . . .              | p. 70 |
| 27 | Benchmarks with Dhrystone - ALU . . . . .                          | p. 70 |
| 28 | Benchmarks with Whetstone - FPU . . . . .                          | p. 71 |
| 29 | Multimedia Benchmarks Double Results . . . . .                     | p. 71 |
| 30 | Multimedia Benchmarks Float Results . . . . .                      | p. 71 |
| 31 | Multimedia Benchmarks Integer Results . . . . .                    | p. 71 |
| 32 | Benchmarks with Dhrystone and Whetstone . . . . .                  | p. 72 |
| 33 | Benchmark with Cryptography in CPUs . . . . .                      | p. 72 |
| 34 | Wrap up of the Benchmarks Performed with Multimedia . . . . .      | p. 73 |
| 35 | Benchmark of Energy Consumption for Processor . . . . .            | p. 73 |
| 36 | .NET Arithmetic Benchmark on several CPUs . . . . .                | p. 74 |
| 37 | .NET Multi-Media Benchmark on several CPUs . . . . .               | p. 74 |
| 38 | DVD Benchmark (read) . . . . .                                     | p. 75 |
| 39 | Mounted File Systems Benchmark . . . . .                           | p. 75 |
| 40 | Physical Disk Benchmark (read) . . . . .                           | p. 76 |
| 41 | Physical Disk Benchmark (write) . . . . .                          | p. 76 |
| 42 | Tape Drives Benchmark . . . . .                                    | p. 76 |
| 43 | Java VM Arithmetic Benchmark . . . . .                             | p. 77 |
| 44 | Java VM Multi-Media Benchmark . . . . .                            | p. 77 |
| 45 | Memory Bandwidth Benchmark (newer components) . . . . .            | p. 78 |
| 46 | Memory Bandwidth Benchmark - (legacy components) . . . . .         | p. 78 |
| 47 | Memory Latency Benchmark - linear disposition . . . . .            | p. 79 |
| 48 | Memory Latency Benchmark - random disposition . . . . .            | p. 79 |

|    |  |       |
|----|--|-------|
| 49 | LAN Devices Benchmark . . . . .                            | p. 80 |
| 50 | Internet Connection Benchmark . . . . .                    | p. 80 |
| 51 | Wireless Modems/Routers Performance . . . . .              | p. 80 |
| 52 | Measures made with the Energy Measurement Device . . . . . | p. 81 |
| 53 | Measures Resulted from Benchmark with SANDRA . . . . .     | p. 82 |
| 54 | Processor Contained in each Measured Computer . . . . .    | p. 82 |
| 55 | Manufacturer Specification . . . . .                       | p. 83 |

# 1 *Introduction*

## 1.1 Motivation

The planet is threatened by global warming. The progressive pressure we impose to the environment has already exceeded the limits imposed by the available natural resources. In actual figures, it can be stated that 125% of the renewal capacity of natural resources is currently consumed. If the growth continues at this rate, in 2050 we will be consuming more than twice the production capacity of the planet Earth (TOWNSEND, 2002).

The seek for environmental friendly solutions is spreading throughout all the economic sectors and consumers have become more aware of environmental issues and thus opt for products and services of companies which have proven to be more ecologically friendly. Moreover, it is possible to say that we will soon enter in a green trend - if we are not already in it - where environmental policies will be executed without economical or political pressure, but rather as a necessary measure for the sustainability of the business. In a following phase companies will perceive green solutions as a competitive differential instead of a necessary preoccupation thereby giving the green issue a push towards being a definitive part of the business.

In the last years, the concept of Green ICT has been increasingly popular by the mantra of *Going Green*. A study from Info-Tech Research Group (INFO-TECH, July 2007), made in U.S.A., believes that the increasing interest in adopting a green solution is beginning to generate meaningful actions. However, there exists a big gap between what companies think it is a green ICT solution and what they are really doing about it. This same study states that “Info-Tech expects continued interest in green IT strategies and significant traction among those initiatives that both reduce waste and reduce cost. As enterprises begin to translate concern for green into practice, we expect higher spending in many leading areas such as data center design, virtualization and consolidation, print optimization, and system management tools”.

The current situation is that there exists a high interest in the issue, yet scarce adoption. Nonetheless, companies have reached the consensus that it is necessary to start changing their minds towards green thoughts. So, leading industries and governments have started a proactive *Going Green* promotion to expand the existent market. Measures taken in favor of this green market include the allocation of a significant amount of money in researches in the area. Besides that, it is important to notice that as soon as information related of careful management of energy consumption starts to spread, it will start to attract the companies attention. The first step will be to start to study the impact of environmental harm and power consumption in the TCO accountancies.

The most important benefit of a Green ICT strategy is the reduction of costs related to the energy consumption. Some studies says that the costs with power and cooling in data centers can reach up to 20% of the IT cost. In the economic sector, the potential savings for companies could be huge and simple actions can have big impacts in the organization. As David Frampton, VP general manager of Cisco's LAN switching business unit, explained to Reuters (CHESTNEY, 2009), "a bank branch could save nearly €40,000 (US\$53,020) just by turning off phones and wireless access points outside business hours". Following the same pattern, last year, Symantec launched a study named "State of the Data Center Report 2008", in which the social responsibility was the least important reason for applying a Green initiative. It states instead that *reduction of costs* and *reduction of power consumption* are the most important reasons to invest in such idea.

Another benefit is that Green ICT can be used as a *marketing strategy* and with the growing popularity of the issue, vendors have started to put green labels on their products and consumers also started to seek for green products instead of the traditional ones. And if the scenario continues like that, the companies which do not adopt the *Going Green* concept will lose an important competitive edge.

The most difficult phase when applying a new solution is going against the inertia of the company. In this case, the state of being at rest is not applying a green solution and what is required is the force and influence for pushing forward the green idea. After the first step has been taken the others should come with time. A critical issue for taking this first step towards the green initiative is the allocation of budget. Before the economical crisis IT resources could be larger, but now it has become more difficult to manage the budget towards new initiatives. Therefore, the Green ICT budget should reflect what the company is expecting from the solution. Even with the economical crisis, there has been an increase in the expenses with technology production related to power efficient products,



which usually is allied with productivity increase and reduction of waste generation.

This work relates to one specific aspect of the *Going Green* concept, which is the *Green Data Center*. The related measures focuses in re-engineering the Data Center with the use of a wide number of techniques that will be described in the following chapter.

## 1.2 Definition of the problem

The present study was conducted in order to empirically and quantitatively catalog computer components related data by means of benchmarking, web research and to validate these with the use of direct measurements. This information can then be used to better compose the data center with respect to energy efficiency. The goal is to support companies in order to apply a green solution by assisting the choice of the right combination of components and, besides that, point the ones which consumes less energy and have higher efficiency (best performance/power ratio).

Moreover, this study may provide a means to identify critical bottlenecks in power consumption and to address the problem by making a more efficient use of the identified components. To that end, the aim of this research is to design a computer component database with information about their characteristics and benchmark tests. The information that regards power consumption will then be validated with the use of direct measurements in order to determine the accuracy of the component power estimated by the benchmarking tools.

### 1.2.1 Thesis Statement

The study aims to address the following questions:

1. Which computer components are more efficient, i.e. consume the less energy while providing a good performance?
2. How to choose among a set of machine configurations the best one, concerning power efficiency?
3. How to catalog, analyze and understand the reasons behind power efficiency in a component?

These will be addressed with the use of an adequate component database, which will be the scope of this work.

## 1.3 Solution Strategy

The first step to be taken in the direction of the solution to the problem is data collection. In this phase, it was acquired from many sources, that will be described in Chapter 3, data related to the energy consumed by the components. After this, the information collected was separated by categories and linked together with a MPN code, which is unique for each component. All the information acquired from the measures was inserted into a consolidated database of components. The next step is the analysis of the collected data. This *database of components* has as objective finding a *qualitative solution* to the issue of choosing the best machine configuration concerning their energy efficiency.

## 1.4 Structure

This document is structured as follows:

- Chapter 1 is the introduction;
- Chapter 2 is the state of the art, giving relevant information about available technologies and techniques applied in Green ICT;
- Chapter 3 is the Methodology, where the problem is engineered, the used method used is exposed and a means to evaluate it is provided;
- Chapter 4 exposes the results achieved. It describes how the database was created and explains the results of the analysis carried out to evaluate it;
- Chapter 5 is the conclusion. It presents the conclusion of the work and suggests how it could be further developed.

## 2 *State of the Art*

### 2.1 Green ICT or Green Computing

Green ICT, which is a new term originated from *Green Computing*, is the exploitation of a combination of techniques and approaches in ICT towards the end of achieving a more energy efficient use of computer related resources. In other words, it is the research and development of techniques and software that monitor the energy spent by servers, computers, printers and all information and communication equipment to the end of making a responsible use of these resources in terms of energy consumption. In order to achieve this objective, it is imperative to analyse the information about the ICT components among workstations, servers, networks, cooling and many others. The analysis of the information provided by these measures is made through a set of tools, which will be explained in the chapter 3.

The steps that have to be taken in order to apply a green strategy are first to analyse where in the data center the more energy is being wasted (*Assessment*), and then to act with correction and prevention interventions (*Action Plan*). For instance: when buying a new piece of equipment, it should be determined how much energy each of the available options spend and opt for those which consume less energy. Moreover, energy-efficient architectures such as thin clients, virtualization and power management policies should be considered in higher decisional levels. The direct benefits from green ICT strategies range from the direct reduction of electricity bills and costs related to cooling to the reduction of the space required by a datacenter.

The ICT energy consumption has become a critical issue for IT organizations nowadays, where it can provide substantial cost reductions in datacenters and compliance with environmental policies. In the United States alone, data centers consumed \$4.5 billion worth of electricity in 2006. Industry analyst Gartner (KUMAR, February 2007) estimates that over the next 5 years, most enterprises will spend as much energy as they spend on hardware infrastructure, power and air conditioning. Furthermore, It is also important

to consider that there are some indirect objectives concerning green computing, such as reduction of carbon footprint and disposal of hazard elements to the environment.

### 2.1.1 Strategies for Applying a Green Solution

According to NTT Communications(NTTCOMMUNICATIONS, 2009), there are two main approaches for applying a green solution.

**Green of ICT** concentrates on the operation of the ICT equipment and information system. The objective of the method is to reduce the environmental impact through power saving and recycling.

**Data Center** Centralizing the information in a Data Center, with consolidated data, thereby reducing power consumption while improving the efficiency regarding cost, operation and maintenance.

**Hosting** It is an enterprise related solution including virtualization, which can be used to optimally allocate resources.

**Green by ICT** concentrates on the energy efficiency reached by the use of ICT operations. The objective is to reduce logistics costs and personnel transport through ICT.

**Communitation** reduces the energy consumed with transportation, by utilizing VOIP solutions with video-conference

**Remote Data Access** reduction of travel and material consumption by having, for example, mobile terminals or VPNs, where the employees can have access to work information wherever. In addition, the service should provide secure and reliable remote access enabling the use of multiple devices.

In the next sections there is the explanation of all the approaches and categories for applying a green solution.

## 2.2 Computer Energy Management Categories

In terms of hardware and equipment, the main measures to be taken towards a Green ICT environment can be grouped in the following categories:

- Workstation Configuration;
- Policies / Tools / Labels;
- Thin client architectures;
- Servers and Virtualization;
- Data Storage;
- Power Architectures;
- Data Center Infrastructure.

For each of those categories there are several types of information that are relevant to the evaluation of the current situation of power consumption. For each category there will be a corresponding description along with a number of possible interventions, either purely conceptual or available in the market. In some cases a numerical analysis will also be provided. This information will allow the creation of a methodology to identify critical consumption issues where an investment in green ICT would bring the greater savings.

### 2.2.1 Machine Configuration

This category represents the components used in a certain machine configuration. The component's performance and power consumption can be obtained from several sources, such as the manufacturer specifications, benchmarks and also direct measurements in the case of power consumption. The following are the dimensions that influence the final power consumption of a machine.

**Single-core / Multi-core Processors** Processors in general affect the overall power consumption of the computer by means of the workload that is required by it. For example, if the computer is in idle (without any processes running) the energy consumed is less than if the computer stays in full workload, but the idle state does not mean anything to the efficiency, because it is needed a high workload (about 70%) to have the best workload/power consumption ratio.

**RAM Memory** There are several types and dimensions of memories that should be analyzed, for instance the difference in operation in 2.5V in DDR SDRAM, when compared 3.3V in SDRAM, significantly reduce the power consumption. When comparing

DDR and DDR2, The Table 1 compares the difference in power consumption of DDR and DDR2 under various circumstances and it shows that the power consumed by RAM, even on maximum workload (+4.5W), does not have much effect on the overall computer consumption ( 220W).

| RAM Type     | Size   | Load      | +12V1     | +5V       | +3.3V     | Rise from Baseline |
|--------------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------------------|
| PC3200 DDR   | 512 MB | Idle      | 0.5A      | 0.6A      | 3.0A      | n/a                |
|              |        | Memtest86 | No Change | No Change | +0.7A     | +2.3W              |
|              | 1 GB   | Idle      | No Change | No Change | +0.6A     | +2.0W              |
|              |        | Memtest86 | No Change | No Change | +1.0A     | +3.3W              |
| 533 MHz DDR2 | 512 MB | Idle      | 0.5A      | 3.6A      | 0.5A      | n/a                |
|              |        | Memtest86 | No Change | +0.4A     | No Change | +2.0W              |
|              | 1 GB   | Idle      | No Change | No Change | No Change | No Change          |
|              |        | Memtest86 | No Change | +0.9A     | No Change | +4.5W              |

**Table 1:** Power Consumption: RAM

**Hard Drives and Mass Memory** Power consumption in this case is affected mainly by design of the hard drive's spindle motor and the number and size of the spindle platters and, also, other components such as the actuator and controller board. Also, solid-state and flash drives reduce significantly the power consumed by the component, Figure 1 shows this difference.

**Chassis** Concerning power supply, fans or other PC components not belonging to the main parts, it is necessary to require quality other than price. Heating and cooling are really where the power consumption goes. Most computers only make up a fairly small percentage of your electrical bill. One should never underestimate the efficiency of the power supply, because most of the low quality products are only about 45-55% efficient, whereas it is possible to achieve more than 80%.

**Monitor Type** As shown by Table 2 (BLUEJAY, 2008), flat panel liquid crystal display (LCD) monitors power consumption equals to half the power of conventional CRT monitors. LCD monitors also dissipate less heat, which helps to reduce air conditioning costs. Another interesting point is that either LCD or CRT monitors consume the same amount of energy with or without screensavers. As LCD monitors do not consume much energy when turned off, that would be the best solution for idle computers.




Figure 1: Power Consumption for Hard-drives

| Monitors                      |               |
|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Typical 17" CRT               | 80 watts      |
| Typical 17" LCD               | 35 watts      |
| Apple MS 17" CRT <sup>a</sup> | 63 watts      |
| Apple MS 17" CRT <sup>b</sup> | 54 watts      |
| Screen saver <sup>c</sup>     | same as above |
| Sleeping monitor <sup>d</sup> | 0-15 watts    |
| Monitor turned off at switch  | 0-10 watts    |

<sup>a</sup> mostly white (blank IE window)<sup>b</sup> mostly black (black Windows desktop with just a few icons)<sup>c</sup> any image on screen<sup>d</sup> dark screen

Table 2: Energy used by Monitors

### 2.2.2 Policies / Tools / Labels

The amount of saved energy depends also on policies that regard technology acquisition and IT management, which may be enforced by a variety of specialized tools. Examples of policies that regard equipment acquisition are: the acquisition of new computers or components labeled as green by the manufacturer, purchase of computers with multi-core processors and even to discourage the purchase of specific kinds of hardware such as dual or large monitors and graphic cards. Another kind of policy relates to the management of the machines. One example of the latter is to turn off workstations or servers if they are going to be unused for a long time. This kind of measure is particularly efficient as a computer in idle mode uses 20 to 50 times the power of a computer in standby mode (KAESTNER, 2009).

| Computers                    |              |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Desktop Computer             | 60-250 watts |
| On screen Saver <sup>a</sup> | 60-250 watts |
| Sleep / Standby              | 1-6 watts    |
| Laptop                       | 15-45 watts  |

<sup>a</sup> no difference

**Table 3:** Energy used by a standard computer

The tools that automate these methods have as their main feature the possibility to let computers in a network in standby mode or even to turn them off after a long period of no utilization. In addition, the shared usage of networked pieces of hardware can be an effective way to achieve energy savings. Networked systems allow several nearby users to share a single printer, which generally generates savings in both equipment cost and energy if compared with each computer having a dedicated printer. Above that, choosing multifunction devices (MFD) that encapsulates in one machine the functionality of many others. In addition to saving space and materials, these multifunctionals save energy if compared to several different machines working in parallel. The Table 4 (THE..., 2007) describes the power consumption in standby mode that an energy-efficient networked printer should have in relation to the printer type and to the number of pages it prints per minute.

One last kind of policy is to favor the acquisition of eco-labeled products. An eco-label is given to products that comply with some energy efficiency specifications. The most famous of these labels is the ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup>, which is an energy efficiency program sponsored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. For example, An ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup> qualified computer is possible to use up to 70% less electricity than computers



| Efficiency Recommendation |                                       |                          |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Printer Speed             | Recommended “Sleep” Mode <sup>a</sup> |                          |
|                           | Laser B/W + All Ink jet <sup>b</sup>  | Laser Color <sup>c</sup> |
| ≥10 pages/min             | 10 watts or less                      | 35 watts or less         |
| 11-20 pages/min           | 20 watts or less                      | 45 watts or less         |
| 21-30 pages/min           | 30 watts or less                      | 70 watts or less         |
| 31-44 pages/min           | 40 watts or less                      | 70 watts or less         |
| >44 pages/min             | 75 watts or less                      | 70 watts or less         |

<sup>a</sup> “Sleep” mode is a low-power standby condition, it restores automatically with a print request.

<sup>b</sup> Includes both black-ink and color ink jets, and printer/fax combinations.

<sup>c</sup> Also includes LED and thermal transfer color printers.

**Table 4:** Energy Recommendation to an Energy-Efficient Printer

without enabled power management features.

### 2.2.3 Thin Client Architectures

According to *Wikipedia*, in 2009, “a thin client is a client computer or client software in client-server architecture networks which depends primarily on the central server for processing activities, and mainly focuses on conveying input and output between the user and the remote server”. This is very well connected to both ideas of cloud computing and Green ICT and it is possible to subdivide in three categories for comparison against standard the PC architecture: Performance, Power Consumption and Hardware Savings and they are going to be exploited in the following subsections.


#### PC vs. Thin Client: Performance

In order to analyze and give a comparison base of the performance between standard PCs and two types of thin clients, a set of tests were executed. The variable that was the number of active clients on a network, each running the same typical office applications tasks. The following client platforms were considered in this study:

- PC: OptiPlex 210L PCs, basic managed PC desktops running Windows XP Professional;
- Sun thin client: Sun Ray 2 running Sun Ray proprietary software;
- Wyse thin client: Wyse Winterm 5150SE, Linux-based thin clients running Wyse Linux V6.

Each network used a standard file server, an HP ProLiant DL360 3.4MHz with and Intel Xeon processor and Microsoft Server 2003 Enterprise Edition. For test reasons, all the files that were manipulated by the PC were stored at the server. The tests are listed below:


- Calculating subtotal in Microsoft Office Excel 2003 (Figure 2 and Table 5);
- Compressing a PDF within Adobe Acrobat 7.0 Standard (Figure 3 and Table 6).



**Figure 2:** Normalized Excel Subtotals Task Response Times

| Performance Results |                       |                     |                                     | Comparative Rating |                       |                     |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| PC solution         | Thin-client solutions |                     | Number of concurrent active clients | PC solution        | Thin-client solutions |                     |
| Dell OptiPlex 210L  | Sun Ray 2             | Wyse Winterm 5150SE |                                     | Dell OptiPlex 210L | Sun Ray 2             | Wyse Winterm 5150SE |
| 12.9                | 13.2                  | 13.1                | 1                                   | 1.00               | 0.90                  | 0.98                |
| 12.8                | 30.2                  | 29.7                | 2                                   | 1.01               | 0.43                  | 0.43                |
| 12.7                | 45.5                  | 41.9                | 3                                   | 1.02               | 0.28                  | 0.31                |
| 12.9                | 58.3                  | 57.3                | 4                                   | 1.00               | 0.22                  | 0.23                |
| 12.8                | 68.1                  | 67.9                | 5                                   | 1.01               | 0.19                  | 0.19                |

**Table 5:** Performance Results for Excel Subtotals Calculation

**Figure 3:** Normalized PDF Subtotals Task Response Times

| Performance Results |                       |                     |                                     | Comparative Rating |                       |                     |
|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| PC solution         | Thin-client solutions |                     | Number of concurrent active clients | PC solution        | Thin-client solutions |                     |
| Dell OptiPlex 210L  | Sun Ray 2             | Wyse Winterm 5150SE |                                     | Dell OptiPlex 210L | Sun Ray 2             | Wyse Winterm 5150SE |
| 16.1                | 16.0                  | 15.6                | 1                                   | 1.00               | 1.01                  | 1.03                |
| 16.4                | 23.8                  | 24                  | 2                                   | 0.98               | 0.68                  | 0.67                |
| 16.5                | 33.0                  | 33.1                | 3                                   | 0.98               | 0.49                  | 0.49                |
| 16.6                | 43.7                  | 44.3                | 4                                   | 0.97               | 0.37                  | 0.36                |
| 16.7                | 54.0                  | 55.1                | 5                                   | 0.96               | 0.30                  | 0.29                |

**Table 6:** Performance Results for PDF Compression Subtotals Calculation

### PC vs. Thin Client: Power Consumption

Supposing 30 thin users share a 400W server, the total power consumption will be 1300W - a yearly cost of €640.00. 30 PCs would consume 10000W instead - a yearly cost of €4900.00 (assuming the MWh cost is €80.00). The Table 7 shows the power consumption of thin-client and PC.

### Hardware Savings

**Savings on client hardware** The economy brought by the substitution of PCs with thin clients was estimated around US\$ 208 per PC per year. The estimative considered the average prices of a PC, an adequate thin client and the PC upgrade costs every 3

|   | <b>Thin Client</b>      | <b>PC</b>               |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>Weight</b>                               | 2.2 - 7.7 lbs           | 22 - 33 lbs             |
| <b>Volume</b>                               | 1.5 - 3 dm <sup>3</sup> | 30 - 35 dm <sup>3</sup> |
| <b>Packing material</b>                     | 2.2 - 4.4 lbs           | 3 - 5 kg                |
| <b>Power consumption(including monitor)</b> | 20 - 50 watt            | 300 - 400 watt          |
| <b>Heat rejection</b>                       | 5 - 35 watt             | 85 - 115 watt           |
| <b>Noise level</b>                          | 0 dbA                   | 50 - 60 dbA             |

**Table 7:** PC and thin client power consumption

years. If energy consumption is considered, the savings will be even greater.

The following considerations were taken:

- Thin client cost: US\$250.00 x PC cost: US\$750.00;
- PC needs to be upgraded every 3 years and thin clients need to be replaced every 6 years.

Therefore, in a 6-year period US\$1500.00 will be spent on a PC against US\$250.00 that will be spent on a thin client.

**Extra server hardware costs**    Considering that:

- On average 30 users will need a dual processor server with 4 GB of RAM and SCSI hard disks;
- A brand new server should cost around US\$4,500.00 and will depreciate on average in 3 years.


For 60 users, the thin client solution should out-price the PC one by US\$11,300.00 per year, excluding the administration costs of both solutions.

## 2.2.4 Servers and Virtualization

### Rack vs. Blade

According to Goldworm(GOLDWORM, 2007), Blade servers are a package of “ultra-high density components including servers, storage, and communications interfaces in a pre-wired chassis with shared components such as power, cooling, and networking. In contrast to the conventional *horizontal* positioning within a rack (rack mounted servers),


blade servers are typically (though not always) installed *vertically* in a blade chassis, like books in a bookshelf”. This disposition of the blade servers along with their reduced dimension provide a high server density and thus of performance. For example, 60 blade servers such as the one depicted in Figure 4 can fit in the same physical space as 42 rack-mounted servers. A blade enclosure, which can hold from 8 to 24 (REHN, 2008) blade servers, provides common services such as power supply, cooling and networking thus eliminating redundancies in each individual blade server. A standard rack can accommodate more than 250 blade servers against approximately 42 standard servers. In



**Figure 4:** Examples of Blade Servers

the Table 8, a comparison is made between IBM HS21 blades and x3550 rack servers. The blades and rack servers have comparable performance.

- 2.0 GHz intel quad core;
- 8 GB DDR2 memory;
- Both in standard configuration, with no HDDs;
- Space saving and efficiency - packing more computer power in a significantly smaller area;
- Consolidation of servers to improve and centralize management as well as utilization;

**Figure 5:** Examples of Rack Servers

- Return on investment (ROI) and improved total cost of ownership (TCO) through increased hardware utilization and reduced operating expenses;
- More energy efficient, due to existence of centralized power supply, cooling and networking.

| IBM server model                 | Base Power Consumption | kWh consumed over 5 years | Total cost (\$0.03/kWh) over 5 years |
|----------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| BC-H Chassis, no blades          | 0.510 kWh              | 22,350                    | \$670.50                             |
| BC-H HS21 blade                  | 0.318 kWh              | 13,936                    | \$418.08                             |
| x3550 server                     | 0.373 kWh              | 16,346                    | \$490.39                             |
| x3650 server                     | 0.455 kWh              | 19,940                    | \$598.20                             |
| BC-H chassis with 14 HS21 blades | 4.962 kWh              | 217,455                   | \$6,523.65                           |
| 14 x3550 servers                 | 5.222 kWh              | 228,849                   | \$6,865.46                           |
| 14 x3650 servers                 | 6.370 kWh              | 279,259                   | \$8,374.80                           |

**Table 8:** Power consumption for several servers, excluding cooling and redundancy

According to the figures, the choice of using a blade server provides roughly 5% power saving over a similar rack-mount configuration. The main benefit brought by the use of blade servers, however, is the processing density, as a rack filled with blade servers may carry up to 50% more servers than one with rackable servers. Other benefits are that blade servers are easier to service and reduce the number of power cables needed from as much as 80% (HENDERSON, 2007).

In conclusion, blade servers do not provide much in terms of power saving but it greatly reduces the amount of space used in datacenters. However, the high power density might

prove to be a problem to server farms in terms of overheating. Solutions to this problem are described in the section of Data Center Infrastructure.

### Virtualization

The overall goal of virtualization is to create a logical abstraction of physical assets. It allows multiple *virtual* servers to run on one physical server, thereby consolidating many physical servers into one. *Wikipedia*, in 2009, defines virtualization as the following: “Virtualization is the process of presenting a logical grouping or subset of computing resources so that they can be accessed in ways that give benefits over the original configuration. This new virtual *view* of the resources is not restricted by the implementation, geographic location or the physical configuration of underlying resources.”. Virtualization can improve efficiency and availability of resources and applications in the organization and according to *Vmware*, the choice of virtualized servers over the standard nonvirtualized configuration makes possible to save 50-70% overall IT costs. Apart from the reduction of costs, virtualization may free up IT resources, provide better infrastructure optimization and utilization, increase availability and improve desktop management.

Besides that, virtualization has made positive improvements to the environment issue. Gartner (STAMFORD, October 2007) estimates that 1.2 million workloads run in virtual machines, which represents an annual aggregate power savings of about 8.5 billion kWh - more electricity than is consumed annually in all of New England for heating, ventilation and cooling. While this is a good start, there are plenty of opportunities for saving even more energy and money. Analyst firm IDC (IDC, February 2007) states that the un-utilized server capacity equates to approximately:


- in term of equipment and energy costs : US\$140 billion annually;
- in terms of hardware costs : 3 years supply of hardware;
- in terms of computing power : more than 20 million servers.

At the annual production rate of 4 tons of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) per server, these un-utilized servers produce a total of more than 80 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub> per year. This is more than is emitted from the country of Thailand and more than half of all countries in South America. From the organizational point of view these data suggests that virtualization is a good improvement to the data center, saving not only space provided to the servers but also saving energy by reducing the idle time of the servers and augmenting their workload.

It is also important to state that, by providing a virtualized solution, the number and variety of available applications can be increased.

There are two kinds of virtualization that may be used in a data center: storage and computing virtualization. Storage-area networks (SAN) may be implemented to present several different physical storage racks as a single virtual storage pool (ANTONPOULOS, September 2005). On the other hand, computing virtualization can be implemented in two ways. The first case is when a single physical server can offer multiple virtual servers, each with its own OS. Another option is to consolidate multiple physical servers into a cluster that acts as a single server. There are cross-platform server virtualization softwares available which allows data center managers to cluster and partition servers.

**Virtualized Versus Nonvirtualized Servers Installed Base Forecast, 2006–2011**




Source: IDC, 2007

**Figure 6:** Installed Base of Virtualized and Non-Virtualized Servers

According to the Figure 6 there is a trend indicating an increasing number of virtualized units over time along a forecast that by the end of 2009 the number of virtualized servers will be greater than non-virtualized ones. Logical units represent virtualized storage while physical units represent the use of non-virtualized storage. As shown in the Figure 7, virtualization tools such as VMware allow one physical server to act as a num-



ber of logical servers. VMware also provides a benchmark tool called VMmark<sup>1</sup> along with a set of test results in (MAKHILJA, September 2006) for a configuration that includes a mail server, a java server, a standby server, a web server, a database server and a file server.



**Figure 7:** Illustration of Virtualization Applied to a Physical Server

Coming along with the virtualization trend are high-throughput and eco-responsible processors such as the Sun's UltraSPARC T1 processor (HETHERINGTON, December 2005), which support up to 128 virtualized systems in a single server and gives one of the best performance per watt of the available processors. As shown in the Table 9<sup>2</sup>, with relation to the UltraSPARC CPU the only comparable performance was met by the POWER5+ processor, which in average dissipates 4.5 times as much as the earlier.

### 2.2.5 Data Storage

There are currently three main technologies to store data: hard disks, tape drives and flash-based storage. This session will cover the first two, as they are the predominant technologies in datacenters. At the end of the session a comparison will be made between hard and tape drives.

<sup>1</sup><http://www.vmware.com/products/vmmark/>

<sup>2</sup><http://www.anandtech.com/cpuchipsets/showdoc.aspx?i=2657&p=4>

| System             | CPU                        | Power<br>Dissipation<br>CPUs<br>(Estimated) | Number<br>of cores | Number<br>of<br>Active<br>Threads | Score<br>(bops) | Score<br>(%) |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Sun Fire<br>T2000  | 1x 1.2GHz<br>UltraSPARC T1 | 72-79 W                                     | 8                  | 32                                | 63.378          | 160%         |
| Sun Fire<br>X4200  | 2x 2.4GHz<br>DC Opteron    | 150-180 W                                   | 4                  | 4                                 | 45.124          | 114%         |
| IBM<br>p5 550      | 2x 1.9GHz<br>POWER5+       | 320-360 W                                   | 4                  | 8                                 | 61.789          | 156%         |
| IBM 346<br>xSeries | 2x 2.8GHz<br>DC Xeon       | 270-300 W                                   | 4                  | 8                                 | 39.585          | 100%         |

**Table 9:** Performance and Power Dissipation for Several Processors by the Specjbb2005 Java Benchmark

### Tape Drives

A tape drive is a data storage device that reads and writes data stored on a magnetic tape. Its main use is as archival storage of data stored in hard drives. It is typically used for archival storage of data stored on hard drives. Tape media generally has a favorable unit cost, long archival stability and low energy consumption per MB of data stored to compensate for their slow seek times. Despite the slow seek time, tape drives can stream data to tape as quickly as hard drives. For example, modern LTO drives can reach continuous data transfer rates of up to 80MB/s, which is as fast as most 10,000rpm hard disks, according to *Wikipedia, 2008*. Tape drives can range in capacity from a few megabytes to hundreds of gigabytes. Data can be compressed as to maximize the capacity usage. In this case the compression rate is of usually 2:1. A set of tables related to tape drives can be found in Appendix B

### Disk Arrays

Disk array refers to a linked group of one or more physical independent hard disks constituting a larger, high-performance system. They are usually implemented using RAID technology, which can provide component redundancy and high throughputs.

### Comparison between Tape Drives and Disk Arrays

Supposing a 995 TB database consisting of:

- Storage base (frequently used data);

- Backup cache (13 weeks);
- Backup archive (1 year backup).

A solution consisting exclusively of disk arrays would require four 32-drawer disk array systems of 245 TB each. In order to ensure reliability and recoverability, a RAID5 format with two RAID5 arrays assigned to each drawer has been assumed. The total equipment cost is estimated on US\$10.57M (REINE, October 2008) and according to the table 10 the disk array solution consumes 98KWh per TB per year. With a native capacity of 800GB

| Power   | Processor Chassis | Standby Power Supply | Per SATA Drawer | Number of SATA Drawers | Total Array Power | Power Per Day | Annual Power | Annual Cost<br>US\$0.12/kWh |
|---------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Typical | 430 W/h           | 34 W/h               | 325 W/h         | 32                     | 11 kW/h           | 264 kWh       | 96,360 kWh   | 11,563                      |
| Maximum | 800 W/h           | 300 W/h              | 425 W/h         | 32                     | 15 kW/h           | 360 kWh       | 131,400 kWh  | 15,768                      |

**Table 10:** Tape Drive Power Costs

and throughput of 120 MB/sec, an LTO 4 drive has a compressed capability to write at 240 MB/sec, or 864 GB/hour. Supposing the same database is to be entirely stored at this drive, the equipment cost would be of US\$233,878.00 with an annual energy cost of US\$599.00. The tape solution will consume 1150 kWh in 1 year or 1,16kWh per TB per year. In overall, for the 995 TB database the following conclusions can be drawn:

| N° of frames acquired | N° of drives acquired | Library acquisition cost | Frame acquisition cost | Cartridge cost | Drive acquisition cost | Space cost | Energy cost | Total cost |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------|-------------|------------|
| 1                     | 2                     | 76,000                   | 30,000                 | 82,278         | 45,600                 | 68,850     | 599         | 303,327    |

**Table 11:** Disk Array Power Costs


- Disk arrays consume 84 times as much as tape drives, per TB stored;
- The disk array solution costs 35 times as much as the tape drive solution.

Although the cost difference between of both solutions may be high, performance should be also considered in the comparison. In that case, an adequate proportion between disk array and tape storage must be drawn according to the frequency of backup access.

## 2.2.6 Power Architectures

### Conventional AC Architecture

In this configuration (Figure 8) the following transformations take place:




**Figure 8:** Conventional AC architecture efficiency

- PDU steps down the voltage from 480VAC to 208VAC;
- Power Supply Unit (PSU) converts 208VAC to 380VDC;
- Final component distribution at 12VDC.

The efficiency is measured for both conventional (baseline) and high efficiency (best-in-class) equipments. The difference in efficiency between the two equipment choices is of 20%.

### Rack-Level DC Architecture



**Figure 9:** Rack-level DC architecture efficiency

On Figure 9, it is possible to see that, after the PDU, an 208VAC to 48VDC/380VDC conversion is made in the rack. PSU and PDU are considered to be best-in-class, with high efficiency.

### Facility-level DC Architecture

In this configuration (Figure 10), the DC-AC conversion in the UPS and the AC-DC conversion in the power supply are removed. It can be noted that the 480VAC-380VDC conversion in the UPS is more efficient than the 480VAC-48VDC conversion.




Figure 10: Facility-level DC architecture efficiency

2.2.7 Data Center Infrastructure

Water Cooling

The reasonable limit of rack power and cooling capacity for a conventional forced-air (HVAC) cooled data center is 8 kW per rack. For power densities approaching 15 kW per rack, the layout of the computing rooms and cooling facilities must be determined using specialized software (such as HP Static Smart Cooling). For racks requiring more than 15 kW, the latest cooling techniques use water (Figure 11) (HP, April 2007).




Figure 11: Power Consumption per Number of Servers in the Rack

As shown in the figure 12, the use of water cooling reduces in 50% the equipment footprint, allowing greater server density. A 35 kW heat load dispersed among 4 racks could be concentrated in one single rack.

With relation to maintenance costs, The annual cost for water cooling and air cooling




Figure 12: Footprint Reduction for a 35 kW Heat Load




Figure 13: Economic Cross-over of Annualized Charges Air-cooled to Water-cooled for 2000 Hours of Operations (in US \$)

(including charges, maintenance, equipment) do not differ by a large amount as seen in Table 12 and Figure 13. In this way, the main benefit brought by water cooling is the

| LIFE CYCLE COSTING - TOTAL ANNUAL CHARGES METHOD - TI AE 140  |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
|---|------------------|--|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Generic Comparison 600 kW @ 3000 hrs  |                  | Option A - Water Cooled With Cooling Tower |                      |                   |                      | Option B - Packaged Air Cooled Plant |                      |                   |                      |
| ITEM  | Design Years = n | Full Life Cost                             | Annual Charge Factor | Present Value (1) | Equiv. Annual Charge | Full Life Cost                       | Annual Charge Factor | Present Value (1) | Equiv. Annual Charge |
| <b>CAPITAL COSTS</b>  |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
| A - Provision of New Water Cooled Chiller   | 15               | \$189,750                                  | 0.15                 |                   | \$29,362             |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
| B - Cost of Air Cooled Packaged Plant.  | 15               |  | 0.15                 |                   |                      | \$159,500                            | 0.15                 |                   | \$24,681             |
| Dosing Set c/w dual biocide and inhibitor pumps   | 15               | \$2,750                                    | 0.15                 |                   | \$426                |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
| Water Meter Monitoring  | 15               | \$250                                      | 0.15                 |                   | \$39                 |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
| Chemical Spill control  | 15               | \$50                                       | 0.15                 |                   | \$8                  |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
| Cleaning Access to cooling Tower to facility RMP and OH&S requirements  | 15               | \$10,000                                   | 0.15                 |                   | \$1,547              |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
|   |                  |  | 0.15                 |                   |                      |                                      | 0.15                 |                   |                      |
| SUB TOTAL   |                  |  |                      |                   | \$31,382             |                                      |                      |                   | \$24,681             |
| <b>RUNNING COSTS</b>  |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
|   |                  | Cost/a                                     |                      |                   |                      | Cost/a                               |                      |                   |                      |
| Water Supply Cost for Options A   | 15               | \$2,479                                    | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$2,792              |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| Water Sewerage Discharge Cost for Options A.  | 15               | \$150                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$169                |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| Annual maintenance Chemical Dosing and Cleaning for Option A  | 15               | \$2,022                                    | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$2,277              |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| Annual Registration Charge and RMP Review for Option A  | 15               | \$500                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$563                |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| A - Estimated Power Cost - for Options A.   | 15               | \$36,264                                   | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$40,837             |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| B - Power Cost - Air Cooled Chiller.  | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      | \$45,664                             | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$51,423             |
|   | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| SUB TOTAL   |                  |  |                      |                   | \$46,638             |                                      |                      |                   | \$51,423             |
| <b>MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT COSTS</b>  |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
|   |                  | Cost.                                      |                      |                   |                      | Cost.                                |                      |                   |                      |
| Option A Compressor and Chiller Component Replacement.  | 7.5              |  | 0.22                 |                   |                      |                                      | 0.22                 |                   |                      |
| Option B Fan Motor Replacement  | 7.5              |  | 0.22                 |                   |                      | \$5,000                              | 0.22                 |                   | \$1,083              |
|   |                  | Cost/a                                     |                      |                   |                      | Cost/a                               |                      |                   |                      |
| A - General Maintenance Costs for Option A.   | 15               | \$1,500                                    | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$1,689              |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| B - General Maintenance Costs for Option B.   | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      | \$500                                | 0.15                 | 7.28              | \$563                |
|   | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
|   | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |                                      | 0.15                 | 7.28              |                      |
| SUB TOTAL   |                  |  |                      |                   | \$1,689              |                                      |                      |                   | \$1,646              |
| <b>SALVAGE VALUE</b>  |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
| A - Scrap Value of Cooling Tower System   | 15               | -\$500                                     | 0.15                 | 0.16              | -\$12                |                                      | 0.15                 | 0.16              |                      |
| B - Scrap Value of Air Cooled Packaged Plant  | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 0.16              |                      | -\$500                               | 0.15                 | 0.16              | -\$12                |
|   | 15               |  | 0.15                 | 0.16              |                      |                                      | 0.15                 | 0.16              |                      |
| SUB TOTAL   |                  |  |                      |                   | -\$12                |                                      |                      |                   | -\$12                |
| TOTAL ANNUAL CHARGES  |                  |  |                      |                   | \$79,696             |                                      |                      |                   | \$77,738             |
| ASSUMPTIONS<br>Escalation = e 2.0%<br>Discount Rate = r 13.0%   |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |
| NOTES<br>(1) Present Value (Escalating Annuity) for Running Costs and Maintenance.<br>Present Value (Single Sum) for Salvage Value and Replacement Costs. |                  |  |                      |                   |                      |                                      |                      |                   |                      |

Table 12: Life Cycle Costs of Water-cooled and Air-cooled Solutions

footprint reduction which can increase the server density in a data center.

## 3 *Methodology*

This chapter will describe the steps taken to the end of constructing the components database and of validating the data contained in it.

These can be shortly described as follows:

**Phase 0: Project definition** - As this work is part of a project aimed to create a methodology to implement a Green ICT strategy, this first phase consisted of the definition of the logical components of this project and of how the current work would collaborate to it;

**Phase 1: Analysis of Benchmarking Softwares** - A number of existing softwares were analysed and those that have proven to be more adequate were selected. A list of the analysed softwares can be found in Appendix C;

**Phase 2: Catalog** - The tools were used to obtain information about computer components that were later used to create a component database;

**Phase 3: Database design and construction** - The database schema was designed and data began to be inserted into the relations;

**Phase 4: Analysis** - The validity of the stored data was tested with the help of direct measurements.

### 3.1 Overview

The main and broader objective of the research that is being conducted is to develop a methodology to implement a green ICT strategy. Namely, the methodology would provide a set of tools to guide the hardware acquisition process in an organization either in terms of workstations or of datacenter equipment. The present work will contribute to this research by providing a component database with information related to hardware




components, which will be used as one of the inputs of the methodology. This work was conducted in order to determine how much energy a computer's components, for instance, CPU, Memory and Hard Drives spend and also how much they would affect the cost of acquisition of new computers as a whole. This is calculable with information such as component performance, power consumption and price. The analysis was carried out with the help of specialized softwares that will be described in the following sections and also with analytical measures made with an energy measurement device. In the end the benchmarking measures obtained from these softwares were compared with both the measures obtained from the device and with information provided by the component datasheets. With the benchmarking software, more than 1000 components were categorized in a database, whose schema can be found in Figure 16. Firstly, the SiSoft Sandra's database 3.3.1 was used to collect the components and separate them by categories, along with their benchmark related data. Secondly, WebSPHINX, a web crawler described in 3.3.3, was used to create a collection of components and their respective MPNs. In the end, an energy measurement device 3.3.2 was used for the comparison and validation of the results given by the other benchmarks and acquisition of new data. Finally, these data were all linked in a database for later comparison.

## 3.2 Research Design

The experimental method of research was used in this study. Figure 14 draws the steps of the method. To define the experimental type of research, Bryman (BRYMAN, 1989) states that "the experimental design (...) allows the causal hypothesis that underpins the question to be examined", which means that this method is a systematic and scientific approach to research in which the researcher manipulates one or more variables, controlling and measuring any changes in other variables. The emphasis given is on the results and analysis of the benchmarks provided and their measures. It allows to verify the thesis on which this work is based by making use of empirical methods which in the case relates to the benchmarks used.

The present study is meant to identify the power consumption of the computer components and to evaluate the accuracy of the obtained data through direct measurements. The quantitative method (direct measurements and benchmarking), other than the qualitative method, was employed in order to identify the more energy efficient components that may be used in green datacenters. Among all components, the ones included in the measurements are: Chipsets, Memory, Data Storage, Processor and the chassis (fan,



**Figure 14:** The Experimental Design Process

power supply, etc). The choice of analysing each component separately and also the whole computer power consumption was made in order to evaluate the behaviour of a machine configuration where a number of components have to interact and confront it to the expected behaviour of each component.

In order to obtain relevant data, three analysis' methods were used: empirical, benchmarking and research. For the empirical method, it was used an energy measurement device (section 3.3.2) that connected the electrical plug to the computer, and the measure was written in a spreadsheet 14. While doing this, the benchmarking tool (section 3.3.1) was performed in the host computer in order to acquire measures in a set of different situations. The last method, the research, carried with the use of a web crawler called WebSPHINX, provided information about the price and the MPN of each component in the database. As each component has a unique MPN this made possible to uniquely identify each one of them, enabling thus the use of a normalized database over the identified components.

In a later stage, all the data acquired by the measurement approaches was separated by categories and components. The database generated is described and furtherly explained in the section 3.4.

### 3.3 Energy Management and Benchmarking Tools

In order to obtain relevant information about the data required for making the comparison between the components, some energy management and benchmarking tools were used.

The softwares that used were selected over the other available ones for their superior evaluation on the following criteria:

**Size of Database** The database of components used by the software, in order to get a good result, should be considerably large;

**Characteristics of Benchmarks** The benchmarks provided by the software should provide information about the energy consumed for each component;

**Number of Benchmarks** The software should have a good variety of benchmarks;

**Quality of Benchmarks** Although the number of benchmarks should be sufficient in number, the quality, precision and relevancy were also important in the decision method;

**Ease of Use** In the sense that the software should provide an ambient of work that is both intuitive and user-friendly;

The acquisition of data was made analysing the results of these benchmarks, making use of their database and system measurement capabilities.

#### 3.3.1 SiSoftware SANDRA

SiSoftware Sandra<sup>1</sup> is an information and diagnostic utility. It provides most of the information one need to know about their hardware, software and other devices whether hardware or software. SANDRA was the main software utilized to benchmark the data in this thesis work. It contains a vast database of components associated with both benchmark results and manufacturer specifications.

This software gives the possibility of benchmarking computer devices at several levels of operation. For example, it can benchmark a processor and show its performance over several operational levels, from power saving to full workload. Moreover, it may monitor

---

<sup>1</sup>The **S**ystem **A**Nalyser, **D**iagnostic and **R**eporting **A**ssistant

the performance in several levels, from the overall performance of a system to the performance of its components, including CPU, memory, hard disks, CD/DVD ROM, network adapters, etc. For that reason, it is considered one of the most complete benchmarking tools available. Besides the benchmarking, Sandra also provides hardware specifications for components such as the Motherboard, processor, disks, printers, etc. One last resource is the benchmarking of software performance, which is available for key softwares (web browsers, e-mail program, etc.), OS information, processes, memory usage and more.

The detailed list of modules utilized by SiSoftware Sandra can be found in Appendix A.

Furthermore, SiSoftware Sandra provides a catalogue of pricing, which, in addition to the power consumption and other important characteristics, enables the user to choose the best combination (which means the maximum performance/power ratio) of devices can be chosen to the server.

### 3.3.2 Energy Measurement Instrument



**Figure 15:** Energy Measurement Instrument

The device, which can be seen on Figure 15, was used for comparing and validating the results of the benchmarks given by Sandra. After the result of the benchmark was obtained from the SiSoftware Sandra, this equipment that was connected to the computer read how much energy it was consuming. The data from both sources were inserted in the database.

### 3.3.3 WebSPHINX - A Personal, Customized Web Crawler

WebSPHINX<sup>2</sup> is a Java class library used for web crawling. It provides a way to browse and process web pages automatically.

This piece of software was used to determine the component's MPN code and also to create the pricing list, used in the database described in 4.1.

The target website used to obtain the information provided a specific search engine for each kind of component. The searches for each one of those used a base URL concatenated with a page number and the result pages were standardised and presented a list of components of a specific category (i.e. hard drives or processors) along their MPN number and suggested price. This made possible the automation of the search and the subsequent filtering of the desired information.

The individual components along with their MPN codes were inserted in the Device relation in the database while the pricing data were used in the Price relation.

### 3.3.4 CPU-Z

CPU-Z detects information about the CPU, RAM Memory, motherboard, chip-set and more. That program was used to complete the database with missing information about the components.

This software extracts system information such as name, number of cores, cache size and clock frequency for processors; mainboard model and chipset and size, bandwidth and type for main memory. This information is particularly useful when SiSoftware Sandra cannot identify a component or individuate its power consumption. The data obtained with the use of CPU-Z is confronted with the power consumption of similar components to obtain an estimate of the desired value.

## 3.4 Data Processing and Analysis

### 3.4.1 Measures

For each computer in which this method of data acquisition was performed the results were inserted in the tables 13 and 14. The Table 13 was obtained by running SANDRA

---

<sup>2</sup>Website-Specific Processors for HTML Information Extraction

benchmarks where the first column “Processor Benchmark” represents the results from the “Processor Arithmetic” benchmark, where the energy spent by the processor is displayed in the results. Afterwards, the “Cache & Memory” benchmark was executed and its estimate of the power consumption of processor, chipset and memory was inserted in the table.

Similarly, for the measurement device (table 14) the power consumption was measured in three situations: firstly, with the computer in idle state (monitor on, with no user processes running). Secondly, with the same configuration but with the monitor powered off. Lastly, the power consumption was measured with the processor fully stressed, i.e. while running SANDRA performance benchmarks. One limitation we had while taking measures is that it was only possible to obtain data from notebooks. In this way the difference between the measures with the monitor turned on or off should provide the monitor power, which is not considered by the Sandra benchmarks.

In order illustrate an example of the acquired data, only a few measures are displayed in the tables. The full version is evinced in Appendix D.2.

| Computer Model            | Processor Benchmark (W) | Cache & Memory Benchmark (W) |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el (13.3")        | 19.69                   | 26.69                        |
| HPdv6580el (15.4")        | 32.01                   | 40.06                        |
| Compaq-nx9420 (17.0")     | 26.93                   | 36.16                        |
| Acer Aspire 4720z (15.0") | 19.78                   | 34.57                        |
| Acer Aspire 5930G (15.4") | 25.13                   | 32.13                        |

**Table 13:** SANDRA Table Analysis (example with five computers)

| Computer Model            | Idle with Monitor On (W) | Idle with Monitor Off (W) | Estimated Monitor Power (W) | Processor Fully Stressed (W) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el (13.3")        | 28.57                    | 25.19                     | 3.38                        | 35.64                        |
| HPdv6580el (15.4")        | 62.18                    | 57.14                     | 5.04                        | 85.27                        |
| Compaq-nx9420 (17.0")     | 78.89                    | 74.65                     | 4.24                        | 79.64                        |
| Acer Aspire 4720z (15.0") | 44.57                    | 39.88                     | 4.69                        | 67.28                        |
| Acer Aspire 5930G (15.4") | 44.48                    | 39.56                     | 4.92                        | 62.83                        |

**Table 14:** Energy Measurement Device Table Analysis (example with five computers)

### 3.4.2 Components Database

The Sisoftware SANDRA has a database with the results of all benchmarks for a considerable number of components making it proper for component comparison in terms

of performance and energy efficiency. The data from this database was extracted to fit the database described in Appendix D.1.

The only issue related to the SANDRA database is the that components are not treated uniquely and each benchmark has its own list of components. For example, a benchmark of cryptography for the processor provides just the processor family “Intel Core 2 Duo T8400” while other relations may store a specific processor model, such as “Intel Core Duo T2300 (DC, 1.66GHz, 2MB L2)”. As the database cannot be normalized in this way, it was necessary to provide a unique code for each component.

In Sisoftware website there exists a list of components and their suggested price. This list has a web-based version and also can be accessed inside the software, which besides the price provides all the information present in the linked inside the software for each component that is being analysed. An information from the website that has proven to be useful is the MPN code, that, like the ISBN for books, is unique for each component. Therefore, in order to create a unique relation with all the components that would be referred by the benchmark relations it was necessary to obtain these MPNs and assign them to the components and afterwards link them to the specific benchmarks. An example of the table generated with WebSPHINX for processors are shown in Table 15.

| Processors                                 | MPN            |
|--|----------------|
| AMD Phenom II X4 940 Quad Core Processor   | HDZ940XCGIBOX  |
| Intel Core 2 Duo E8400 Dual Core Processor | BX80570E8400   |
| AMD Athlon 64 X2 Dual Core Processor       | AD775ZWCGBHBOX |
| AMD Phenom II X3 720 Triple Core Processor | HDZ720WFGIBOX  |
| Intel Core 2 Q9550 Quad Core Processor     | BX80569Q9550   |

**Table 15:** Example of Table Generated by WebSPHINX

### 3.4.3 Manufacturer Specifications

The last set of information that was required by the final evaluation were the manufacturer specifications. These data were obtained by searching for each analysed computer model in the manufacturer site and looking for its components. As the more power-consuming components in a computer (excluding power supply components) are the processor, mainboard and memory, these were identified in the manufacturer site.

After identifying the processor, mainboard and memory used in each computer, their specifications were used to validate the informations obtained by the benchmarks.

## 4 *Analysis and Results*

The objective of this chapter is to describe the designed components' database and evaluate it in comparison with measured data and data obtained from the components' manufacturer. The result of this evaluation will determine the adequacy of power consumption data provided by the database as a way to estimate the power consumption of different machine configurations.

### 4.1 Analysis

#### 4.1.1 Component's Database

The component's database will be described in terms of its relations. For each relation its semantic meaning will be explained along with the included data and the source of this data. The database schema is present in Appendix D.3.

#### **Relations: Classification**

Four relations were create in order to classify the components in different ways. These relations are 1CAT, 2CAT, 3CAT and DEVICE. In this hierarchical disposition each component is classified in three levels by the relations 1CAT, 2CAT and 3CAT and then uniquely identified by the DEVICE relation. This classification follows the one present in the website analyzed by the crawler.

**Relation 1CAT** This is the first level of classification and is a general one, because it just states the final usage of the component. As the components used in the database are computer components they will be defined like that in this first level.



**Relation 2CAT** This relation fits the component into one of the main devices of a computer architecture. These are the following: processors, main memory, mass storage device, networking devices, CD/DVD player, main board, etc.

**Relation 3CAT** The component is classified in the last level to provide contextual information about its usage. Processors, for example, are defined either as boxed or directly available in an OEM computer configuration. Memory can be used for servers, workstations or notebooks. Network devices can be LAN cards or networking equipment such as routers. Finally, mass storage devices are separated by technology, which can be hard-disk or flash-based.

**Relation DEVICE** The last level of these categories is the identification of each component by a unique MPN code. This is the central relation in the database connecting pricing, benchmark and characteristic relations associated to specific components. The MPN information stored here was obtained with the use of the WEBSPHINX crawler over the SiSoftware shopping site. This device relation uses MPN as its key and associates for each component the three previous classifications, the component model/name and the date in which it was inserted in the database.

### Relations: Characteristics

This set of relations associates each component with its specifications, provided by the manufacturer. As SiSoftware Sandra provides these, it was the preferred source for this kind of data. Other sources such as CPU-Z reports and component datasheets were used in case the information could not be found in Sandra.

**Relation DEVICE\_CHARACTERISTIC** This determines the value of the characteristic being described. The value in CHAR\_VALUE can be for example number of cores or clock frequency for a processor, disk rotation or average bandwidth for a hard drive or size and bandwidth for main memory. The attribute CHAR\_ID is linked to the following relation in order to define the type of the characteristic.

**Relation CHARACTERISTIC** Each characteristic, other than a value associated in the previous relation, should be described in terms of type and measurement unit. One example may be the clock frequency which is measured in MHz. In this relation the

attribute CHAR\_NAME would be “clock frequency”, the attribute CHAR\_UM would be “MHz” and the DESCRIPTION attribute would explain the meaning of the characteristic.

**Relation SOURCE** For each component, the source is the location from which the information was retrieved. It may be, for instance, SiSoftware Sandra, the web or other softwares such as CPU-Z.

### Benchmark Relations

In SANDRA there were two types of benchmarks analyzed: single-value or graph-based. Single-value benchmarks provide one value as output, such as power consumption and average performance. Graph-based benchmarks generate a graph by adjusting one parameter and measuring the value of another one. Examples are clock frequency per workload for a processor and bandwidth per data block size for main memory.

**Relation BENCHMARK** This is the main benchmark relation. It identifies a single benchmark type by giving it a name, measure unit, description and type (attribute MULTIPLE), which can be 0 for single-value or 1 for graph-based. Depending on the MULTIPLE attribute, the benchmark will be either referenced by the DEVICE\_BENCHMARK or the BENCHMARK\_POINT relations.

**Relation DEVICE\_BENCHMARK** This relation stores one single-value for a benchmark. It also references both the benchmark and the component.

**Relation BENCHMARK\_POINT** This relation stores a set of values provided as the output of the benchmark. It also references both the benchmark and the component.

### Relation PRICE

Inside the SANDRA’s website, in the “shopping” area, it is possible to retrieve information about the price and also the MPN of the components. The suggested prices were shown together with a rating. The rating represents the number of users that suggested a price for the component and the higher it is, greater the credibility of the price information.

## 4.1.2 Overview

### Data Insertion into the Database of Components

The database of components was created by extracting information from the database provided by SiSoftware Sandra and it contains information about components' characteristics and benchmarks' results. However, this information was not uniformly stored as represented by Figure 16 in Appendix D.3, but instead as a set of independent relations without a central component repository. The original schema is described in Appendix D.1 and it contains the extracted tables provided by SiSoftware SANDRA.

As SiSoftware Sandra did not provide a centralized component's database, a new relation would have to be created with an association of each component with its respective MPN in order to uniquely identify each component. The method used to that end was explained in section 3.3.3.

The steps taken to populate the final database are, as follows:

- The Sandra database information was extracted into the relations shown in Appendix D.1.
- The component's MPN relation was created and populated with the output of the procedure described in section 3.3.3.
- Each component in the extracted Sandra database was assigned to a unique MPN and linked.
- The information from the Sandra database was exported to the component database whose schema is in Figure 16 in Appendix D.3.

### Measurements and Result Analysis

The final task was to compare benchmarks executed in a number of machines and compare their results with measurements with the power measurement device. A standard procedure was defined and then applied to a set of computers. The parameters measured and benchmarked are described in the following paragraphs.

For a deeper study, the measures themselves are in Appendix D.2.

**Measurements** For each computer the tool showed in Section 3.3.2 was used and a measure of three parameters was made:

- The power of the computer with monitor powered on in idle mode, i.e. without running any user processes.
- The power of the computer with monitor off also in idle mode.
- The power of the computer with monitor on and processor fully stressed while executing a Sandra processor benchmark.

**Benchmarking** The following Sandra benchmarks were then executed in each computer:

- Processor arithmetic performance benchmark, which provided the power consumption of the processor.
- Cache and memory benchmark, which provided the total power consumption of the set processor, chipset and memory.
- Physical disk benchmark, that shows the power consumption of the computer's hard drive.

**Component Specifications** The last set of information used in the benchmark result analysis are the processor specifications (datasheets) provided by the manufacturers.

## 4.2 Results

This section explains how the obtained data was prepared in order to make the comparisons between the various sources of information and exposes the results together with their analysis.

### 4.2.1 Data preparation

**Notebook monitor power** The power consumed by the notebook monitor was estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{monitor power consumption} = & \text{power measured with monitor on and idle processor} - \\ & \text{power measured with monitor off and idle processor} \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

**Idle processor measure** Under the hypotheses that:

- Hard disk consumption can be assumed to be low, under 2W in idle mode<sup>1</sup>
- While not searching for an access point, the notebook wireless card consumes less than 0,5W<sup>2</sup>

It can be said that the computer power consumption is approximately the sum of the power of the PSU, processor, chipset and memory. This would correspond to the measurements made with the monitor powered off. In the idle processor case, the value was directly measured.

The Table 16 presents the treated measures that were later used in the comparison.

| Computer Model       | Measurement Result: <i>Idle</i> With Monitor Off (W) | Estimated PSU Power <sup>a</sup> (W) | Measured Power <sup>b</sup> (W) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el           | 25.19  | 6.30                                 | 18.89                           |
| HPdv6580el           | 57.14  | 14.29                                | 42.86                           |
| Compaq-nx9420        | 74.65  | 18.66                                | 55.99                           |
| Acer Aspire 6935g    | 33.76  | 8.44                                 | 25.32                           |
| Acer Aspire 4720z    | 39.88  | 9.97                                 | 29.91                           |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 39.56  | 9.89                                 | 29.67                           |
| HP dv6000            | 39.12  | 9.78                                 | 29.34                           |
| Toshiba              | 46.03  | 11.51                                | 34.52                           |
| Fujitsu AMILO Pa2548 | 55.40  | 13.85                                | 41.55                           |
| Samsung Q310         | 26.60  | 6.65                                 | 19.95                           |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 32.52  | 8.13                                 | 24.39                           |
| HP Pavilion dv6000   | 29.38  | 7.35                                 | 22.04                           |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N     | 45.67  | 11.42                                | 34.25                           |
| HP Pavilion ze2000   | 31.48  | 7.87                                 | 23.61                           |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e   | 29.57  | 7.39                                 | 22.18                           |
| Asus F3 Series       | 38.98  | 9.75                                 | 29.24                           |
| HP 550               | 33.60  | 8.40                                 | 25.20                           |

<sup>a</sup> at 75% Efficiency

<sup>b</sup> processor/chipset/memory

**Table 16:** Measures with Processor in *idle* state

<sup>1</sup><http://www.tomshardware.com/charts/2.5-hard-drive-charts/Idle-Power-Consumption,681.html>

<sup>2</sup><http://www.notebookreview.com/default.asp?newsID=3597&article=wireless+and+battery+power>

**Stressed processor measure** As the stressed processor measure was only made with the monitor powered on, the estimated monitor power will be subtracted from it as shown in equation 4.2.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{consumption with stressed processor} = \\ &\text{measured consumption with stressed processor and monitor on} - \quad (4.2) \\ &\text{monitor power consumption} \end{aligned}$$

The Table 17 presents the treated measures that were later used in the comparison.

| Computer Model       | Measurement<br>result: <i>Fully<br/>Stressed</i> <sup>a</sup> (W) | Estimated<br>PSU Power <sup>b</sup><br>(W) | Measured<br>power <sup>c</sup> (W) |
|----------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el           | 32.26   | 8.07                                       | 24.20                              |
| HPdv6580el           | 80.23   | 20.06                                      | 60.17                              |
| Compaq-nx9420        | 75.40   | 18.85                                      | 56.55                              |
| Acer Aspire 6935g    | 50.48   | 12.62                                      | 37.86                              |
| Acer Aspire 4720z    | 62.59   | 15.65                                      | 46.94                              |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 57.91   | 14.48                                      | 43.43                              |
| HP dv6000            | 54.42   | 13.61                                      | 40.82                              |
| Toshiba              | 56.96   | 14.24                                      | 42.72                              |
| Fujitsu AMILO Pa2548 | 82.52   | 20.63                                      | 61.89                              |
| Samsung Q310         | 41.55   | 10.39                                      | 31.16                              |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 55.59   | 13.90                                      | 41.69                              |
| HP Pavilion dv6000   | 43.52   | 10.88                                      | 32.64                              |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N     | 74.88   | 18.72                                      | 56.16                              |
| HP Pavilion ze2000   | 52.34   | 13.09                                      | 39.26                              |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e   | 38.87   | 9.72                                       | 29.15                              |
| Asus F3 Series       | 41.68   | 10.42                                      | 31.26                              |
| HP 550               | 40.40   | 10.10                                      | 30.30                              |

<sup>a</sup> estimated monitor power <sup>b</sup> at 75% efficiency

<sup>c</sup>processor/chipset/memory

**Table 17:** Measures with Processor *Fully Stressed*

## 4.2.2 Analysis of results

The results may be divided into two categories: first the comparison between the measured processor consumption by the benchmark and the product specification and secondly the comparison between the cache and memory benchmark and the direct measures.

**Processor power analysis** The results of the processor consumption benchmark are compared with their nominal power in Table 18. As can be seen in it, the benchmark results are not coherent for five processors, where the measured/estimated processor power is higher than the nominal power determined by their specifications.

| Computer model     | Benchmark processor power (W) | Specification nominal processor power (W) |
|--------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| HPdv3500el         | 19.69                         | 25  |
| HPdv6580el         | 32.01                         | 35  |
| Compaq-nx9420      | 26.93                         | 31  |
| Acer Aspire 6935g  | 28.03                         | 35  |
| Acer Aspire 4720z  | 19.78                         | 35  |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 25.13                         | 25  |
| HP dv6000          | 25                            | 34  |
| Toshiba            | 22.5                          | 31  |
| Samsung Q310       | 26.28                         | 25  |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 38.6                          | 35  |
| HP Pavilion dv6000 | 12.95                         | 35  |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N   | 28.99                         | 35  |
| HP Pavilion ze2000 | 14.62                         | 35  |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e | 35.08                         | 25  |
| Asus F3 Series     | 12.44                         | 35  |
| HP 550             | 29.63                         | 27  |

**Table 18:** Processor Specifications' Results

**Analysis of the set processor/chipset/memory power consumption** In this analysis the following comparisons were made:

1. Sandra Cache and Memory Benchmark *versus* Idle processor with monitor off measurement - PSU estimated power
2. Sandra Cache and Memory Benchmark *versus* Stressed processor with monitor on measurement - monitor estimated power - PSU estimated power

This analysis was conducted with the processor in idle mode, as shown in Table 19 and with the processor fully stressed, as shown in Table 20. The percentage delta was calculated in absolute values taking the measured consumption as the reference, and its average was of 39% for the idle processor case and of 23% for the stressed processor case.

| Computer Model     | Sandra Benchmark: Measurement of Consumption <sup>a</sup> | Measured Consumption <sup>a</sup> | Percentage delta over the measured values |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| HPdv3500el         | 26.69   | 18.89                             | 41%                                       |
| HPdv6580el         | 40.06   | 42.86                             | 7%  |
| Compaq-nx9420      | 36.16   | 55.99                             | 35%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 6935g  | 35.03   | 25.32                             | 38%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 4720z  | 34.57   | 29.91                             | 16%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 32.13   | 29.67                             | 8%  |
| HP dv6000          | 34.23   | 29.34                             | 17%                                       |
| Toshiba            | 31.24   | 34.52                             | 10%                                       |
| Samsung Q310       | 33.28   | 19.95                             | 67%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 47.63   | 24.39                             | 95%                                       |
| HP Pavilion dv6000 | 31.84   | 22.04                             | 44%                                       |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N   | 49.68   | 34.25                             | 45%                                       |
| HP Pavilion ze2000 | 17.86   | 23.61                             | 24%                                       |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e | 42.08   | 22.18                             | 90%                                       |
| Asus F3 Series     | 28.53   | 29.24                             | 2%  |
| HP 550             | 44.42   | 25.20                             | 76%                                       |
|                    |   | <b>Average delta:</b>             | <b>39%</b>                                |

<sup>a</sup> chipset+processor+memory

**Table 19:** Results for Processor in *Idle* State



| Computer Model     | Sandra Benchmark: measurement of Consumption <sup>a</sup> | Measured Consumption <sup>a</sup> | Percentage delta over the measured values |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| HPdv3500el         | 26.69   | 24.20                             | 10%                                       |
| HPdv6580el         | 40.06   | 60.17                             | 33%                                       |
| Compaq-nx9420      | 36.16   | 56.55                             | 36%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 6935g  | 35.03   | 37.86                             | 7%  |
| Acer Aspire 4720z  | 34.57   | 46.94                             | 26%                                       |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 32.13   | 43.43                             | 26%                                       |
| HP dv6000          | 34.23   | 40.82                             | 16%                                       |
| Toshiba            | 31.24   | 42.72                             | 27%                                       |
| Samsung Q310       | 33.28   | 31.16                             | 7%  |
| Acer Aspire 5930G  | 47.63   | 41.69                             | 14%                                       |
| HP Pavilion dv6000 | 31.84   | 32.64                             | 2%  |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N   | 49.68   | 56.16                             | 12%                                       |
| HP Pavilion ze2000 | 17.86   | 39.26                             | 55%                                       |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e | 42.08   | 29.15                             | 44%                                       |
| Asus F3 Series     | 28.53   | 31.26                             | 9%  |
| HP 550             | 44.42   | 30.30                             | 47%                                       |
|                    |   | <b>Average delta:</b>             | <b>23%</b>                                |

<sup>a</sup> chipset+processor+memory

**Table 20:** Results for Processor *Fully Stressed*

## 5 *Conclusions*

This chapter summarizes the main findings of this study and draws out their support for applying a green solution. It thereby aims to enrich the understanding of the method and of the valuable information that can be extracted from the created database.

The use of *green ict* applied to data centers can be a very useful strategy in different scenarios. The database of components resulted from this thesis work can be very effective for what it is proposed to be: offering a way to compare the energy consumption of the computer components in one single place. Retrieving information about how much components spend in terms of power consumption will help the development of the green project in the *Assessment* phase by comparing components already existent in the market with the ones present in the data center. That is important firstly because the analysis and research of power consumption of critical spots can be made with ease. The database can also provide assessment when renewing or expanding the data center by permitting the choice of the most adequate and power-efficient machine configurations.

In the test conducted with a series of notebooks, the results of the power consumption data analysis shows that the power consumption estimated by the Sandra benchmarks is different by a margin of 20-40% of the directly measured power consumption. This result is consequence of not only the Sandra benchmarks inherent error, but also of the prior approximation of the power of the PSU (considered for comparison reasons) and of not taking into account the power of the some components that spend little power, such as hard drives, chassis components and wireless card.

Although the software estimates were diverse with respect to the direct measurements, the usefulness of the component database should be no lesser. It provides a great number of other useful information, mainly regarding component performance benchmarks and price which are essential when analyzing datacenter equipment.

A measure that could be taken to tune the power consumption measurements would be to consider also low-power components as that would eliminate the need of approx-

---

imations made for comparison purpose. Another possibility is to use other sources of power-related data other than the Sandra benchmarking tools, such as systematic measurement of components in an adequate aggregation level or even to define a function of the components nominal power which would approximate their power consumption at a given workload.

## 5.1 Perspectives and Future Developments

As part of the initial phase of the development of a green methodology, there are some possible functionalities and information that could still be added. These are as follows:

- This first version of the component's database is not automatically updated, so it could be made a back-end robot which would crawl for new components as they are released in the market and automatically populate the database;
- Direct component measurements or estimates created with the use of a function of their nominal power could also be inserted in the database;
- To create a front-end software for a interactive and effective way of comparing the components.

# References

- ANTONPOULOS, A. M. What can virtualization bring to the data center? *Network World*, September 2005.
- BAILEY. What are the difference between servers? *XENON*, 2009.
- BLUEJAY, M. *How much electricity do computers use?* jun. 2008. <http://michaelbluejay.com/electricity/computers.html>.
- BRYMAN, A. *Research Methods and Organization Studies*. [S.l.]: Routledge, 1989. ISBN 0415084040.
- CHESTNEY, N. *IT industry joins energy efficiency push*. jan. 2009. <http://www.reuters.com/article/technologyNews/idUSTRE50R4AL20090129>.
- COOKE, D. *Power Distribution within Six PCs*. jun. 2009. <http://www.silentpcreview.com/article265-page1.html>.
- GOLDWORM, B. *Blade Servers and Virtualization*. [S.l.]: Wiley-India, 2007. ISBN 8126512156, 9788126512157.
- HENDERSON, T. Blade servers vs. rack servers. *Network World*, 2007.
- HETHERINGTON, R. *The UltraSPARC T1 Processor - Power Efficient Throughput Computing*. [S.l.], December 2005.
- HP. *HP Modular Cooling System: water cooling technology for high-density server installations*. [S.l.], April 2007.
- IDC. Enterprise class virtualization 2.0 application mobility, recovery, and management. February 2007.
- INFO-TECH. *Info-Tech's Green Index: How Green Are You?* [S.l.], July 2007.
- KAESTNER, R. *Computer + Infrastructure Energy Usage*. fev. 2009. <http://www.cosn.org/Initiatives/GreenComputing/EnergyUse/tabid/4515/Default.aspx>.
- KUMAR, R. Eight critical forces shape enterprise data center strategies. *Gartner, Inc.*, February 2007.
- MAKHIJA, V. *VMmark: A scalable benchmark for virtualized systems*. [S.l.], September 2006.
- NTTCOMMUNICATIONS. *Green ICT Solutions for Realizing Environmental Measures Addressing the New Management Issue of "Green ICT"*. 2009. <http://www.reuters.com/article/technologyNews/idUSTRE50R4AL20090129>.

REHN, R. What else do you know about blade servers. *Hospedagem Local*, 2008.

REINE, D. *Disk and Tape Square Off Again - Tape Remains King of the Hill with LTO-4*. [S.l.], October 2008.

STAMFORD, C. Agility will become the primary measure of data centre excellence by 2012. *Gartner, Inc.*, October 2007.

THE SUN benchmarks. fev. 2007. [http://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/procurement/eep\\_printer.html](http://www1.eere.energy.gov/femp/procurement/eep_printer.html).

TOWNSEND, M. *Earth 'will expire by 2050'*. jul. 2002. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2002/jul/07/research.waste>.

## *APPENDIX A – List of SiSoftware Sandra Modules*

Here is the list of principal modules used in this research work.

- System Summary
- Mainboard/Chipset/System Monitors Info
- CPU/BIOS Info
- APM & ACPI (Advanced Power Management) Info
- PCI(e), AGP, CardBus, PCMCIA bus and devices Info
- Video Information (monitor, card, video bios, caps, etc.)
- OpenGL Information
- Keyboard Info
- Windows Memory Info
- Windows Info
- Font (Raster, Vector, TrueType, OpenType) Information
- Modem/ISDN TA Information
- Network Information\*
- IP Network Information\*
- WinSock & Internet Security Information
- Drives Information (Removable Hard Disks, CD-ROM/DVD, RamDrives, etc.)

- Ports (Serial/Parallel) Info
- Remote Access Service Connections (Dial-Up, Internet)\*
- OLE objects/servers Info\*
- Processes (Tasks) & Threads Info
- Modules (DLL, DRV) Info
- Services & Device Drivers (SYS) Info\*
- SCSI, SAS Information\*
- ATA, ATAPI, SATA, RAID Information
- Data Sources Information\*
- CMOS/RTC Information\*
- Smart Card & SIM Card Information\*

#### List of Benchmarks

- Arithmetic Benchmark (including SSE2, SSSE3)
- Multi-Media Benchmark
- Multi-Core Efficiency Benchmark
- Power Management Efficiency Benchmark
- File System (Removable, Hard Disks, Network, RamDrives) Benchmark
- Removable Storage/Flash Benchmark
- CD-ROM/DVD Benchmark
- Memory Bandwidth Benchmark
- Cache & Memory Bandwidth Benchmark
- Network/LAN Bandwidth Benchmark
- Internet/ISP Connection Benchmark
- Internet/ISP Peerage Benchmark



## Applications and Usage

- Hardware Interrupts Usage\*
- DMA Channel Usage\*
- I/O Ports Usage\*
- Memory Range Usage\*
- Plug & Play Enumerator\*
- Hardware registry settings
- Environment settings
- Registered File Types
- Key Applications\* (web-browser, e-mail, news, anti-virus, firewall, etc.)
- Installed Applications\*
- Installed Programs\*
- Start Menu Applications\*
- Installed Web Packages\* (ActiveX, Java classes)
- System Event Logs\*

\* Commercial version only

## *APPENDIX B – Comparison Tape Drives*

| SDLT & DLT Tape Drives | Native Capacity & Transfer Rate | Compressed Capacity & Transfer Rate |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <b>DLT-S4</b>          | 800GB at 60MB/s                 | 1600GB at 320MB/s                   |
| <b>SDLT 600</b>        | 300GB at 36MB/s                 | 600GB at 72MB/s                     |
| <b>SDLT 320</b>        | 160GB at 16MB/s                 | 320GB at 32MB/s                     |
| <b>SDLT 220</b>        | 110GB at 11MB/s                 | 220GB at 22MB/s                     |
| <b>DLT 8000</b>        | 40GB at 6MB/s                   | 80GB at 12MB/s                      |
| <b>DLT V4</b>          | 160GB at 10MB/s                 | 320GB at 20MB/s                     |
| <b>DLT1</b>            | 40GB at 3MB/s                   | 80GB at 12MB/s                      |
| <b>DLT-VS160</b>       | 80GB at 8MB/s                   | 160GB at 16MB/s                     |
| <b>DLT-VS80</b>        | 40GB at 3MB/s                   | 80GB at 6MB/s                       |
| <b>DLT 7000</b>        | 35GB at 5MB/s                   | 70GB at 10MB/s                      |
| <b>DLT 4000</b>        | 20GB at 1.5MB/s                 | 40GB at 3MB/s                       |
| <b>DLT 2000XT</b>      | 15GB at 1.25MB/s                | 30GB at 2.5MB/s                     |

**Table 21:** Comparison Between SDLT and DLT Tape Drives Capacities and Transfer Rates

| Product            | Capacity, native (uncompressed) | Average file access time (first file) | Data transfer rate, native (uncompressed) |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| <b>T-Series</b>    |                                 |                                       |   |
| T9840A             | 20 GB                           | 8 sec                                 | 10 MB/sec                                 |
| T9840B             | 20 GB                           | 8 sec                                 | 19 MB/sec                                 |
| T9840C             | 40 GB                           | 8 sec                                 | 30 MB/sec                                 |
| T9940A             | 60 GB                           | 41 sec                                | 10 MB/sec                                 |
| T9940B             | 200 GB                          | 41 sec                                | 30 MB/sec                                 |
| <b>LTO Ultrium</b> |                                 |                                       |   |
| LTO Gen 1          | 100 GB                          | 86-96 sec                             | 15-16 MB/sec                              |
| LTO Gen 2          | 200 GB                          | 64-75 sec                             | 32-35 MB/sec                              |
| LTO Gen 3          | 400 GB                          | 72 sec                                | 80 MB/sec                                 |
| <b>SDLT</b>        |                                 |                                       |   |
| SDLT 320           | 160 GB                          | 82 sec                                | 16 MB/sec                                 |
| SDLT 600           | 300 GB                          | 79 sec                                | 36 MB/sec                                 |

**Table 22:** Access times for several tape drives

| <b>SDLT &amp;<br/>DLT Tape Drives</b> | <b>Native Capacity &amp;<br/>Transfer Rate</b> | <b>Compressed<br/>Capacity &amp;<br/>Transfer Rate</b> |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>LTO-4</b>                          | 800GB at 120MB/s<br>(864GB per hour)           | 1.6TB at 240MB/s                                       |
| <b>HP Ultrium 1760</b>                | 800GB  | 1.6TB at 576GB/hr                                      |
| <b>HP Ultrium 1840</b>                | 800GB at 120MB/s                               | 1.6TB at 240MB/s                                       |
| <b>HP Ultrium 960</b>                 | 400GB at 80MB/s                                | 800GB at 160MB/s                                       |
| <b>HP Ultrium 460</b>                 | 200GB at 30MB/s                                | 400GB at 60MB/s  |
| <b>HP Ultrium 230</b>                 | 100GB at 15MB/s                                | 200GB at 30MB/s  |
| <b>IBM LTO-4</b>                      | 800GB at 120MB/s                               | 1.6TB at 240MB/s                                       |
| <b>IBM LTO-3</b>                      | 400GB at 80MB/s                                | 800GB at 160MB/s                                       |
| <b>IBM LTO-2</b>                      | 200GB at 35MB/s                                | 400GB at 70MB/s  |
| <b>IBM LTO-1</b>                      | 100GB at 15MB/s                                | 200GB at 30MB/s  |
| <b>Quantum LTO3</b>                   | 400GB at 245GB/hr                              | 800GB at 490GB/hr                                      |
| <b>Quantum LTO3 HH</b>                | 400GB at 68MB/s                                | 800GB at 90MB/s  |
| <b>Quantum LTO2</b>                   | 200GB at 123GB/hr                              | 400GB at 245GB/hr                                      |
| <b>Quantum LTO2HH</b>                 | 200GB at 94GB/hr                               | 400GB at 144GB/hr                                      |
| <b>Tandberg Data LTO4 FH</b>          | 800GB at 120MB/s                               | 1.6TB at 240MB/s                                       |
| <b>Tandberg Data LTO3 FH</b>          | 400GB at 80MB/s                                | 800GB at 160MB/s                                       |
| <b>Tandberg Data LTO3 HH</b>          | 400GB at 60MB/s                                | 800GB at 120MB/s                                       |
| <b>Tandberg Data LTO2 HH</b>          | 200GB at 24MB/s                                | 400GB at 48MB/s  |
| <b>Tandberg Data LTO1 HH</b>          | 100GB at 16MB/s                                | 200GB at 32MB/s  |
| <b>Certance LTO-1</b>                 | 100GB at 960MB/min                             | 200GB at 1920MB/min                                    |

**Table 23:** Comparison Between LTO Tape Drives Capacities and Transfer Rates

## ***APPENDIX C – List of Other Energy Management Tools***

### **C.1 Power To Change**

Power To Change is a widget for desktops that measures how much energy was saved when the computer is turned-off. With this application installed, when the machine is turned on, the user can receive information about how much energy and carbon footprint it was saved while it was turned off, and also, compare with global results and others. The widget can be downloaded from <http://www.hp.com/powertochange>.

### **C.2 PlateSpin - Recon**

This software did not compose the ones used for doing this thesis. Yet, it is important to notice this, because it is almost the same of Sandra, but it provides a more incisive work on Data Centers in general. It provides workload profiling, analysis and planning of complex server consolidation, disaster recovery, capacity planning, asset management and green data center initiatives. It also provides forecasting for optimizing the data center by collecting hardware, software and services inventory for all server workloads. Furthermore, it results an statistics work for the server workloads running on data center and how their resources are being used.

### **C.3 APC Virtualization Energy Cost Calculation**

APC has released a free online tool that will enable managers make decisions regarding the physical requirements of a data center after a virtualization project. The Virtualization Energy Cost Calculator, which can be downloaded from the APC site, can be used in data center planning and allows the simulation of different scenarios.

It does not, however, allow to differentiate between different servers and their power consumption. "It's not meant as an accurate planning tool," said an APC spokesman. "The idea is that gives facilities and IT managers a rough idea of the power consumption but it does not go into detail. APC does have another product to get a more accurate picture - InfrastuXure Central, although that is not a free tool." <http://www.techworld.com/green-it/news/index.cfm?RSS&NewsID=116650>

## ***APPENDIX D – Database of Components***

### **D.1 SANDRA Benchmark Table Schema**

This section describes the extracted tables from SANDRA’s database. They were linked through a combination of other tables from the same database in order to have more relevant data.

#### **CPU Benchmarks**

Tables 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35 are related to benchmarks for the processor.

| <b>Field Name</b>       | <b>Data Type</b> | <b>Description</b>        |
|-------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>ManID</b>            | Number           | Sandra manufacturer ID    |
| <b>ClassID</b>          | Number           | Sandra CPU class ID       |
| <b>TypeID</b>           | Number           | Sandra CPU type ID        |
| <b>ModelID</b>          | Number           | CPUID model ID            |
| <b>Processor Name</b>   | Number           | Name of CPU of this model |
| <b>RatedSpeed (MHz)</b> | Number           | rated Speed for wattage   |
| <b>RatedVoltage (V)</b> | Number           | rated Vcore for wattage   |
| <b>RatedPower (W)</b>   | Number           | rated wattage             |
| <b>MaxTemp</b>          | Number           | in °C                     |
| <b>CoolerRating</b>     | Number           | target cooler °C/W rating |

**Table 24:** CPU and the energy in wattage consumed

#### **.NET Benchmarks**

Tables 36 and 37 are related to .NET benchmarking for the processor.

| Field Name     | Data Type | Description               |
|----------------|-----------|---------------------------|
| <b>ManID</b>   | Number    | Sandra manufacturer ID    |
| <b>ClassID</b> | Number    | Sandra CPU class ID       |
| <b>TypeID</b>  | Number    | Sandra CPU type ID        |
| <b>ModelID</b> | Number    | CPUID model ID            |
| <b>Upgrade</b> | Number    | Type (od, mobile, etc.)   |
| <b>BrandID</b> | Number    | CPUID brand ID            |
| <b>Name</b>    | Text      | Name of CPU of this model |

**Table 25:** Characteristics of the CPU organized by the Model

| Field Name              | Data Type | Description   |
|-------------------------|-----------|---|
| <b>ManID</b>            | Number    | Sandra manufacturer ID  |
| <b>ClassID</b>          | Number    | Sandra CPU class ID   |
| <b>TypeID</b>           | Number    | Sandra CPU type ID  |
| <b>ModelID</b>          | Number    | CPUID model ID  |
| <b>SteppingID</b>       | Number    | CPUID stepping ID (it identifies how much the design of a microprocessor has advanced from the original design) |
| <b>Upgrade</b>          | Number    | type (od, mobile, etc.)   |
| <b>BrandID</b>          | Number    | CPUID brand ID  |
| <b>Stepping Mask</b>    | Text      | stepping mask   |
| <b>RatedSpeed (MHz)</b> | Number    | rated Speed for wattage   |
| <b>RatedVoltage (V)</b> | Number    | rated Vcore for wattage   |
| <b>RatedPower (W)</b>   | Number    | rated wattage   |
| <b>MaxTemp</b>          | Number    | in °C   |
| <b>CoolerRating</b>     | Number    | target cooler °C/W rating   |

**Table 26:** CPU's characteristics organized by Stepping

| Field Name                  | Data Type | Description  |
|-----------------------------|-----------|--|
| <b>CPU Type Description</b> | Text      | Processor Name   |
| <b>Os Type</b>              | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                         |
| <b>Speed (MHz)</b>          | Number    | Frequency in MHz                                       |
| <b>N° Core</b>              | Number    | N° of Core   |
| <b>Dhrystone Type</b>       | Text      | Type of Dhrystone                                      |
| <b>ALU Performance</b>      | Number    | Dhrystone int ALU (Arithmetic Logic Unit) value (MIPS) |
| <b>Comment</b>              | Text      | Type of Benchmark used.                                |

**Table 27:** References to the benchmarks with Dhrystone (Arithmetic Logic Unit) performed with the processors

| Field Name     | Data Type | Description  |
|----------------|-----------|--|
| CPU Name       | Text      | Processor Name   |
| Os Type        | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                           |
| Speed          | Number    | Frequency in MHz   |
| N° Core        | Number    | N° Core  |
| Whetstone Type | Text      | Whetstone Type   |
| FPU            | Number    | Whetstone float FPU (Floating Point Unit) value (MFLOPS) |
| Comment        | Text      | Type of Benchmark used.                                  |

**Table 28:** References to the benchmarks with Whetstone (Floating Point Unit) performed with the processors

| Field Name                 | Data Type | Description                    |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| CPU Name                   | Text      | Processor Name                 |
| Os Type                    | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64) |
| Speed                      | Number    | Frequency in MHz               |
| N° Core                    | Number    | N° Core                        |
| Multimedia Double Type     | Text      | Type of multimedia used        |
| Multimedia Instruction Set | Number    | Mm instruction set to use      |
| Comment                    | Text      | Comment on result              |

**Table 29:** Multimedia benchmarks with the use of double

| Field Name                 | Data Type | Description                    |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| CPU Name                   | Text      | Processor Name                 |
| Os Type                    | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64) |
| Speed                      | Number    | Frequency in MHz               |
| N° CPU                     | Number    | N° CPU                         |
| Multimedia Float Type      | Text      | Type of multimedia used        |
| Multimedia Instruction Set | Number    | Mm instruction set to use      |
| Comment                    | Text      | Comment on result              |

**Table 30:** Multimedia benchmarks with the use of float

| Field Name                 | Data Type | Description                    |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
| CPU Name                   | Text      | Processor Name                 |
| Os Type                    | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64) |
| Speed                      | Number    | Frequency in MHz               |
| N° CPU                     | Number    | N° CPU                         |
| Multimedia Int Type        | Text      | Type of multimedia used        |
| Multimedia Instruction Set | Number    | MM instruction set to use      |
| Comment                    | Text      | Comment on result              |

**Table 31:** Multimedia benchmarks with the use of integer



| Field Name     | Data Type  | Description                        |
|----------------|------------|------------------------------------|
| ID             | AutoNumber | ID Number                          |
| Type of Result | Text       | Type of Result                     |
| Os Type        | Text       | Architecture type (x86 or x64)     |
| Platform       | Number     | Platform type                      |
| Dateset        | Date       | Date of benchmark                  |
| CPU Name       | Text       | Reference system name              |
| Speed          | Number     | MHz                                |
| Power          | Number     | Power in 0.01W                     |
| CPU Type       | Text       | CPU Type                           |
| N° Cores       | Number     | N° Core units                      |
| FSB Speed      | Number     | FSB Speed in MHz                   |
| MOPS           | Number     | Combined value (MOPS)              |
| Dhrystone ALU  | Number     | Dhrystone in ALU value (MIPS)      |
| Dhrystone Type | Text       | Type of Dhrystone                  |
| Whetstone      | Number     | Whetstone float FPU value (MFLOPS) |
| Whetstone Type | Text       | Type of whetstone                  |

Table 32: Reference to the results of the benchmarks with Dhrystone and Whetstone

| Field Name                    | Data Type  | Description                    |
|-------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| ID                            | AutoNumber | ID Number                      |
| Result Type                   | Number     | Type of result                 |
| Os Type                       | Text       | Architecture type (x86 or x64) |
| Platform                      | Number     | Platform type                  |
| Dateset                       | Date/Time  | Date of benchmark              |
| Name                          | Text       | Reference system name          |
| Speed                         | Number     | Speed in MHz                   |
| Power                         | Number     | Power in 0.01W                 |
| CPU Type                      | Number     | CPU type                       |
| N° Cores                      | Number     | N° Cores per unit              |
| FSB Speed                     | Number     | FSB Speed in MHZ               |
| Total                         | Number     | Total MB/s                     |
| Crypto                        | Number     | Crypto MB/s                    |
| Encryption                    | Number     | Encryption                     |
| Decryption                    | Number     | Decryption                     |
| Cryptographic Algorithm       | Number     | Cryptographic Algorithm        |
| Cryptographic Instruction set | Number     | Cryptographic Instruction set  |
| Hash                          | Number     | Hash                           |
| Hash algorithm                | Number     | Hash algorithm                 |
| Hash Instruction set          | Number     | Hash Instruction set           |

Table 33: Reference to the Results of the Benchmark with Cryptography in CPUs

| Field Name            | Data Type  | Description                    |
|-----------------------|------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>ID</b>             | AutoNumber | ID Number                      |
| <b>Result Type</b>    | Number     | Type of result                 |
| <b>Os Type</b>        | Text       | Architecture type (x86 or x64) |
| <b>Platform</b>       | Number     | Platform type                  |
| <b>Dateset</b>        | Date/Time  | Date of benchmark              |
| <b>Name</b>           | Text       | Reference system name          |
| <b>Speed</b>          | Number     | Speed in MHz                   |
| <b>Power</b>          | Number     | Power in 0.01W                 |
| <b>CPU Type</b>       | Number     | CPU type                       |
| <b>N° Cores</b>       | Number     | N° Cores per unit              |
| <b>FSB Speed</b>      | Number     | FSB Speed in MHZ               |
| <b>Total</b>          | Number     | Total                          |
| <b>MM Int</b>         | Number     | Integer                        |
| <b>MM Int Type</b>    | Text       | Integer Type                   |
| <b>MM Float</b>       | Number     | Float                          |
| <b>MM float Type</b>  | Text       | Float type                     |
| <b>MM double</b>      | Number     | Double                         |
| <b>MM double type</b> | Text       | Double type                    |

Table 34: Wrap up of the Benchmarks Performed with Multimedia

| Field Name           | Data Type  | Description  |
|----------------------|------------|--|
| <b>ID</b>            | AutoNumber | ID Number  |
| <b>Result Type</b>   | Number     | Type of result   |
| <b>Os Type</b>       | Text       | Architecture type (x86 or x64)   |
| <b>Platform</b>      | Number     | Platform type  |
| <b>Dateset</b>       | Date/Time  | Date of benchmark  |
| <b>Name</b>          | Text       | Reference system name  |
| <b>Speed</b>         | Number     | Speed in MHz   |
| <b>Power</b>         | Number     | Power in 0.01W   |
| <b>Workload Type</b> | Number     | Workload Type  |
| <b>N° Cores</b>      | Number     | N° Cores per unit  |
| <b>FSB Speed</b>     | Number     | FSB Speed in MHZ   |
| <b>Combine score</b> | Number     | Combined score in units  |
| <b>Efficiency</b>    | Number     | Efficiency factor  |
| <b>Table</b>         | Number     | A set of points of the curve generated by increasing the workload on the processor |

Table 35: Benchmark for the energy consumption of processor by augmenting the workload

| Field Name                                | Data Type | Description   |
|---|-----------|---|
| <b>ID</b>                                 | Number    | Component ID  |
| <b>OsType</b>                             | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                    |
| <b>Platform</b>                           | Text      | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                         |
| <b>System Name</b>                        | Text      | CPU Model   |
| <b>Speed (MHz)</b>                        | Number    | CPU Speed   |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>                       | Number    | CPU Power   |
| <b>CPU Type</b>                           | Text      | CPU Family  |
| <b>No of Core Units</b>                   | Number    | Number of CPU cores   |
| <b>FSB Speed (MHz)</b>                    | Number    | Bus Speed Obs: set as 0 for all records                           |
| <b>Aggregate Performance (MOPS)</b>       | Number    | Average between performance in dhrystone and whetstone benchmarks |
| <b>Dhrystone int ALU value (MIPS)</b>     | Number    | Dhrystone performance   |
| <b>Type of dhrystone</b>                  | Text      | Type of dhrystone benchmark (.NET)                                |
| <b>Whetstone float FPU value (MFLOPS)</b> | Number    | Whetstone performance   |
| <b>Type of whetstone</b>                  | Text      | Type of whetstone benchmark (.NET)                                |

Table 36: .NET Arithmetic Benchmark on several CPUs

| Field Name                                | Data Type | Description   |
|---|-----------|---|
| <b>ID</b>                                 | Number    | Component ID  |
| <b>OsType</b>                             | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                              |
| <b>Platform</b>                           | Text      | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                   |
| <b>System Name</b>                        | Text      | CPU Model   |
| <b>Speed (MHz)</b>                        | Number    | CPU Speed   |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>                       | Number    | CPU Power   |
| <b>CPU Type</b>                           | Text      | CPU Family  |
| <b>No of Core Units</b>                   | Number    | Number of CPU cores   |
| <b>FSB Speed (MHz)</b>                    | Number    | Bus Speed Obs: set as 0 for all records                     |
| <b>Aggregate Performance (kpixels/s)</b>  | Number    | Average between performance in integer and float benchmarks |
| <b>Int .NET Performance (kpixels/s)</b>   | Number    | Int Performance   |
| <b>Float .NET Performance (kpixels/s)</b> | Number    | Float Performance   |

Table 37: .NET Multi-Media Benchmark on several CPUs

## Storage Benchmarks

Tables 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 are related to storage system.

| Field Name   | Data Type | Description                               |
|--|-----------|---|
| <b>ID</b>  | Number    | Component ID                              |
| <b>OsType</b>  | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| <b>Drive Model</b>                                       | Text      | DVD drive model                           |
| <b>Platform</b>  | Text      | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| <b>Drive Speed (in X)</b>                                | Number    | 4x, 16x, etc                              |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>                                      | Number    | Drive Power                               |
| <b>Size of Media (in MB)</b>                             | Number    | Disk size                                 |
| <b>Combined Index (kB/s)</b>                             | Number    | Aggregate performance                     |
| <b>Random Access Time (ms)</b>                           | Number    |   |
| <b>Table: Drive index (kB/s) x Position on Media (%)</b> | Number    | Performance for each position on media    |

**Table 38:** DVD Benchmark (read)

| Field Name                     | Data Type | Description  |
|--------------------------------|-----------|--|
| <b>ID</b>                      | Number    | Component ID                                       |
| <b>OsType</b>                  | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                     |
| <b>Drive Model</b>             | Text      |  |
| <b>Platform</b>                | Text      | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)          |
| <b>Drive Speed (RPM)</b>       | Number    |  |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>            | Number    | Drive Power  |
| <b>Drive Size (in MB)</b>      | Number    | Disk size  |
| <b>Drive type</b>              | Text      | HD/Removable/Network                               |
| <b>Drive index (kB/s)</b>      | Number    | Aggregate performance for both reading and writing |
| <b>Random Access Time (ms)</b> | Number    |  |

**Table 39:** Mounted file systems benchmark. Aggregate performance for several types of drives (HD/Removable/Network)

## Java Benchmarks

Tables 43 and 44 are related to Java benchmars.

## Memory Benchmarks

Tables 45, 46, 47 and 48 are related to memory benchmarks.

| Field Name  | Data Type | Description                               |
|---|-----------|---|
| <b>ID</b>   | Number    | Component ID                              |
| <b>OsType</b>   | Text      | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| <b>Platform</b>                                       | Text      | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| <b>Drive Model</b>                                    | Text      |   |
| <b>Drive Speed (RPM)</b>                              | Number    | Obs.: set to 1000 for pen drives          |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>                                   | Number    | Drive Power                               |
| <b>Drive Size (in MB)</b>                             | Number    | Disk size                                 |
| <b>Combined Index (kB/s)</b>                          | Number    | Aggregate Performance                     |
| <b>Random Access Time (ms)</b>                        | Number    |   |
| <b>Table: Drive index (kB/s) x Position on HD (%)</b> | Number    | Performance for each position on HD       |

**Table 40:** Physical Disk Benchmark (read)

| <b>ID</b>   | <b>Number</b> | <b>Component ID</b>                       |
|---|---------------|---|
| <b>OsType</b>   | Text          | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| <b>Platform</b>                                       | Text          | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| <b>Drive Model</b>                                    | Text          |   |
| <b>Drive Speed (RPM)</b>                              | Number        | Obs: set to 1000 for pen drives           |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>                                   | Number        | Drive Power                               |
| <b>Drive Size (in MB)</b>                             | Number        | Disk size                                 |
| <b>Combined Index (kB/s)</b>                          | Number        | Aggregate Performance                     |
| <b>Random Access Time (ms)</b>                        | Number        |   |
| <b>Table: Drive index (kB/s) x Position on HD (%)</b> | Number        | Performance for each position on HD       |

**Table 41:** Physical Disk Benchmark (write)

| <b>ID</b>                      | <b>Number</b> | <b>Component ID</b>                       |
|--------------------------------|---------------|---|
| <b>OsType</b>                  | Text          | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| <b>Platform</b>                | Text          | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| <b>Drive name/model</b>        | Text          |   |
| <b>Interface speed (Mbps)</b>  | Number        |   |
| <b>Power (.01W)</b>            | Number        |   |
| <b>Size of tape (MB)</b>       | Number        |   |
| <b>Drive index (kB/s)</b>      | Number        |   |
| <b>Random access time (ms)</b> | Number        |   |

**Table 42:** Tape Drives Benchmark

| ID                                 | Number | Component ID  |
|------------------------------------|--------|---|
| OsType                             | Text   | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                    |
| Platform                           | Text   | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                         |
| System Name                        | Text   | CPU Model   |
| Speed (MHz)                        | Number | CPU Speed   |
| Power (.01W)                       | Number | CPU Power   |
| CPU Type                           | Text   | CPU Family  |
| No of Core Units                   | Number | Number of CPU cores   |
| FSB Speed (MHz)                    | Number | Bus Speed Obs: set as 0 for all records                           |
| Aggregate Performance (MOPS)       | Number | Average between performance in dhrystone and whetstone benchmarks |
| Dhrystone int ALU value (MIPS)     | Number | Dhrystone performance   |
| Type of dhrystone                  | Text   | Type of dhrystone benchmark (Java)                                |
| Whetstone float FPU value (MFLOPS) | Number | Whetstone performance   |
| Type of whetstone                  | Text   | Type of whetstone benchmark (Java)                                |

Table 43: Java VM Arithmetic Benchmark on several CPUs

| ID                                 | Number | Component ID  |
|------------------------------------|--------|---|
| OsType                             | Text   | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                              |
| Platform                           | Text   | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                   |
| System Name                        | Text   | CPU Model   |
| Speed (MHz)                        | Number | CPU Speed   |
| Power (.01W)                       | Number | CPU Power   |
| CPU Type                           | Text   | CPU Family  |
| No of Core Units                   | Number | Number of CPU cores   |
| FSB Speed (MHz)                    | Number | Bus Speed Obs: set as 0 for all records                     |
| Aggregate Performance (kpixels/s)  | Number | Average between performance in integer and float benchmarks |
| Int Java Performance (kpixels/s)   | Number | Int Performance   |
| Float Java Performance (kpixels/s) | Number | Float Performance   |

Table 44: Java VM Multi-Media Benchmark on several CPUs

| ID                                  | Number  | Component ID   |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--|
| OsType                              | Text    | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                 |
| Platform                            | Text    | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                      |
| Memory model                        | Text    | Different configurations: Single chipsets or pairs of chipsets |
| Memory Speed (MHz)                  | Number  |  |
| Memory Power (.01W)                 | Number  |  |
| Memory Size (MB)                    | Number  | Sum of capacities of all chipsets in the configuration         |
| Cache speed (MHz)                   | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                  |
| Memory control speed (MHz)          | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                  |
| Internal Graphics (0: no, 1:yes)    | Boolean | Set as 1 if it is a graphical card's internal memory           |
| Aggregate memory performance (MB/s) | Number  | Average between ALU and FPU bandwidths                         |
| ALU bandwidth                       | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| ALU type                            | Text    | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| FPU bandwidth                       | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| FPU type                            | Text    | Obs.: not shown in Sandra                                      |

**Table 45:** Memory Bandwidth Benchmark (newer components) Obs: differences between ALU and FPU bandwidths only noticeable in older components

| ID                                  | Number  | Component ID   |
|-------------------------------------|---------|--|
| OsType                              | Text    | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                 |
| Platform                            | Text    | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                      |
| Memory model                        | Text    | Different configurations: Single chipsets or pairs of chipsets |
| Memory Speed (MHz)                  | Number  |  |
| Memory Power (.01W)                 | Number  |  |
| Memory Size (MB)                    | Number  | Sum of capacities of all chipsets in the configuration         |
| Cache speed (MHz)                   | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                  |
| Memory control speed (MHz)          | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                  |
| Internal Graphics (0: no, 1:yes)    | Boolean | Set as 1 if it is a graphical card's internal memory           |
| Aggregate memory performance (MB/s) | Number  | Average between ALU and FPU bandwidths                         |
| ALU bandwidth                       | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| ALU type                            | Text    | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| FPU bandwidth                       | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |
| FPU type                            | Text    | Obs: not shown in Sandra                                       |

**Table 46:** Memory Bandwidth Benchmark (older, legacy components) Obs: differences between ALU and FPU bandwidths only noticeable in older components

| ID   | Number  | Component ID   |
|--|---------|--|
| OsType   | Text    | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                   |
| Platform   | Text    | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                        |
| Memory model   | Text    | Different configurations: Single chipsets or pairs of chipsets   |
| Memory Speed (MHz)                                   | Number  |  |
| Memory Power (.01W)                                  | Number  |  |
| Memory Size (MB)                                     | Number  | Sum of capacities of all chipsets in the configuration           |
| Cache speed (MHz)                                    | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                    |
| Memory control speed (MHz)                           | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                    |
| Internal Graphics (0: no, 1:yes)                     | Boolean | Set as 1 if it is a graphical card's internal memory             |
| Combined index (ns)                                  | Number  | Aggregate latency result   |
| Speed factor   | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra   |
| Table: Memory latency (ns) x Test Range Size (bytes) | Number  | Latency for chunks of data of different sizes (from 1kB to 64MB) |

Table 47: Memory Latency Benchmark (linear disposition of data chunks)

| ID   | Number  | Component ID   |
|--|---------|--|
| OsType   | Text    | Architecture type (x86 or x64)                                   |
| Platform   | Text    | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server)                        |
| Memory model   | Text    | Different configurations: Single chipsets or pairs of chipsets   |
| Memory Speed (MHz)                                   | Number  |  |
| Memory Power (.01W)                                  | Number  |  |
| Memory Size (MB)                                     | Number  | Sum of capacities of all chipsets in the configuration           |
| Cache speed (MHz)                                    | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                    |
| Memory control speed (MHz)                           | Number  | Obs: set as 0 for all records                                    |
| Internal Graphics (0: no, 1:yes)                     | Boolean | Set as 1 if it is a graphical card's internal memory             |
| Combined index (ns)                                  | Number  | Aggregate latency result   |
| Speed factor   | Number  | Obs: not shown in Sandra   |
| Table: Memory latency (ns) x Test Range Size (bytes) | Number  | Latency for chunks of data of different sizes (from 1kB to 64MB) |

Table 48: Memory Latency Benchmark (data chunks randomly disposed throughout the memory)



## Network Connection Benchmarks

Tables 49, 50 and 51 are related to Network connection benchmarks.

| ID                     | Number | Component ID                              |
|------------------------|--------|---|
| OsType                 | Text   | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| Platform               | Text   | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| Network Adapter        | Text   | Network card model                        |
| Interface speed (kbps) | Number | Divide by 1000 to obtain speed in Mbit    |
| Power (.01W)           | Number |   |
| Bandwidth (kB/s)       | Number | Measured speed                            |
| Average latency (us)   | Number |   |

**Table 49:** LAN Devices Benchmark (network cards)

| ID                      | Number | Component ID                              |
|-------------------------|--------|---|
| OsType                  | Text   | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| Platform                | Text   | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| Type/name of connection | Text   | Router/modem model                        |
| Interface speed (kbps)  | Number | Divide by 1000 to obtain speed in Mbit    |
| Power (.1W)             | Number | Obs: set as 0 for all records             |
| Bandwidth (kB/s)        | Number | Measured speed                            |
| Average latency (ms)    | Number |   |

**Table 50:** Internet Connection Benchmark - modems/routers performance

| ID                      | Number | Component ID                              |
|-------------------------|--------|---|
| OsType                  | Text   | Architecture type (x86 or x64)            |
| Platform                | Text   | Platform type (Desktop / Mobile / Server) |
| Type/name of connection | Text   | Router/modem model                        |
| Interface speed (kbps)  | Number | Divide by 1000 to obtain speed in Mbit    |
| Power (.01W)            | Number |   |
| Bandwidth (kB/s)        | Number | Measured speed                            |
| Average latency (us)    | Number |   |

**Table 51:** Wireless Modems/Routers Performance

## D.2 Measurement Tables

| Computer Model       | <i>Idle</i> with<br>monitor<br>on (W) | <i>Idle</i> with<br>monitor<br>off (W) | Estimated<br>Monitor<br>Power<br>(W) | Processor<br>fully<br>stressed |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el           | 28.57                                 | 25.19                                  | 3.38                                 | 35.64                          |
| HPdv6580el           | 62.18                                 | 57.14                                  | 5.04                                 | 85.27                          |
| Compaq-nx9420        | 78.89                                 | 74.65                                  | 4.24                                 | 79.64                          |
| Acer Aspire 6935g    | 38.67                                 | 33.76                                  | 4.91                                 | 55.39                          |
| Acer Aspire 4720z    | 44.57                                 | 39.88                                  | 4.69                                 | 67.28                          |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 44.48                                 | 39.56                                  | 4.92                                 | 62.83                          |
| HP dv6000            | 43.65                                 | 39.12                                  | 4.53                                 | 58.95                          |
| Toshiba              | 54.80                                 | 46.03                                  | 8.77                                 | 65.73                          |
| Fujitsu AMILO Pa2548 | 60.28                                 | 55.40                                  | 4.88                                 | 87.40                          |
| Samsung Q310         | 33.60                                 | 26.60                                  | 7.00                                 | 48.55                          |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 39.33                                 | 32.52                                  | 6.81                                 | 62.40                          |
| HP Pavilion dv6000   | 34.06                                 | 29.38                                  | 4.68                                 | 48.20                          |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N     | 52.44                                 | 45.67                                  | 6.77                                 | 81.65                          |
| HP Pavilion ze2000   | 37.48                                 | 31.48                                  | 6.00                                 | 58.34                          |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e   | 34.84                                 | 29.57                                  | 5.27                                 | 44.14                          |
| Asus F3 Series       | 47.63                                 | 38.98                                  | 8.65                                 | 50.33                          |
| HP 550               | 41.31                                 | 33.60                                  | 7.71                                 | 48.11                          |

**Table 52:** Measures made with the Energy Measurement Device

| Computer Model       | Processor Benchmark (W) | Cache & Memory Benchmark <sup>a</sup> (W) | Physical Disks Benchmark (W) |
|----------------------|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el           | 19.69                   | 26.69                                     | N/A                          |
| HPdv6580el           | 32.01                   | 40.06                                     | 2.00                         |
| Compaq-nx9420        | 26.93                   | 36.16                                     | N/A                          |
| Acer Aspire 6935g    | 28.03                   | 35.03                                     | N/A                          |
| Acer Aspire 4720z    | 19.78                   | 34.57                                     | N/A                          |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 25.13                   | 32.13                                     | N/A                          |
| HP dv6000            | 25.00                   | 34.23                                     | N/A                          |
| Toshiba              | 22.50                   | 31.24                                     | N/A                          |
| Fujitsu AMILO Pa2548 | N/A                     | N/A                                       | N/A                          |
| Samsung Q310         | 26.28                   | 33.28                                     | N/A                          |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | 38.60                   | 47.63                                     | N/A                          |
| HP Pavilion dv6000   | 12.95                   | 31.84                                     | N/A                          |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N     | 28.99                   | 49.68                                     | N/A                          |
| HP Pavilion ze2000   | 14.62                   | 17.86                                     | N/A                          |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e   | 35.08                   | 42.08                                     | N/A                          |
| Asus F3 Series       | 12.44                   | 28.53                                     | N/A                          |
| HP 550               | 29.63                   | 44.42                                     | N/A                          |

<sup>a</sup> chipset + processor + memory

N/A Not Returned a Valuable Result

Table 53: Measures Resulted from Benchmark with SANDRA

| Computer Model       | Processor Model                 |
|----------------------|---------------------------------|
| HPdv3500el           | Intel Core Duo P8400 @ 2.26GHz  |
| HPdv6580el           | Intel Core Duo T7300 @ 2.00GHz  |
| Compaq-nx9420        | Intel Core Duo T2400 @ 1.83 GHz |
| Acer Aspire 6935g    | Intel Core Duo T6400 @ 2.00GHz  |
| Acer Aspire 4720z    | Intel Core Duo T2310 @ 1.66 GHz |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | Intel Core 2 P7350 @ 2.0GHz     |
| HP dv6000            | Intel Core Duo T5600 @ 1.83GHz  |
| Toshiba              | Intel Core Duo T2300 @ 1.66 GHz |
| Fujitsu AMILO Pa2548 | AMD Turion 64 X2 TL-58 @ 1.9GHz |
| Samsung Q310         | Intel Core Duo P7350 @ 2.00GHz  |
| Acer Aspire 5930G    | Intel Core Duo T9400 @ 2.53GHz  |
| HP Pavilion dv6000   | Intel Core Duo T5450 @ 1.66GHz  |
| Sony Vaio SZ650N     | Intel Core Duo T7500 @ 2.20 GHz |
| HP Pavilion ze2000   | Intel Pentium M 1.60 GHz        |
| Sony Vaio v6nfw11e   | Intel Core Duo P8400 @ 2.26 GHz |
| Asus F3 Series       | Intel Core Duo T7300 @ 2.00GHz  |
| HP 550               | Intel Celeron 530 @ 1.73 GHz    |

Table 54: Processor Contained in each Measured Computer

| Processor Model                 | Processor<br>nominal power<br>(W) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Intel Core Duo P8400 @ 2.26GHz  | 25                                |
| Intel Core Duo T7300 @ 2.00GHz  | 35                                |
| Intel Core Duo T2400 @ 1.83 GHz | 31                                |
| Intel Core Duo T6400 @ 2.00GHz  | 35                                |
| Intel Core Duo T2310 @ 1.66 GHz | 35                                |
| Intel Core 2 P7350 @ 2.0GHz     | 25                                |
| Intel Core Duo T5600 @ 1.83GHz  | 34                                |
| Intel Core Duo T2300 @ 1.66 GHz | 31                                |
| AMD Turion 64 X2 TL-58 @ 1.9GHz | 31                                |
| Intel Core Duo P7350 @ 2.00GHz  | 25                                |
| Intel Core Duo T9400 @ 2.53GHz  | 35                                |
| Intel Core Duo T5450 @ 1.66GHz  | 35                                |
| Intel Core Duo T7500 @ 2.20 GHz | 35                                |
| Intel Pentium M 1.60 GHz        | 35                                |
| Intel Core Duo P8400 @ 2.26 GHz | 25                                |
| Intel Core Duo T7300 @ 2.00GHz  | 35                                |
| Intel Celeron 530 @ 1.73 GHz    | 27                                |

**Table 55:** Manufacturer Specification

## **D.3 Database Schema**




Figure 16: Database Schema