

# Leveraging Core and Uncore Frequency Scaling for Power-Efficient Serverless Workflows

Achilleas Tzenetopoulos  
National Technical University of Athens  
Athens, Greece

Sotirios Xydis  
National Technical University of Athens  
Athens, Greece

Dimosthenis Masouros  
National Technical University of Athens  
Athens, Greece

Dimitrios Soudris  
National Technical University of Athens  
Athens, Greece

## Abstract

Serverless workflows have emerged in FaaS platforms to represent the operational structure of traditional applications. With latency propagation effects becoming increasingly prominent, step-wise resource tuning is required to address the end-to-end Quality-of-Service (QoS) requirements. Modern processors' allowance for fine-grained Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS), coupled with the intermittent nature of serverless workflows presents a unique opportunity to reduce power while meeting QoS.

In this paper, we introduce a QoS-aware DVFS framework for serverless workflows.  $\Omega$ kypous regulates the end-to-end latency of serverless workflows by supplying to the system the Core/Uncore frequency combination that minimizes power consumption. With Uncore DVFS enriching the efficient power configurations space, we devise a grey-box model that accurately projects functions' execution latency and power, to the applied Core and Uncore frequency combination. To the best of our knowledge,  $\Omega$ kypous is the first work that leverages Core and Uncore DVFS as an integral part of serverless workflows. Our evaluation on the analyzed Azure Trace, against state-of-the-art (SotA) power managers, demonstrates an average power consumption reduction of 9% (up to 21%) while minimizing QoS violations.


## 1 Introduction

Serverless computing platforms (e.g., AWS Lambda [2], Microsoft Azure Functions [5], etc.) continue to grow in popularity, as they alleviate the complexities of infrastructure management and resource provisioning. Serverless relies on the execution of short-lived tasks (*functions*), which are orchestrated into dependency graph workflows (*chains*), thus, enabling the construction of complex applications through interconnected functions. These workflows are managed by backend services (e.g., AWS Step Functions [3], Alibaba Serverless Workflow [6], Azure Durable Functions [4], OpenWhisk [1]) which handle the triggering, execution sequencing, and resource management of each function.

The strategy of decomposing applications into short functions forms a key enabler for more fine-grained resource management policies, tailored to the unique characteristics of each function. As applications experience varying phases

throughout their lifecycle [33, 41], the intermittent nature of serverless workflows allows for “right-sizing” resources for each function, aligning with different optimization goals. While prior research has explored this for Quality-of-Service (QoS) guarantees [39, 43, 47, 56, 66], there is minimal focus on serverless computing's potential in managing power consumption. Notably, power consumption is increasingly significant for data center facilities providers [29, 37, 38], with operational expenses closely tied to the power needs of these facilities. For instance, Google incorporates CPU speed into their billing policies [59], and IBM has recently open-sourced a cloud-native power monitor [8, 12], indicating a growing awareness and need for efficient power management in serverless environments.

**Power management in the cloud:** From a system level perspective, power management in cloud infrastructures is commonly tackled through the implementation of Dynamic Voltage and Frequency Scaling (DVFS) techniques [17, 35, 65], the utilization of Asymmetric Multicore Processors (AMPs) [29] and the integration of sleep state management [19, 54, 61]. Numerous research efforts [17, 35, 65] focus on optimizing



**Figure 1.** UFS expands the Latency-Power Pareto front

power management without compromising QoS constraints, yet they typically target either single-stage (microservice-level) or monolithic deployments. Such approaches do not adequately account for second-level effects, intrinsic to serverless architectures, such as function-level timing slacks arising either from the execution of the function itself or from the latency propagation between interdependent functions [26, 57]. Moreover, these models predict power use and latency from the core's clock frequency, representing just about a third of a server's total power consumption [42].

However, with post-Haswell era Intel<sup>®</sup> processors offering independent frequency control for both the CPU core (CFS) and Uncore (UFS) components, there is a novel opportunity to further enhance infrastructure efficiency, through the coordinated configuration of CFS and UFS, allowing for a

more refined balance between performance and power consumption. Figure 1 shows the power - latency profile for a typical serverless function (*thumbnailer* [21]) when operating under differing CFS and UFS configurations. As shown, the coordinated selection of CFS & UFS reveals an expanded solution space of higher quality that i) completely dominates the conventional CFS solution, and ii) enables iso-latency configurations with up to 25% power gains.

**Harnessing the “power” of serverless functions:** The inherent flexibility and fine-granularity of serverless computing allows for a “just-right” approach, where resources are optimized to exactly meet QoS objectives, i.e., being *QoS-precise*. Coupled with the extended power/latency surface offered by CFS/UFS configurations, this strategy presents a significant opportunity for power savings through the careful adjustment of operating clock frequencies based on real-time performance metrics and workload characteristics. However, realizing this potential is not without challenges, as it necessitates sophisticated modeling to understand the performance and power impact of each setting at the function level (§3). The diverse resource requirements of serverless functions, along with their varied input workloads [46, 49, 52] make predicting latency and power consumption extremely challenging. Existing approaches [17, 65, 66] attempt to leverage latency estimation for QoS-constrained power management, but they face practical limitations. Some require detailed per-function modeling [17], while others assume a linear relationship between latency and frequency [65], or require multiple iterations for configuration updates [66]. Notably, according to Azure’s insights [62], serverless workflows’ invocation count may not be adequate to effectively train ML-based latency estimation models in a per-configuration manner. Hence, there is a need for practical, more mechanistic, less data-driven, and universally applicable approaches to address resource management requirements promptly.

**Our work.** In this paper, we present  $\Omega$ kypous, a novel, QoS-precise function-granular DVFS control framework that leverages the intermittent nature of serverless workflows to minimize power consumption while guaranteeing the end-to-end QoS requirement. We employ an adaptive frequency selection strategy for both the Core and Uncore components, tailored to each function in the workflow, based on the propagated latency up to the current stage.  $\Omega$ kypous uses a global gray-box model, to estimate with negligible error (7% MAPE) the latency and power consumption per configuration, to control the serverless chain propagated latency per stage, tuning the Core and Uncore frequency across the enriched solution space of configurations.  $\Omega$ kypous outperforms the related SotA in terms of QoS violations and power efficiency.

**Contributions.** Our main contributions are: i) Detailed analysis of the combined effects—latency and power consumption—of Core and Uncore frequency scaling on serverless computing functions, alongside a comparison with the

CPU-quota scaling approach. ii) We design a global gray-box model for estimating function latency that considers the dynamicity of both the Core and Uncore parts of the processor. iii) We introduce  $\Omega$ kypous, the first Core and Uncore frequency controller for QoS-precise serverless workflows. iv) We provide an extensive comparative evaluation study w.r.t. the respective SotA DVFS frameworks, validating the practicality and the effectiveness of  $\Omega$ kypous, showing its impressive capabilities in nearly eliminating QoS violations while achieving up to 21% power savings. v) In-depth characterization of  $\Omega$ kypous, including decomposition, noise assessment, and responsiveness analysis.

## 2 Related Work

**DVFS-enabled power management:** Various research efforts have been made to optimize the power consumption of latency-critical applications using DVFS [17, 31, 34, 38, 57, 65]. Pegasus [38] was one of the first works to use package-level power limit adjustments via RAPL for managing latency objectives in server systems, however, its coarse-grained approach and reliance on application-specific parameters limit its flexibility. In response, Rubik [34] and Adrenaline [31] shifted focus to request-level granularity in power management. However, Adrenaline’s reliance on application-level features for identifying long requests and Rubik’s conservative approach focusing on the tail of latency distributions render them unsuitable for diverse workload scenarios. More recently, Gemini [65] and Retail [17] proposed CFS-driven strategies again at request-level. Gemini relies on black-box, application-specific neural networks for request latency prediction, which can introduce huge overheads to the milliseconds requirements of serverless. On the other hand, Retail relies on linear regression techniques, which, although simpler and more generalizable, may not fully capture the dynamic nature of complex cloud environments. Despite their respective modeling limitations (which we further discuss in §5.1), all these works operate at microservice- or request-level granularity, overlooking the advantages presented by serverless computing. Moreover, their focus remains on CFS-driven mechanisms, leaving the impact of UFS on power management relatively unexplored. DVFaaS[57] is most probably the closest work to ours, which leverages the intermittent nature of serverless workflows to address their end-to-end latency requirements while minimizing power consumption. However, DVFaaS still relies on CFS-driven power management, while also following a reactive strategy for adjusting core frequencies based on slack propagation.

**QoS-aware strategies:** Several works have also been proposed to optimize resource allocation for latency-critical applications under QoS constraints [16, 44, 45, 51, 63]. While these works effectively address resource optimization to meet latency requirements, they do not focus on power management as a key optimization goal. Moreover, they operate

**Table 1.** Qualitative comparison between state-of-the-art and  $\Omega$ kypous

	Pegasus[38]	Gemini[65]	ReTail[17]	SeqClock[26]	Aquatope[66]	DVFaaS[57]	$\Omega$ kypous
<b>Modeling</b>	-	NN Classification	Linear Regression	-	Bayesian Optimization	-	Interpolation+LR
<b>Objective (s.t. QoS)</b>	Power Min.	Power Min.	Power Min.	CPU util. Min.	Cost Min.	Power Min.	Power Min.
<b>Technique</b>	RAPL	CFS	CFS	Core Scaling	Core Scaling	CFS	CFS & UFS
<b>Scope</b>	Service	Service	Service	Workflow	Workflow	Workflow	Workflow
$\mu$ arch-aware	X	X	X	X	X	X	✓
Propagation-aware	X	X	X	✓	X	✓	✓


at microservice-level, overseeing the opportunities offered by the serverless paradigm. Latest research efforts target explicitly serverless workflows, either considering the minimization of cost expenses [25, 43, 60, 66] or the regulation of the end-to-end latency [22, 26, 36, 47, 55, 64]. SeqClock[26] and Aquatope[66] are closely related to our work. However, while they employ CPU-quota scaling to meet QoS requirements in serverless workflows, they do not prioritize power optimization. SeqClock follows a function-agnostic, step-wise, closed-loop approach to regulate end-to-end execution latency of serverless workflows, while Aquatope [66] employs Bayesian Optimization to build black-box models that minimize CPU time usage while addressing the end-to-end QoS constraints. However, as we later show in §3, DVFS strategies appear to be a more suitable configuration knob for power management compared to CPU quotas.

**$\Omega$ kypous value & differentiators:**  $\Omega$ kypous introduces a practical DVFS approach that uses a single, lightweight global gray-box model to predict function execution latency, taking also into consideration the impact of frequency scaling on the Uncore parts (UFS) of the processor infrastructure. It adapts dynamically to any performance variability by utilizing closed-loop control for per-core DVFS, leveraging the by-design step-wise, fine-grained nature of serverless chains. It is designed for QoS precision, adapting to multiple levels of QoS requirements, while minimizing the power consumed. Table 1 summarizes the most closely related works, providing a qualitative comparison and the position of  $\Omega$ kypous with current state-of-the-art works.

### 3 DVFS strategies and Serverless: Open Challenges & Opportunities

**Challenge 1: Vertical CPU scaling vs. Core DVFS:** *Between CPU- and voltage/frequency-scaling knobs, which is the more effective and robust method for regulating execution time while minimizing power consumption?*

CPU-quota scaling has been used in recent studies for latency regulation of serverless workflows [26, 66]. To highlight the potential of CPU quotas compared to DVFS strategies, we examine their impact on power consumption and execution latency. Specifically, we conduct a detailed experiment across various serverless functions, evaluating the average latency and power consumption over 100 invocations. For CPU quotas, we allocate 8 vCPUs per function and we vary the quota limit within the range of 0.5 to 8, under the



**Figure 2.** Impact of CPU-quota and DVFS on the latency (90<sup>th</sup> percentile) and Power consumption of functions.


default frequency scaling policy (*ondemand* Linux governor). For DVFS, we only vary the core frequency component (CFS), within the range of 1.2 to 2.5 GHz and we allocate two vCPUs per function<sup>1</sup>, which is the most common configuration for serverless deployments [59]. The detailed experimental setup is described in §6.

Figure 2 shows the results, where we observe a notable trend in the comparison between CPU quotas and CFS. Interestingly, even though CPU quotas allow for more cores to be utilized, CFS reveals a similar range but with more fine-grained latency values while simultaneously achieving reduced power consumption. This suggests a more efficient trade-off between latency and power within the CFS approach. The observed increase in power consumption with larger CPU quotas is attributed to the operational characteristics of the *ondemand* governor, which dynamically scales the frequency up/down in response to changes in core utilization. Moreover, we also see that diverse applications exhibit substantial variations in their CPU quota requirements; for instance, *thumbnailer* demands as low as 0.5 CPU quota for achieving low-latency performance, while *graph-pagerank* requires as much as 2 CPU quota respectively. These disparities underscore the inherent challenges in achieving performance predictability and power proportionality.

► **Opportunity 1:** *DVFS is a more suitable configuration knob when the primary goal is power consumption reduction.*

**Challenge 2: Adequacy of existing frequency governors:** *Are the current DVFS policies sufficient for QoS-aware power management?* One of the key components of power

<sup>1</sup>Without loss of generality, for the rest of the paper, we consider two vCPUs available per function.



**Figure 3.** Impact of Core (x-axis) and Uncore frequency on tail latency and power consumption.

management in modern processors is the implementation of governors, which are software modules in the Linux kernel that control the frequency and voltage of the CPU based on system demand and power constraints. The four most common CPU governors are i) *powersave*, ii) *performance*, iii) *ondemand*, and iv) *conservative* available through the CPUFreq subsystem in Linux. To assess the impact of each governor on performance and power consumption, we sequentially invoke ten functions from [21] four separate times, each time using exclusively one of the aforementioned governors. Our findings indicate that *powersave* and *performance* governors anchor the CPU frequency at its minimum and maximum limits respectively. In contrast, the *ondemand* and *conservative* governors adjust the CPU frequency based on CPU utilization, with the latter showing a more gradual response to utilization changes, thereby promoting reduced power consumption. This analysis reveals that Linux governors behave identically regardless of any specified target QoS requirements, i.e., current DVFS governors in the Linux kernel are QoS-agnostic.

► **Opportunity 2:** A custom frequency scaling *userspace* policy can offer better integration with serverless frameworks, by enabling QoS-aware power-efficient policies, tailored to function-specific characteristics.

**Challenge 3: Investigating functions’ performance sensitivity under Core- & Uncore-Frequency Scaling** Next, we examine the impact of CFS and UFS on the latency and power consumption of serverless functions. Specifically, we deploy the *thumbnailer* and *video processing* functions from [21] and measure their tail latency and power consumption for various configurations of the Core and Uncore frequencies available in our system (as described later in §5.5). Figure 12 summarizes the results, where the green-shaded lines indicate the configured Uncore frequency level. The red line represents the system-managed UFS (default configuration), which utilizes Intel®’s firmware to vary the Uncore frequency dynamically according to the CPU usage [28, 30]. Based on these outcomes, we answer two fundamental questions:


1) *Is direct linear proportionality between Core frequency and latency a reasonably safe assumption?* Prior research [19, 34, 65] assume linear proportionality between application latency and applied core frequency. For example, Gemini [65] calculates latency values at different frequency levels by assuming that the product of latency and frequency remains constant. However, as demonstrated in Fig. 3a the relationship between CFS and latency varies per function. For example, in the case of *video-processing*, scaling the Core frequency from 1.2GHz to 2.5GHz results in  $\approx 50\%$  tail latency reduction while in *thumbnailer* it is only improved by 30%. Therefore, given the considerable variability in the frequency-to-latency relationship across different serverless functions, relying on a linear (one-to-one) proportionality is not a universally applicable assumption. However, as depicted in Fig. 1, UFS allows for leveraging iso-latency configurations for lower power consumption. Notably, in the 2.5GHz core frequency scenario, when explicitly applying UFS, power consumption is reduced by 23.5%, with the latency degrading by only 0.3%, 10% for the *thumbnailer* and *video-processing* respectively.

► **Opportunity 3:** *Better modeling strategies should be devised to enable the exploitation of the extended range of execution latencies provided by distinct UF values, thus permitting QoS-precise tuning and allowing for power savings.*

**Challenge 4: Functions’ latency modeling under DVFS**

Recently, Azure released a trace dataset [62] from its datacenter, comprising invocations of 424 distinct functions recorded over a two-week period. As illustrated in Figure 4, half of these functions were invoked less than 30 times during the provided time period, highlighting the existence of “small-data” scenarios in serverless. Given the variability in input sizes within serverless computing [46], models must be adept at predicting latency for diverse configurations. This observation pinpoints the need for latency estimation models that are accurate yet lightweight, offering efficient retraining capabilities and low-overhead inference suitable for such “small-data” contexts. Unfortunately, in the context of predictive methodologies this is not yet the case, e.g., Retail [17] requires at least one execution for each function and each available frequency configuration (under fixed input sizes).

► **Opportunity 4:** *The huge design space formed by the CFS/UFS knobs and the diverse workload characteristics of serverless functions, compounded by the inherent scarcity of data, necessitates the adoption of global and lightweight performance modeling approaches.*



**Figure 4.** Function invocation count CDF from Azure Trace [62].



## 4 Ωkypous: Problem formulation


**Ωkypous Rationale:** Ωkypous relies on the intermittent nature of serverless workflows, with its core idea being to leverage *slack propagation* effects between functions. This approach enables the system to explore optimal CFS/UFS configurations for each function, ensuring power consumption is minimized while closely satisfying target latency QoS constraints, i.e., being *QoS-precise*. Figure 5 shows a simplified motivational example, which considers a serverless chain consisting of 5 functions and a conditional branch. In this case, the target QoS corresponds to the worst-case scenario, i.e., the cumulative latencies of each function that forms part of the critical path. However, during actual execution, the observed latency can deviate, leading to *negative* and *positive timing slacks*, which then propagate through the entire workflow. Negative slacks, indicating delays, can be a result of noise effects e.g. interference [16, 64], or inaccuracies in latency predictions [65, 66]. Positive slacks, which imply time saved, may result from similar latency prediction errors or system noise. The intermittent nature of serverless workflows facilitates the identification of timing slacks, which can be strategically utilized to apply “just-enough” frequency to each function. This approach can optimize power consumption while closely adhering to target QoS constraints (*QoS-precision*).

**Power efficiency subject to QoS:** Power consumption is a critical concern for modern cloud infrastructures, with power capping being a first-class strategy followed in high-end data centers [37, 38]. Ωkypous optimizes power consumption of serverless workflows under QoS constraints by targeting the following problem specification:

$$\min_k \sum_{k=1}^n P_k, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad L(f_1, \dots, f_k, \dots, f_n) \leq T \quad (1)$$

Specifically, for a workflow comprising of  $n$  functions, we aim to minimize the power consumed per function  $P_k$ , while preserving the end-to-end QoS latency requirement or latency target  $-L(f_1, \dots, f_k, \dots, f_n) \leq T$ .

**Pre-deployment Latency Budgeting:** To project this high-level objective to our problem, we need first to employ a latency budgeting model, i.e., a mechanism to distribute the workflow’s end-to-end latency budget to several per-function latency constraints. As shown in the top of Figure 7, a serverless workflow can be represented as a DAG of functions. DAG’s execution is dynamic, thus most of the time the execute paths are defined during runtime, based on the output of the intermediate functions. Nevertheless, a DAG can be decomposed in several mutually exclusive paths, as shown in the same Figure (left part of pre-deployment phase). To construct the latency budgeting model, given the end-to-end latency constraint  $T$ , we need first to consider every possible serverless chain or path  $i$ . We calculate the critical path (CP)  $\max_i \sum \min l_k^i$ , based on the maximum end-to-end




**Figure 5.** *Slack propagation* management for *QoS-precise* power-efficient workflow execution.

execution time of chains, considering the sum of the minimum latency  $l_k$  that can be achieved per function  $k$ . Given the various DVFS strategies of each function  $k$  we can select any combination of target function latency  $t_k$  that i) meets the end-to-end requirement  $T (\geq CP)$ , and minimizes the slack, or deviation from the target  $T$ :

$$\sum_{k=1}^n t_k \leq T_n, \quad \min_i T_n - \sum_{k=1}^n t_k \quad (2)$$

This procedure allows us to define the QoS target latency  $t_k^{CP}$  per function  $k$  that resembles the chain of the critical path (right part of pre-deployment in Figure 7).

**Dynamic Latency Budgeting:** Based on the DAG representation and the established per-function latency budgeting, Ωkypous dynamically adjusts the budgeted latency per function at runtime, taking into account *slacks* propagated from previous functions. To avoid speculation and the corresponding misprediction costs [55], we adopt a less aggressive strategy (see §5.2) that tries to meet the accumulated QoS requirement up to the current stage of the workflow. For example, in the DAG of Figure 5, after function  $f_2$  returns and  $f_4$  is determined as the next function to be invoked after the conditional branch, we have to select a configuration for the execution of function  $f_4$  that will meet the following objectives: i)



**Figure 6.** Fan-Out / Fan-In scenario.

ii) remain under the QoS constraint at stage 4 and ii) minimize the power consumed. We note that the adopted dynamic time budgeting approach methodology remains consistent and applies also to the Fan-out/Fan-in serverless workflow scenario. For instance, considering the workflow in Fig. 6, we choose a configuration that effectively mitigates the accumulated slack for each one of the concurrent functions  $f_{1-n}^1$ , while minimizing power consumption.

## 5 Ωkypous Design

Ωkypous addresses the problem of *QoS-precise* power management for serverless workflows. We design Ωkypous based on the opportunities identified in §3, by leveraging advanced DVFS, i.e., cooperative CFS and UFS, as the knob to drive optimization. Figure 7 shows an overview of Ωkypous design, which we analyze in the remainder of this section.

### 5.1 Latency & Power modeling

Serverless functions exhibit significant dynamicity in their configurations, both in terms of hyperparameters (e.g., compression rates for video processing) as well as in the size of inputs, which can vary greatly across different invocations. Given this variability, an effective latency estimation model must be capable of capturing such parameters to make accurate predictions. To this end, Ωkypous employs a two-staged, lightweight modeling approach, that leverages hardware performance monitoring counters (PMCs), a practice commonly used in data centers [58], which provides a prominent way to characterize system performance and guide decision-making [13, 40]. The first step maps the impact of varying payload sizes to these performance counters. The gathered data are then utilized by a grey-box model, which integrates mechanistic insights with theoretical principles, to predict the latency and power consumption of serverless functions under various Core and Uncore frequency settings. Opposed to previous approaches that often require a distinct model for each function and frequency configuration [17], or rely on a direct proportionality assumption between frequency and latency [65], Ωkypous employs a global modeling strategy. Specifically, driven by *Opportunity 4*, we construct a single model that is applicable across all functions, enhancing its efficiency and scalability in diverse serverless environments.

**5.1.1 Payload to PMCs interpolation:** The performance of functions is highly affected by variations in the size of input data. The data size can reflect the number of nodes in graph processing or the byte size in image processing. To identify which input knob influences function latency, a preliminary correlation analysis is required [17]. Indicatively, Figure 8a shows the measured execution time of *graph-bfs*, *dynamic-html* and *dna-viz* functions under the selected scaled payload sizes. As depicted, the execution time of these functions exhibits a linear scaling behavior relative to the payload size, with the execution variability increasing for higher payload sizes. Still, representing payload size in a global modeling approach can be challenging. Due to the diversity of input types across functions – both in terms of size and content – it becomes impractical to encode payload size into a unified scale. Moreover, categorizing payload sizes, such as mapping sizes to discrete labels (e.g., notate datasets under 1MB as “small”), not only restricts the model to a discrete space but also fails to provide flexibility for interpolating to unseen payloads.




Figure 7. Ωkypous overview.

To address this challenge, we employ a strategy where different payload sizes are mapped to their corresponding PMCs under a default Core/Uncore frequency configuration<sup>2</sup>. These PMC mappings are then utilized by our grey-box model (refer to Section 5.1.2) to make predictions for other frequencies. PMCs allow to have unified and function-agnostic interpretation of payload sizes, while they closely correlate with both payload size and execution time of functions. Figure 8c shows the Pearson correlation [20] of all the collected PMC with the payload size and execution time of each function. As shown, despite the different functionality and runtime behavior of the three examined functions, there is a set of important PMCs, e.g. Figure 8c, that exhibit high correlations (>0.7) w.r.t. payload size, thus allowing PMCs to characterize the payload-related latency values.

Specifically, Ωkypous maintains a meta-data table that records the PMCs from previous executions of each function, where each entry is associated with its corresponding payload size. In instances where Ωkypous encounters a new request with a payload size not previously observed, the system estimates its PMCs by performing a linear interpolation based on the nearest data points available in the meta-data table. Figure 8c evaluates the interpolation’s achieved accuracy over the overall function set of Ωkypous. As shown, the proposed interpolation scheme manages to deliver high accuracy over PMCs of high and moderate predictive importance<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup>For simplicity and without loss of generality, we set the default frequency to 1.4GHz for both Core and Uncore components.

<sup>3</sup>We characterize PMCs’ importance by the amplitude of the weights derived after training the linear interpolation model.

with MAPE ranging between 0.01-0.05. Last,  $\Omega$ kypous considers functions with different hyperparameters (e.g., compression rate in compression function) as separate entries in the meta-data table, i.e., different functions.

**5.1.2 Grey-box modeling of latency and power.** After estimating the PMCs for the invoked function we use them as a means to predict the execution latency<sup>4</sup> under different CF, and UF configurations. We employ a single grey-box model that formulates execution latency as a function of the Core  $F^c$ , Uncore  $F^u$ , and DRAM frequencies  $F^d$ , and total number of cycles  $W^c$ ,  $W^u$ ,  $W^d$  concluded on Core, Uncore, and DRAM parts. Prior research [18, 24, 50] has shown that execution latency depends on the workload distributed across the CPU, the on-chip memory, and the off-chip DRAM memory components, thus it can be modeled as:

$$L(F^c, F^u) = \frac{W^c}{F^c} + \frac{W^u}{F^u} + \frac{W^d}{F^d} \quad (3)$$

However, accurately counting the Core, Uncore and DRAM working cycles on a superscalar architecture is a quite complex procedure. To this end, we transform Equation 3 to represent  $W^c$ ,  $W^u$ ,  $W^d$  as the sum of relevant PMCs over time<sup>5</sup>. Specifically, for each function, we map  $W^c$ ,  $W^u$ ,  $W^d$  to the PMCs of the default CF,UF frequency ( $F_{base}^c, F_{base}^u$ ) configuration (§5.1.1). Based on this, Equation 3 is transformed to the following:

$$L(F^c, F^u) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N c_i \cdot P_i^c}{F^c} + \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N u_i \cdot P_i^u}{F^u} + \sum_{i=1}^N d_i \cdot P_i^d \quad (4)$$

In our model,  $P_i^c, P_i^u, P_i^d$  represent the PMCs chosen to reflect the working cycles of the Core, Uncore, and DRAM components, respectively. The weights of each PMC in modeling the working cycles ( $W^c, W^u, W^d$ ) are denoted by  $c_i, u_i, d_i$ . We carefully select the most relevant PMCs for each component based on correlation analysis and insightful information for current literature [15]. To determine the coefficients  $c_i, u_i, d_i$ , we employ regression analysis. Specifically, we examine various regression methods including Linear Regression, Decision Trees, and Extreme Gradient Boosting (xgBoost). We asses each method by evaluating the end-to-end case, i.e., we test each models with function/payload pairs not encountered during training. The PMCs for these payloads are calculated using interpolation (§5.1.1) and are propagated to our grey box model to estimate the final latency. Table 2 shows the respective results per regression approach and per examined function (§6), by reporting the Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE). As shown, there is no clear

<sup>4</sup>A similar approach is also followed for power modeling.

<sup>5</sup>Due to our hardware (§6) not supporting DRAM frequency scaling, we treat its impact as constant value in our design.

**Table 2.** End-to-End MAPE (%) for different regressors.

	vp	dh	cmp	ir	gb	gp	gm	th	dv
LR	1.8	14.8	<b>9.6</b>	3.7	<b>9.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>4.9</b>	5.5	<b>3.3</b>
DT	<b>0.7</b>	19.2	16.5	<b>0.8</b>	16.7	2.9	14.7	7.4	15.9
XGB	0.8	<b>13.4</b>	14.8	1.4	12.7	4.5	6.1	9	15.3

winner among the examined cases. However, Linear Regression present the more robust MAPE across all cases and also provides the lowest error in the majority of the cases.

## 5.2 Adaptive controller

$\Omega$ kypous targets serverless DAGs, which are composed of multiple functions. Each function is deployed and serves users' requests without reporting any application-level metrics related to performance, during the execution. Thus, to avoid function-specific configurations for checkpointing, and extra overhead induction, the reporting interval is equal to the function serving time. Exploiting this opportunity, we employ a closed-loop controller, that is activated between function invocations. Let  $t_k$  be the QoS-target latency and  $l_k$  be the actual measured latency, for the function in stage  $k$  of the serverless chain. In Eq.5 we define the cumulative (up to stage  $k$ ) target  $T_k$ , measured  $L_k$  latency as well as the violation time or slack  $V_k$ .

$$T_k = \sum_{i=1}^k t_i, \quad L_k = \sum_{i=1}^k l_i, \quad V_k = T_k - L_k \quad (5)$$


Considering the target control loop,  $L$  forms the process variable,  $T$  is the setpoint, and  $V$  forms the error. We design our controller according to two principles: i) rigorously restrain the system from any cumulative QoS-target violation ( $V(k) \leq 0$ ), and ii) minimize the area between measured and target QoS, i.e., the unexploited latency slack overtime ( $\min \sum_{i=1}^k V(i) \times l(i)$ ). The output of the controller is  $u(k) = K_p V(k-1)$ , where  $K_p$  is the proportional gain, which is adjusted dynamically as a function of  $V(k-1)$  according to Eq. 6.

$$K_p = \begin{cases} R & \text{if } V(k-1) > 0 \\ r_1 V(k-1)^2 + r_2 V(k-1) + r_3 & \text{if } V(k-1) \leq 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $R$  is a constant to overcome any violation as soon as possible, while  $r_1, r_2, r_3$  are parameters, extracted through a grid search approach, that construct the quadratic function.

## 5.3 Conflict Resolver

The Conflict Resolver component is designed to efficiently manage DVFS conflicts arising from differing frequency requirements among concurrently running functions. Conflicts most commonly occur within the shared Uncore components on a per-socket basis but can also emerge in scenarios where



**Figure 8.** a) Impact of different payload sizes on the execution time of serverless functions. b) Pearson correlation of all the examined hardware performance counters with the payload size of each function. c) Interpolation error (MAPE) for the most important PMCs, as designated by the LR regressor (§5.1.2).

different functions are co-located on the same physical cores. To manage these conflicts, the Conflict Resolver employs two priority queues: one for Core frequency requests (CFS) and another for Uncore frequency requests (UFS). In these queues, priorities are assigned based on frequency values, with higher frequencies receiving higher priority. When the Adaptive Controller submits a new CF/UF configuration, the Conflict Resolver adds these frequency values to the corresponding priority queues. It then checks whether the highest-priority frequency in the queue is lower than any frequency currently requested by the running functions. If so, the existing frequencies are maintained to avoid disrupting the ongoing operations of these functions (Fig. ??). However, if a new, higher-priority frequency request appears in the queue, suggesting no conflict with running functions, the Conflict Resolver then signals for these new frequencies to be applied to the system (Fig. ??). If the queues are empty, the lowest frequencies are applied. This hierarchical approach ensures that frequency changes are appropriately adjusted, respecting the operational requirements of all active functions.

#### 5.4 Discussion

◊ *How does  $\Omega$ kypous deal with performance variability errors due to mispredictions, performance variability and/or queuing effects?* Except for latency mispredictions, applications co-location can introduce resource interference, potentially leading to performance variability. Consequently, the additional latency overhead denoted as  $E$  arising from this variability has the potential to adversely affect the overall end-to-end latency of the serverless workflow.  $\Omega$ kypous, by employing the adaptive controller, can reactively mitigate any latency overhead, taking it into account in the slack calculation:  $V(k) = T_k - (L_k) + E(k) \Rightarrow V'(k) = V(k) + E(k) = T(k) - L(k)$ .

◊ *How does  $\Omega$ kypous handle cold-start effects?*  $\Omega$ kypous does not provide a component that directly manages cold-starts. Nevertheless, the Azure trace reveals that the execution time of functions deployed on their premises greatly varies from seconds to minutes [53, 62]. In cases of workflows comprising long-running functions, cold-starts can be eliminated

through *slack* management, as described in §4. On the contrary, in cases of serverless chains containing short running functions,  $\Omega$ kypous can be integrated with frameworks targeted on mitigating cold start latency [27, 48, 66] by proactively pre-warming functions. These approaches address an orthogonal problem to ours, primarily focusing on minimizing idle resource usage.

#### 5.5 $\Omega$ kypous Implementation

We implemented  $\Omega$ kypous as an extension of Apache Openwhisk [1] over a Kubernetes [14] resource orchestrator.

**Storage:** We utilize MinIO [9] object storage to store inputs/outputs of functions. MinIO is deployed on a remote node, to account for network overheads for data fetching [36].

**Core/Uncore DVFS:** We deploy one agent on each physical server, which receives requests and applies the corresponding Core and Uncore frequencies. Each agent exposes an HTTP endpoint by utilizing the Flask [7] web framework, which can be consumed by the Conflict Resolver to alter the respective frequency configuration. Our Intel® server (§6), offers *userspace* per-core scaling configuration, i.e., per-core DVFS. To specify the desired core frequency explicitly, we disable the default scaling driver `intel_pstate` and utilize the `acpi_cpufreq`. We select the *userspace* as the scaling governor and change the frequency per core through the `sysfs` entry `/sys/devices/system/cpu/cpuX/cpufreq/scaling_setspeed`. The available frequency range is between 1.2GHz and 2.2GHz (2.5GHz turbo), while the minimum step for core frequency increments is 100MHz. The frequency changes through system calls require  $40\mu\text{s}$ . Uncore frequency scaling is exposed via the model-specific register (UFS MSR in address 0x620) low-level processor interface. For our architecture, the minimum and the maximum Uncore frequency are 1.2GHz and 2.9GHz, respectively, while the minimum step is 100MHz.

**Core Pinning:** We ensure a one-to-one mapping between serverless functions and Core frequencies by allocating specific vCPUs for each function, with each vCPU mapped to a physical core on the server. This process is managed through a Pub/Sub system using RabbitMQ [11]. Function-to-core mappings are published during function deployment and






Figure 9. Serverless functions 95<sup>th</sup> percentile latency on varying request per second (rps) and concurrency levels.

consumed by agents on the virtual hosts, which pin functions to designated cores using Docker’s `cpuset-cpus` flag.

**Latency, Power & PMC Monitoring:** The latency per function is inherently measured in the core logic of  $\Omega$ kypous between consequent invocations. Moreover, power consumption is monitored through the RAPL-based [23] Intel® Performance Counter Monitor[10] in 20ms intervals. Last, for PMCs collection, we deploy one agent per physical host, which is triggered through a separate endpoint on the physical servers, and monitors the performance events of each core on the system using `linux-perf`.

## 6 Experimental Setup

**Examined Infrastructure:** We deploy four VMs with 10 vCPUs and 16GB each, on top of two Intel® Xeon® E5-2658A servers, a common setup found in public serverless solutions [59]. We pin each VM on a separate socket to allow for granular Uncore frequency, as described in §5.5. We also disable Hyper-Threading, as CFS is applied per physical core.

**Target Benchmarks:** We employ 8 different functions from the Serverless-Benchmark-Suite [21], which represent typical serverless workloads and align with previous studies [53, 62]. Specifically, we utilize the following functions: *video-processing* (*vp*), *dynamic-html* (*dh*), *compression* (*cmp*), *img-class* (*ic*), *graph-bfs* (*gb*), *graph-pagerank* (*gp*), *graph-mst* (*gm*), *thumbnailer* (*th*) and *dna-visualization* (*dv*). We configured a vCPU limit of 2 cores per function, in line with the median configuration reported in [32]. This setting also enables us to include scenarios of core co-location due to the imposed vCPU cap. Moreover, based on these functions, we generate different workflows by building different permutations to simulate realistic workflow variability, including chain, fan-out/in, and mixed compositions. The lengths of these workflows are modeled based on distribution patterns reported for applications running on Azure [53].

**Workflow QoS calculation:** To establish the target QoS for each workflow, our initial step is to determine the maximum input load that each function can sustain. This is achieved by starting with a low request-per-second (RPS) rate and gradually increasing the request rates for each function across various levels of concurrency using the *ondemand* frequency governor. We continue this process until reaching


a saturation point. This point is characterized by an “explosion” in tail latency indicating that the RPS has exceeded the system’s capacity to handle requests effectively. Figure 9 presents the results for each function under varying RPS and concurrency levels. Each cell represents the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile latency for its corresponding RPS and concurrency level, and cells with blue borders highlight the maximum RPS that each function can handle. To define the QoS for each workflow, we calculate the cumulative 95<sup>th</sup> percentile latency of all functions comprising the workflow. Additionally, the maximum load that the workflow can sustain is determined by identifying the lowest RPS among the functions within it.

**Load generation and deployment approach:** We generate load to our system by utilizing invocation traces sourced from Azure [62]. These traces, available in the latest Azure Public Dataset, are labeled according to their associated applications. We define an application invocation as the initial invocation of the first function within each application. In our evaluation of  $\Omega$ kypous, we opted for a methodology distinct from downsampling, which would entail sacrificing trace granularity at a finer time scale [32]. We employed time series K-means clustering on individual segments, each spanning 60 seconds to create ten clusters. This approach allows us to preserve the dynamicity of the traces while facilitating the identification of key patterns and behaviors[32]. We omit the clusters indicating inactivity (cluster 0), and the ones that are found only on single-stage applications (cluster 7). Figure 10a shows the barycenters of each cluster, showing the different invocation patterns identified through the clustering approach. Last, we down-scale the invocation rate, to be consistent with the maximum RPS described in Figure 9. To generate invocation requests, we sample segments from each of the eight remaining clusters, to construct an experimental scenario of 160 minutes. For each selected sample, we use serverless workflows of the same length as the one reported in the trace, using random permutations of serverless functions, as described above.


## 7 Evaluation

### 7.1 $\Omega$ kypous vs power management schemes

In this section, we quantitatively compare  $\Omega$ kypous efficiency w.r.t. other power management schemes. Figure 10



(a) Barycenter Analysis Derived from K-Means Clustering of 60-Second Segments in Azure Trace Data [62].



(b) Exploring the performance of Linux frequency governors and state-of-the-art power managers, alongside  $\Omega$ kypous, across various clusters. The figure showcases distributions of QoS Precision (top) and Power (bottom) observed during invocations of serverless workflows within each examined cluster.

**Figure 10.** Comparative analysis of  $\Omega$ kypous with other power management governors for different invocation patterns, as derived from the Azure Trace dataset [62].

presents aggregated results of our experiment regarding to each examined cluster of the Azure Trace. The top row of Figure 10b shows the distributions of the tail latency (95<sup>th</sup> percentile) normalized to the QoS target for each workflow. In the second row, we plot the distributions of power consumption during the execution of the sampled workflows for each cluster. In the bottom of Fig. 10, we depict the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of power consumption.

**Typical Power Management Schemes:** We assess two Linux frequency governors, *ondemand* and *conservative*, excluding *performance* and *powersave* for their static frequency settings, leading to high power consumption or QoS violations. *Ondemand*, the default governor, exhibits inefficient power usage, while *conservative*, with a less aggressive frequency fluctuation, shows improved consumption. significantly enhances power efficiency, reducing consumption by an average of 16% and 11% compared to *ondemand* and *conservative*, respectively. This improvement is more pronounced in scenarios with lenient QoS requirements or the omitted (almost inactive) cluster trace.

**State-of-the-art power managers:** Next, we compare  $\Omega$ kypous with the strategies of two SotA CFS-based power managers. Gemini [65] and ReTail [17] are designed to manage distinct micro-services. To transform their implementation to the serverless workflow setup we consider two different approaches. First, we implement them considering the entire serverless workflow as a single service (*ReTail*, *Gemini*), which is managed as a whole. Second, we implement them

in a decomposed manner, in which each serverless function is managed independently by a separate controller (*ReTail+*, *Gemini+*). For the latency estimations, we use the average values of the measured execution times (for each frequency level for ReTail, and the base frequency for Gemini).

**QoS-violations:** As depicted in Fig. 10, Gemini and Retail exhibit QoS-precise end-to-end latency in certain clusters (3 and 9) with the chosen frequency. However, performance variability arises from the diverse functions and I/O inter-communication overheads, leading to performance variability that cannot be anticipated at the initiation of the workflow. Gemini presents the most violations, occurred from the inaccurate methodology (assuming linear proportionality).

**Power consumption:**  $\Omega$ kypous improves power consumption up to 17% and 18% (9% and 16% on average) compared to Retail and Gemini respectively, as shown in Fig. 10 The factors that lead to this result include: i) The more fine-grained power management enabled by application decomposition into functions. ii) The introduction of UFS management which furtherly reduces power consumption as discussed in §7.2. Notably, as shown in the bottom of Fig. 10, the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of power, is reduced up to 21% compared to Retail. This would allow for cluster-wide power-capping (RAPL) strategies without increasing the QoS violations.

## 7.2 $\Omega$ kypous characterization

**Responsiveness to change:** To further explore the operational dynamics of  $\Omega$ kypous, particularly in terms of its

ability to manage Core and Uncore frequencies under different conditions, we have developed a specific serverless workflow. We execute this workflow under varying request-per-second (RPS) levels and tested against three distinct Quality of Service (QoS) levels. Figure 11 illustrates these experiments, showing the tail latency corresponding to each QoS constraint (indicated by red lines) along with the fluctuations in Core and Uncore frequencies over time as RPS increases. The results demonstrate that the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile latency consistently stays below the pre-set QoS thresholds, showing  $\Omega$ kypous’s effectiveness in satisfying QoS requirements through its DVFS strategies. Notably, we observe a correlation between higher frequency values and stricter QoS requirements. Specifically, both Core and Uncore frequency exhibit an upward trends in their distributions as the RPS intensifies and the QoS targets become more demanding. Particularly under the strictest QoS constraint (right figure), we also observe instances where  $\Omega$ kypous maintains low Core frequencies, highlighting the significant role of Uncore Frequency in latency regulation.

**Impact of UF management:** At next, we evaluate the additive impact of UFS management. We implement a CFS-only version of  $\Omega$ kypous ( $\Omega$ kypous-CFS), which only manages the Core frequency. In Fig. 12a, based on the Azure Trace clusters (Fig. 10a), we compare the power distributions of the two solutions across all clusters. As shown, we separate the power consumption on DRAM and PROC components. The spikes in power (in time windows equal to each workflow’s execution time) are further decreased by  $\approx 15\%$ . The average value is decreased by 5%/3% for DRAM, and PROC. With  $\Omega$ kypous-CFS, similar to  $\Omega$ kypous, addressing the QoS requirements, the application of strategies such as power capping in both components (DRAM, PROC) would be a better fit for the UFS-enabled version.

**Resilience to execution noise:** We further evaluate the  $\Omega$ kypous controller’s ability to mitigate noise injected during the workflow execution. Figure 12b, illustrates the QoS latency violations on different noise levels (x-axis), applied on different fractions of the workflows (y-axis), on two different workflow types that could affect the result (right/left skewed). The left-skewed workflow, which concentrates the relatively larger latencies at the end of the workflow can adhere to the QoS requirement almost for every noise level when applied to half of the functions. On the other hand, for the right-skewed workflows, any error is harder to compensate since  $\Omega$ kypous does not have available many control steps to absorb the injected noise. In such cases, strategies such as dynamic QoS target adaptation [17] or PMC resampling are required.

**$\Omega$ kypous overhead:** The model prediction latency, the frequency determination, and the time required for the frequency to take effect are all included in the evaluation experiments. More specifically, the interpolation and the *perf*




Figure 11.  $\Omega$ kypous Responsiveness.




Figure 12. Characterization.

metrics pre-processing required 3-15ms, while the inference for latency and power required 2-5ms in total for all the configurations. The conflict resolver requires in total 10-20ms to apply the desired frequency to the remote node before and/or after the function invocation.

## 8 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced  $\Omega$ kypous, a novel QoS-precise DVFS framework for serverless workflows.  $\Omega$ kypous addresses the growing prominence of latency propagation effects in serverless architectures by employing closed-loop control to regulate end-to-end latency while minimizing power consumption through the optimized adjustment of Core and Uncore frequency combinations. A grey-box modeling approach is introduced to accurately predict execution latency and guide the coordinated CFS/UFS control decisions. We thoroughly evaluate  $\Omega$ kypous over the recently released Azure Trace data and we showed that  $\Omega$ kypous consistently outperforms state-of-the-art power managers, achieving up to 21% improved power usage on average compared to state-of-the-art power management schemes, while minimizing QoS violations and being resilient to external noise injection.

## References

- [1] Apache openwhisk: Open source serverless cloud platform. <https://openwhisk.apache.org/>. Accessed: October 31th, 2021.
- [2] Aws lambda: Run code without thinking about servers or clusters. <https://aws.amazon.com/lambda/>. Accessed: October 31th, 2023.
- [3] Aws step functions. Website.
- [4] Azure durable functions. <https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/azure-functions/durable/durable-functions-overview>.

- [5] Azure functions. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/products/functions>. Accessed: October 31th, 2024.
- [6] CloudfLOW: Visualization, o&m-free orchestration, and coordination of stateful application scenarios. <https://www.alibabacloud.com/product/serverless-workflow>. Accessed: October 31th, 2021.
- [7] Flask. <https://flask.palletsprojects.com/>. Accessed: October 31th, 2023.
- [8] Kepler: Efficient power monitoring for kubernetes. <https://next.redhat.com/2023/08/22/introducing-kepler-efficient-power-monitoring-for-kubernetes/>. Accessed: November 3rd, 2023.
- [9] Minio: High performance, kubernetes native object storage. <https://min.io/>. Accessed: October 31th, 2023.
- [10] Processor counter monitor (pcm). <https://github.com/opcm/pcm>. (Accessed: October 31th, 2023).
- [11] Rabbitmq: Open-source message broker. <https://www.rabbitmq.com/>. Accessed: November 2nd, 2023.
- [12] Marcelo Amaral, Huamin Chen, Tatsuhiko Chiba, Rina Nakazawa, Sunyanan Choochothaew, Eun Kyung Lee, and Tamar Eilam. Kepler: A framework to calculate the energy consumption of containerized applications. In *2023 IEEE 16th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 69–71. IEEE, 2023.
- [13] Ricardo Bianchini, Marcus Fontoura, Eli Cortez, Anand Bonde, Alexandre Muzio, Ana-Maria Constantin, Thomas Moscibroda, Gabriel Magalhaes, Girish Bablani, and Mark Russinovich. Toward ml-centric cloud platforms. *Communications of the ACM*, 63(2):50–59, 2020.
- [14] Brendan Burns, Brian Grant, David Oppenheimer, Eric Brewer, and John Wilkes. Borg, omega, and kubernetes. *Queue*, 14(1):70–93, 2016.
- [15] Jing Chen, Madhavan Manivannan, Bhavishya Goel, and Miquel Pericàs. Joss: Joint exploration of cpu-memory dvfs and task scheduling for energy efficiency. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04615*, 2023.
- [16] Shuang Chen, Christina Delimitrou, and José F Martínez. Parties: Qos-aware resource partitioning for multiple interactive services. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 107–120, 2019.
- [17] Shuang Chen, Angela Jin, Christina Delimitrou, and José F Martínez. Retail: Opting for learning simplicity to enable qos-aware power management in the cloud. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 155–168. IEEE, 2022.
- [18] Kihwan Choi, Ramakrishna Soma, and Massoud Pedram. Fine-grained dynamic voltage and frequency scaling for precise energy and performance tradeoff based on the ratio of off-chip access to on-chip computation times. *IEEE transactions on computer-aided design of integrated circuits and systems*, 24(1):18–28, 2004.
- [19] Chih-Hsun Chou, Laxmi N Bhuyan, and Daniel Wong.  $\mu$ dpm: Dynamic power management for the microsecond era. In *2019 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 120–132. IEEE, 2019.
- [20] Israel Cohen, Yiteng Huang, Jingdong Chen, Jacob Benesty, Jacob Benesty, Jingdong Chen, Yiteng Huang, and Israel Cohen. Pearson correlation coefficient. *Noise reduction in speech processing*, pages 1–4, 2009.
- [21] Marcin Copik, Grzegorz Kwasniewski, Maciej Besta, Michal Podstawski, and Torsten Hoefler. Sebs: A serverless benchmark suite for function-as-a-service computing, 2021.
- [22] Rafael Ferreira da Silva, Rosa Filgueira, Ewa Deelman, Erola Pairo-Castineira, Ian M Overton, and Malcolm P Atkinson. Using simple pid-inspired controllers for online resilient resource management of distributed scientific workflows. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 95:615–628, 2019.
- [23] Howard David, Eugene Gorbatov, Ulf R Hanebutte, Rahul Khanna, and Christian Le. Rapl: Memory power estimation and capping. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM/IEEE international symposium on Low power electronics and design*, pages 189–194, 2010.
- [24] Qingyuan Deng, David Meisner, Abhishek Bhattacharjee, Thomas F Wenisch, and Ricardo Bianchini. Coscale: Coordinating cpu and memory system dvfs in server systems. In *2012 45th annual IEEE/ACM international symposium on microarchitecture*, pages 143–154. IEEE, 2012.
- [25] Simon Eismann, Long Bui, Johannes Grohmann, Cristina Abad, Nikolas Herbst, and Samuel Kounev. Sizeless: Predicting the optimal size of serverless functions. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Middleware Conference*, pages 248–259, 2021.
- [26] Ioannis Fakinos, Achilleas Tzenetopoulos, Dimosthenis Masouros, Sotirios Xydis, and Dimitrios Soudris. Sequence clock: A dynamic resource orchestrator for serverless architectures. In *2022 IEEE 15th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 81–90, 2022.
- [27] Alexander Fuerst and Prateek Sharma. Faas-cache: keeping serverless computing alive with greedy-dual caching. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 386–400, 2021.
- [28] Neha Gholkar, Frank Mueller, and Barry Rountree. Uncore power scavenger: A runtime for uncore power conservation on hpc systems. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–23, 2019.
- [29] Md E Haque, Yuxiong He, Sameh Elnikety, Thu D Nguyen, Ricardo Bianchini, and Kathryn S McKinley. Exploiting heterogeneity for tail latency and energy efficiency. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture*, pages 625–638, 2017.
- [30] David L Hill, Derek Bachand, Selim Bilgin, Robert Greiner, Per Hammarlund, Thomas Huff, Steve Kulick, and Robert Safranek. The uncore: A modular approach to feeding the high-performance cores. *Intel Technology Journal*, 14(3), 2010.
- [31] Chang-Hong Hsu, Yunqi Zhang, Michael A. Laurenzano, David Meisner, Thomas Wenisch, Jason Mars, Lingjia Tang, and Ronald G. Dreslinski. Adrenaline: Pinpointing and reining in tail queries with quick voltage boosting. In *2015 IEEE 21st International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 271–282, 2015.
- [32] Artjom Joosen, Ahmed Hassan, Martin Asenov, Rajkarn Singh, Luke Darlow, Jianfeng Wang, and Adam Barker. How does it function? characterizing long-term trends in production serverless workloads. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 443–458, 2023.
- [33] Ram Srivatsa Kannan, Michael Laurenzano, Jeongseob Ahn, Jason Mars, and Lingjia Tang. Caliper: Interference estimator for multi-tenant environments sharing architectural resources. *ACM Transactions on Architecture and Code Optimization (TACO)*, 16(3):1–25, 2019.
- [34] Harshad Kasture, Davide B Bartolini, Nathan Beckmann, and Daniel Sanchez. Rubik: Fast analytical power management for latency-critical systems. In *2015 48th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, pages 598–610. IEEE, 2015.
- [35] Harshad Kasture and Daniel Sanchez. Ubik: Efficient cache sharing with strict qos for latency-critical workloads. *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, 49(4):729–742, 2014.
- [36] Ana Klimovic, Yawen Wang, Patrick Stuedi, Animesh Trivedi, Jonas Pfefferle, and Christos Kozyrakis. Pocket: Elastic ephemeral storage for serverless analytics. In *13th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 18)*, pages 427–444, 2018.
- [37] Vasileios Kontorinis, Liuyi Eric Zhang, Baris Aksanli, Jack Sampson, Houman Homayoun, Eddie Pettis, Dean M Tullsen, and Tajana Simunic Rosing. Managing distributed ups energy for effective power capping in data centers. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 40(3):488–499, 2012.
- [38] David Lo, Liqun Cheng, Rama Govindaraju, Luiz André Barroso, and Christos Kozyrakis. Towards energy proportionality for large-scale latency-critical workloads. In *2014 ACM/IEEE 41st International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*, pages 301–312. IEEE, 2014.



- [39] Ashraf Mahgoub, Li Wang, Karthick Shankar, Yiming Zhang, Huangshi Tian, Subrata Mitra, Yuxing Peng, Hongqi Wang, Ana Klimovic, Haoran Yang, et al. {SONIC}: Application-aware data passing for chained serverless applications. In *2021 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 21)*, pages 285–301, 2021.
- [40] Dimosthenis Masouros, Christian Pinto, Michele Gazzetti, Sotirios Xydis, and Dimitrios Soudris. Adrias: Interference-aware memory orchestration for disaggregated cloud infrastructures. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 855–869. IEEE, 2023.
- [41] Dimosthenis Masouros, Sotirios Xydis, and Dimitrios Soudris. Rusty: Runtime interference-aware predictive monitoring for modern multi-tenant systems. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 32(1):184–198, 2020.
- [42] David Meisner, Brian T Gold, and Thomas F Wenisch. Powernap: eliminating server idle power. *ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News*, 37(1):205–216, 2009.
- [43] Arshia Moghimi, Joe Hattori, Alexander Li, Mehdi Ben Chikha, and Mohammad Shahradd. Parrotfish: Parametric regression for optimizing serverless functions. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pages 177–192, 2023.
- [44] Rajiv Nishtala, Vinicius Petrucci, Paul Carpenter, and Magnus Sjalander. Twig: Multi-agent task management for colocated latency-critical cloud services. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 167–179. IEEE, 2020.
- [45] Tirthak Patel and Devesh Tiwari. Clite: Efficient and qos-aware collocation of multiple latency-critical jobs for warehouse scale computers. In *2020 IEEE International Symposium on High Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 193–206. IEEE, 2020.
- [46] Francisco Romero, Gohar Irfan Chaudhry, Íñigo Goiri, Pragna Gopa, Paul Batum, Neeraja J Yadwadkar, Rodrigo Fonseca, Christos Kozyrakis, and Ricardo Bianchini. Faa \$ t: A transparent auto-scaling cache for serverless applications. In *Proceedings of the ACM symposium on cloud computing*, pages 122–137, 2021.
- [47] Francisco Romero, Mark Zhao, Neeraja J. Yadwadkar, and Christos Kozyrakis. Llama: A heterogeneous & serverless framework for auto-tuning video analytics pipelines. *CoRR*, abs/2102.01887, 2021.
- [48] Rohan Basu Roy, Tirthak Patel, and Devesh Tiwari. Icebreaker: Warming serverless functions better with heterogeneity. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems*, pages 753–767, 2022.
- [49] Alireza Sahraei, Soteris Demetriou, Amiral Sobhghol, Haoran Zhang, Abhigna Nagaraja, Neeraj Pathak, Girish Joshi, Carla Souza, Bo Huang, Wyatt Cook, et al. Xfaas: Hyperscale and low cost serverless functions at meta. In *Proceedings of the 29th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 231–246, 2023.
- [50] Osman Sarood, Akhil Langer, Abhishek Gupta, and Laxmikant Kale. Maximizing throughput of overprovisioned hpc data centers under a strict power budget. In *SC’14: Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 807–818. IEEE, 2014.
- [51] Yannis Sfakianakis, Manolis Marazakis, and Angelos Bilas. Skynet: Performance-driven resource management for dynamic workloads. In *2021 IEEE 14th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pages 527–539. IEEE, 2021.
- [52] Mohammad Shahradd, Jonathan Balkind, and David Wentzlauff. Architectural implications of function-as-a-service computing. In *Proceedings of the 52nd annual IEEE/ACM international symposium on microarchitecture*, pages 1063–1075, 2019.
- [53] Mohammad Shahradd, Rodrigo Fonseca, Íñigo Goiri, Gohar Chaudhry, Paul Batum, Jason Cooke, Eduardo Laureano, Colby Tresness, Mark Russinovich, and Ricardo Bianchini. Serverless in the wild: Characterizing and optimizing the serverless workload at a large cloud provider. In *2020 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 20)*, pages 205–218, 2020.
- [54] Erfan Sharafzadeh, Seyed Alireza Sanaee Kohroudi, Esmail Asyabi, and Mohsen Sharifi. Yawn: A cpu idle-state governor for datacenter applications. In *Proceedings of the 10th ACM SIGOPS Asia-Pacific Workshop on Systems*, pages 91–98, 2019.
- [55] Jovan Stojkovic, Tianyin Xu, Hubertus Franke, and Josep Torrellas. Specfaas: Accelerating serverless applications with speculative function execution. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA)*, pages 814–827. IEEE, 2023.
- [56] Ali Tariq, Austin Pahl, Sharat Nimmagadda, Eric Rozner, and Siddharth Lanka. Sequoia: Enabling quality-of-service in serverless computing. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM symposium on cloud computing*, pages 311–327, 2020.
- [57] Achilleas Tzenetopoulos, Dimosthenis Masouros, Dimitrios Soudris, and Sotirios Xydis. Dvfaas: Leveraging dvfs for faas workflows. *IEEE Computer Architecture Letters*, 2023.
- [58] Kangjin Wang, Ying Li, Cheng Wang, Tong Jia, Kingsum Chow, Yang Wen, Yaoyong Dou, Guoyao Xu, Chuanjia Hou, Jie Yao, et al. Characterizing job microarchitectural profiles at scale: Dataset and analysis. In *Proceedings of the 51st International Conference on Parallel Processing*, pages 1–11, 2022.
- [59] Liang Wang, Mengyuan Li, Yinqian Zhang, Thomas Ristenpart, and Michael Swift. Peeking behind the curtains of serverless platforms. In *2018 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 18)*, pages 133–146, 2018.
- [60] Zhaojie Wen, Yishuo Wang, and Fangming Liu. Stepconf: Slo-aware dynamic resource configuration for serverless function workflows. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2022-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications*, pages 1868–1877. IEEE, 2022.
- [61] Jawad Haj Yahya, Haris Volos, Davide B. Bartolini, Georgia Antoniou, Jeremie S. Kim, Zhe Wang, Kleovoulos Kalaitzidis, Tom Rollet, Zhirui Chen, Ye Geng, Onur Mutlu, and Yiannakis Sazeides. Agilewatts: An energy-efficient cpu core idle-state architecture for latency-sensitive server applications. In *2022 55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, pages 835–850, 2022.
- [62] Yanqi Zhang, Íñigo Goiri, Gohar Irfan Chaudhry, Rodrigo Fonseca, Sameh Elnikety, Christina Delimitrou, and Ricardo Bianchini. Faster and cheaper serverless computing on harvested resources. In *Proceedings of the ACM SIGOPS 28th Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 724–739, 2021.
- [63] Yanqi Zhang, Weizhe Hua, Zhuangzhuang Zhou, G Edward Suh, and Christina Delimitrou. Sinan: ML-based and qos-aware resource management for cloud microservices. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM international conference on architectural support for programming languages and operating systems*, pages 167–181, 2021.
- [64] Laiping Zhao, Yanan Yang, Yiming Li, Xian Zhou, and Keqiu Li. Understanding, predicting and scheduling serverless workloads under partial interference. In *Proceedings of the International conference for high performance computing, networking, storage and analysis*, pages 1–15, 2021.
- [65] Liang Zhou, Laxmi N. Bhuyan, and K. K. Ramakrishnan. Gemini: Learning to manage cpu power for latency-critical search engines. In *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*, pages 637–349, 2020.
- [66] Zhuangzhuang Zhou, Yanqi Zhang, and Christina Delimitrou. Aquatope: Qos-and-uncertainty-aware resource management for multi-stage serverless workflows. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 1*, pages 1–14, 2022.