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Virtual Network Embedding Employing Renewable Energy Sources

Leonard Nconde, Taisir E.H. Elgorashi and Jaafar M.H. Elmirgahni
School of Electronic and Electrical Engineering University of Leeds, LS2 9JT, United Kingdom

Abstract—Environmental sustainability in high capacity networks and cloud data centers has become one of the hottest research subjects. In this paper, we investigate the effective use of renewable energy and hence resource allocation in core networks with clouds as a means of reducing the carbon footprint. We develop a Green Virtual Network Embedding (GVNE) framework for minimizing the use of non-renewable energy through intelligent provisioning of bandwidth and cloud data center resources. The problem is modeled as a mixed integer linear program (MILP). The results show that it is better to instantiate virtual machines in cloud data centers that have access to abundant renewable energy even at the expense of traversing several links across the network. The GVNE model reduces the overall CO$_2$ emissions by up to 32% for the network considering solar power availability and data center locations.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Software Defined Networking (SDN) has brought about many possibilities in service provisioning in cloud networks. The fact that it is now possible to program a network on the fly as well as dictate how it behaves under different conditions provides opportunities for optimization of the physical resources that make up the network. A centralized control plane that is isolated from the data plane allows custom designed algorithms to dynamically route application specific flows or wavelengths in a network in order to fulfill a specific goal. As an example, an algorithm which automatically gives priority minimum hop routing for a live video stream at a particular time of the day and then tears it down when circumstances change can be implemented in the controller. In the absence of SDN, this process would have to be statically implemented and resources assigned even when they may not be used all the time.

In this work, the flexibility of centralized control of networks is used to reduce the carbon footprint of cloud infrastructure providers. An infrastructure provider (InP) in this case is the owner of a multi-tenant network that hosts various heterogeneous enterprise clients’ virtual networks (VNIs). A VN is composed of several virtual nodes and virtual links connecting these nodes. In the process of mapping VNIs, the lnP should satisfy both node (e.g. CPU and storage) and link (e.g. bandwidth and delay) demands of a virtual network request (VNR). The efficient provisioning of resources therefore presents a problem which is commonly known as the virtual network embedding (VNE) problem. Substantial work has been done on solving the NP-Hard VNE problem [1]. The VNE problem has been investigated with the objective of minimizing energy consumption by means of resource consolidation in [2], [3] and [4]. This is necessitated by the fact that there is a huge increase in the use of cloud computing services which are putting a huge stress on energy resources in both data centers and the high capacity IP/optical networks that connect them. In [5] we proposed an energy efficient virtual network embedding approach for cloud computing networks where power savings are introduced by consolidating resources in the network and data centers. We addressed the link embedding problem as a multilayer problem that includes both the IP layer and the optical layer in an IP over WDM network and considered the granular power consumption of various network devices as well as the power consumption in data centers. In [6], we extended our study to investigate the energy efficiency of VNE in optical OFDM networks and in [7] we studied the impact of maximizing profit on the power consumption and acceptance of VNIs.

The use of renewable energy in cloud networks is becoming an urgent requirement for InPs as the regulations surrounding the amount of CO$_2$ emissions are becoming stringent in this era of environmental sustainability. Very few studies have addressed the problem of reducing the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of InPs hosting VNIs. The authors in [8] have developed an energy aware hybrid VNE approach where VNIs are assigned to nodes with the cleanest energy sources. The authors have used CO$_2$ emission factors of cities as the determinant of where nodes are embedded. The city with the least factor becomes the most attractive. Whereas this approach seems reasonable in mitigating CO$_2$ emissions, it fails short of making full use of renewable energy that may be available in a city because it is possible that a city with a comparatively high CO$_2$ emission factor could also have a high availability of renewable energy. In this work we reduce the carbon footprint of cloud infrastructure by tapping into the available renewable energy sources to power the network and data centers. To address this goal, a green virtual network embedding (GVNE) approach that minimizes the use of non-renewable energy in core networks with clouds is proposed. We develop a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) model to minimize non-renewable power consumption. The MILP model determines how to effectively use renewable energy during the mapping of VNRs and whether to embed virtual nodes locally or to move them to distant data centers with abundant solar energy resources. The model results are a benchmark for heuristics and algorithms that would be developed and implemented in the control plane of an SDN based core network architecture with clouds.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: The MILP model for green virtual network embedding in core networks with clouds is introduced in Section II. We analyze the key results and performance of the model in Section III. The paper is concluded in Section IV.
II. MILP MODEL FOR GREEN VIRTUAL NETWORK EMBEDDING

The VNE problem defines how virtualized resources should be realized onto the substrate network. In Fig. 1, the VNRS green, red and blue with node and link demands are to be embedded onto the substrate IP over WDM network [5], [9] with data centers. The nodes of the substrate network have access to hybrid power supplies being composed of non-renewable energy and renewable energy. The renewable energy can be used to power the data centers and the IP over WDM equipment to reduce the total CO₂ emission of an IP over WDM network. The nodes with access to renewable energy also need access to non-renewable energy to guarantee QoS in the absence of renewable energy.

In this section we extend the energy efficient VNE MILP model developed in [5] where our goal was to minimize the overall power consumption of VNE in IP/WDM core networks with data centers through resource consolidation. Here, the problem becomes that associated with minimizing the non-renewable energy consumption of VNE in the hybrid-power IP over WDM network. The model should be intelligent enough to decide whether to embed virtual resources in a locally based data center or to seek out a distant data center that has more energy renewable energy resources. This decision, takes into account the network power consumption that would be consumed if the virtual machines were embedded in a distant data center.

The substrate network is modeled as a weighted undirected graph \( G = (N, L) \) where \( N \) is the set of substrate nodes and \( L \) is the set of substrate links. Each node or link in the substrate network is associated with its own resource attributes. The VNR \( v \) is represented by the graph \( G^v = (R^v, L^v) \) where \( R^v \) is the set of virtual nodes made up of virtual machines and/or virtual routers and \( L^v \) is the set of virtual links.

In the following we reintroduce the sets, parameters, variables and constraints defined in [5] for completeness and introduce the new objective functions, parameters, variables and constraints developed to model the new GVNE approach.

**Sets:**
- \( V \) Set of VNRS

**Parameters:**
- \( R \) Set of nodes in a VNR
- \( N \) Set of nodes in the substrate network
- \( N_{\text{mc}} \) Set of neighbor nodes of node \( m \) in the optical layer

**Variables:**
- \( s \) and \( d \) Source and destination of a traffic demand in a VNR
- \( b \) and \( e \) End points of a link in the virtual network
- \( i \) and \( j \) End points of a virtual link in the IP layer
- \( m \) and \( n \) End points of a physical fiber link in the optical layer
- \( \Delta_{\text{VNR}} \) The maximum number of virtual nodes of a VNR that can be co-located at a substrate node.
- \( \beta \) The virtual machines consolidation factor which defines the maximum number of virtual machines of a VNR that can be co-located in a data center
- \( \mu \) Power consumption per CPU core
- \( \gamma \) Power consumption per CPU core
- \( \lambda_{\text{VNR}} \) Number of virtual cores requested by virtual machine \( s \) of VNR \( v \)
- \( \Delta_{\text{IP}} \) \( \Delta_{\text{IP}} = 1 \) if the master node of VNR \( v \) must be located at substrate node \( b \), otherwise \( \Delta_{\text{IP}} = 0 \)
- \( \alpha \) The virtual nodes consolidation factor which defines the maximum number of virtual nodes of a VNR that can be co-located at a substrate node.
- \( \phi \) The virtual machines consolidation factor which defines the maximum number of virtual machines of a VNR that can be co-located in a data center
- \( V_{\text{IP}} \) The number of total data centers in the network
- \( E_{\text{IP}} \) The number of virtual cores requested by virtual machine \( s \) of VNR \( v \)
- \( R_{\text{IP}} \) \( R_{\text{IP}} = 1 \) if substrate node \( b \) is a data center, otherwise \( R_{\text{IP}} = 0 \)
- \( L_{\text{IP}} \) Bandwidth requested by VNR \( v \) on virtual link \( (s,d) \)
- \( B \) Wavelength rate
- \( W \) Number of wavelengths per fiber
- \( L_{\text{IP}} \) Total length of the physical link \((m,n)\)
- \( E_{\text{IP}} \) Number of EDFAs in physical link \((m,n)\). Typically \( E_{\text{IP}} = \left\lfloor \frac{L_{\text{IP}}}{S} \right\rfloor + 1 \), where \( S \) is the distance between two neighboring EDFAs.
- \( E_{\text{IP}} \) The number of regenerators on a physical link \((m,n)\).
- \( P_{\text{IP}} \) Power consumption of a router Port
- \( P_T \) Power consumption of a transponder
- \( P_E \) Power consumption of an EDFA
- \( P_R \) Power consumption of a regenerator
- \( P_{\text{SE}} \) Solar power capacity at node \( m \)

**Variables:**
- \( \delta_{s,b} \) \( \delta_{s,b} = 1 \), if node \( s \) of VNR \( v \) is embedded in substrate node \( b \), otherwise \( \delta_{s,b} = 0 \).
- \( \psi_{s,b} \) \( \psi_{s,b} = \psi_{s,b} \), if all the nodes of a VNR \( v \) are fully embedded in the substrate network, otherwise \( \psi_{s,b} = 0 \).
- \( P_{\text{IP}}^{v,s,d} \) \( P_{\text{IP}}^{v,s,d} = 1 \), if the embedding of virtual nodes \( s \) and \( d \) of virtual request \( v \) in substrate nodes \( b \) and \( e \), respectively is successful and a link \( (b,e) \) is established if a virtual link \( s,d \) of VNR \( v \) exists.
- \( \omega_{s,b}^{v,s,d} \) \( \omega_{s,b}^{v,s,d} = \) the XOR of \( \delta_{s,b} \) and \( \delta_{s,d} \), i.e. \( \omega_{s,b}^{v,s,d} = \delta_{s,b} \oplus \delta_{s,d} \).
- \( L_{\text{IP}} \) Total traffic demand on virtual link \((b,e)\) due to the embedded links of all VNRs.
- \( \phi_{\text{IP}} \) \( \phi_{\text{IP}} = \phi_{\text{IP}} \), if all the links of VNR \( v \) are fully embedded in the substrate network, otherwise \( \phi_{\text{IP}} = 0 \).
- \( L_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Bandwidth demand of link \((b,e)\) in the virtual network passing through the lightpath \((i,j)\) in the substrate network.
- \( C_{\text{IP}} \) Number of wavelengths in lightpath \((i,j)\) in the substrate network.
- \( \omega_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) \( \omega_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = \) the number of wavelengths of lightpath \((i,j)\) passing through a physical link \((m,n)\).
- \( \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) \( \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \), if all the links of VNR \( v \) are fully embedded in the physical network, otherwise \( \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = 0 \).
- \( L_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Bandwidth demand of link \((b,e)\) in the virtual network passing through the lightpath \((i,j)\) in the substrate network.
- \( C_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Number of wavelengths in lightpath \((i,j)\) in the substrate network.
- \( \omega_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) \( \omega_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = \omega_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \), the sum of wavelengths of lightpath \((i,j)\) passing through a physical link \((m,n)\) powered by renewable energy.
- \( \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) \( \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = \phi_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \), if all the links of VNR \( v \) are fully embedded in the physical network, powered by renewable energy.
- \( F_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Number of fibers in physical link \((m,n)\) powered by renewable energy.
- \( L_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) \( L_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = 1 \), if virtual machine \( s \) of VNR \( v \) has been embedded at data center node \( b \) otherwise \( L_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} = 0 \).
- \( C_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Total number of virtual cores embedded at data center \( b \).
- \( C_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Number of cores embedded at node \( b \) powered by non-renewable energy.
- \( \gamma_{\text{IP}}^{v,s} \) Number of cores embedded at node \( b \) powered by non-renewable energy.

The network power consumption under non-bypass where lightpaths passing through an intermediate node are terminated and forwarded to the IP router as calculated in [10] is given as:
Power consumption of router ports:
\[ \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} \lambda_{m,n} \cdot PR \]

Power Consumption of transponders:
\[ \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} PT \cdot \lambda_{m,n} \]

Power Consumption of regenerators:
\[ \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} RG \cdot \lambda_{m,n} \cdot EG_{m,n} \]

Power Consumption of EDFAs:
\[ \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} PE \cdot E_{m,n} \cdot F_{m,n} \]

We have only considered the power consumption in data centers due to the embedded virtual cores which is given as;
\[ \sum_{b \in B} C_b \cdot \mu \]

The power consumption due to cooling, lighting and power supplies inside the data center has not been considered in this work. This assumption is adequate for the scope of this work because it has been shown in [11] that the workload variation in CPUs is the main contributor to the power consumption variations in a server and therefore the power consumption variations in the data center.

**Objective:**

Minimize total non-renewable power consumption given as:
\[ \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} \lambda^{(NR)}_{m,n} \cdot PR + \sum_{m \in N} \lambda^{(NR)}_{m,n} \cdot PT + \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} EG \cdot \lambda_{m,n} \cdot RG_{m,n} + \sum_{m \in N} \sum_{n \in N_m} PE \cdot E_{m,n} \cdot F_{m,n} + \sum_{b \in B} C^{(NR)}_b \cdot \mu \]

Subject to:

Node Embedding Constraints:
\[ \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{c \in C} C_{v,c} \cdot \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \leq C_b \quad \forall b \in N \quad (1) \]

Constraint (1) ensures that the virtual cores embedded in a data center do not exceed the capacity of the data center.

\[ \sum_{b \in B} \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in V, \forall s \in R \quad (2) \]

Constraint (2) ensures that a virtual node is either rejected or only embedded once in a substrate network.

\[ \sum_{b \in B} \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \leq 1 \quad \forall v \in V, \forall s \in R \quad (3) \]

Constraint (3) ensures that each virtual machine is either rejected or only embedded once in a data center.

\[ D_{v,c} \cdot \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} = \delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \quad \forall v \in V, \forall b \in B, \forall s \in R \quad (4) \]

Constraint (4) ensures that virtual machines are only embedded in nodes with data centers.

\[ \sum_{s \in R} \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \leq \alpha \quad \forall v \in V, b \in N \quad (5) \]

Constraint (5) defines how many nodes belonging to the same request can be co-located on the same substrate node.

\[ \sum_{v \in V} \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} \leq \beta \quad \forall v \in V, b \in N \quad (6) \]

Objectives to 5 are collectively ensuring that a request is not partially co-located in the data center.

Constraint (6) defines how many virtual machines belonging to the same request can be co-located in the same data center.

**Link Embedding Constraints:**

\[ \delta_{v,c}^{x,v} + \delta_{v,c}^{x,d} = \omega_{b_e,v}^{x,v,d} + 2 \cdot \rho_{b_e,v}^{x,v,d} \]

\[ \forall v \in V, \forall b, e \in N, \forall s, d \in R; s \neq d \quad (7) \]

Constraint (7) ensures that virtual nodes connected in the VNR are also connected in the substrate network. We achieve this by introducing a binary variable \( \omega_{b_e,v}^{x,v,d} \) which is only equal to 1 if \( \delta_{b_e,v}^{x,v} \) and \( \delta_{v,c}^{x,d} \) are exclusively equal to 1 otherwise it is zero.

\[ \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{s \in d = e} H_{v,c} \cdot \rho_{v,c}^{x,v,d} = L_{b,e} \quad \forall b, e \in N \quad (8) \]

Constraint (8) generates the traffic demand matrix resulting from embedding the VNRs in the substrate network and ensures that no connected nodes from the same VNR are embedded in the same substrate node.

\[ \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{c \in C} C_{v,c} \cdot \Delta_{v,c}^{x,v} = \psi_{v} \quad \forall v \in V \quad (9) \]

Constraint (9) ensures that nodes of a VNR are completely embedded.

\[ \delta_{b}^{x,v} = LO_{b}^{x,v} \quad \forall v \in V, b \in N \quad (10) \]

Constraint (10) fixes the client’s location in the network to the first node of the VNR.

\[ \sum_{e \in E} \sum_{c \in C} \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{d \in d = e} H_{v,c} \cdot \rho_{v,c}^{x,v,d} = \phi_{v} \quad \forall v \in V \quad (11) \]

Constraint (11) ensures the bandwidth demands of a VNR are completely embedded.

\[ \phi_{v} = \psi_{v} \quad \forall v \in V \quad (12) \]

Constraint (12) ensures that both the nodes and links of a VNR are completely embedded. Constraints (9), (11) and (12) collectively ensure that a request is not partially embedded.

**Flow conservation in the IP Layer:**

\[ \sum_{j \in N \times \{s\}} L_{j,e}^{x} - \sum_{j \in N \times \{s\}} L_{j,e}^{x} = \begin{cases} L_{b,e} & \text{if } i = b \\ \sum_{b, e \in N} L_{b,e} & \text{if } e = e \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall b, e \in N; b \neq e \quad (13) \]

Constraint (13) represents the flow conservation constraint for the traffic flows in the IP Layer.

**Lightpath capacity constraint**

\[ \sum_{d \in d = e \times b \times e} L_{j,i}^{x} \leq C_{i,j} \quad \forall i, j \in N; i \neq j \quad (14) \]

Constraint (14) ensures that the sum of all traffic flows through a lightpath does not exceed its capacity.

**Flow conservation in the optical layer**

\[ \sum_{m \in M} w_{m,n}^{l} - \sum_{m \in M} w_{m,n}^{l} = \begin{cases} L_{i,j} & \text{if } m = i \\ \sum_{m \in M} L_{i,j} & \text{if } m = j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \forall i, j \in N; i \neq j \quad (15) \]

Constraint (15) ensures the conservation of flows in the optical layer.
Constraints (16) and (17) represent the physical link capacity constraints. Constraint (16) ensures that the number of wavelengths in a physical link does not exceed the capacity constraints. Constraint (17) gives the total number of wavelength channels used in a physical link.

$$\forall m \in N, n \in N_m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}^{m,n}} w_{m,n}^{j,i} \leq W \cdot F_{m,n}$$  \quad (16)

$$\forall m \in N, n \in N_m \sum_{j \in \mathbb{J}^{m,n}} w_{m,n}^{j,i} = \lambda_{m,n}$$  \quad (17)

Constraint (18) calculates the total number of cores in a data centre as the sum of the embedded cores powered by renewable energy and the embedded cores powered by non-renewable energy.

$$C_b = C_b^{(S)} + C_b^{(NR)} \forall b \in N$$  \quad (18)

Constraint (19) calculates the total number of wavelengths in fiber link as the sum of the wavelengths powered by renewable energy and the wavelengths powered by non-renewable energy.

$$\lambda_{m,n} = \lambda_{m,n}^{(S)} + \lambda_{m,n}^{(NR)} \forall m, n \in N$$  \quad (19)

Constraint (20) ensures that the total renewable energy consumption by router ports, transponders and data centers at each node does not exceed the maximum renewable power available for the node. Due to the location of EDFAs and regenerators in between nodes, it has been assumed that they only have access to non-renewable energy.

$$\sum_{n \in N_{m}} \lambda_{m,n}^{(S)} \cdot \eta + \sum_{n \in N_{m}} \lambda_{m,n}^{(NR)} \leq \eta \cdot \lambda_{m,n}^{(S)} + \lambda_{m,n}^{(NR)} \leq S \cdot F_{m,n} \forall m \in N$$  \quad (20)

III. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The performance of the GVNE MILP model is examined using the NSFNET reference network topology. The network has 14 nodes and 21 links as shown in Fig. 2. VNFRs come from enterprise clients from all the nodes in the network. The enterprise client’s location is fixed but the requested virtual nodes could be embedded in any data center in the cloud. The concentration of clients at any substrate node is based on the population of the states where the node is located (see Fig. 2). In the case of California where we have two cities in one state (nodes 2 and 3), we have evenly distributed the population of the state between the two cities.

The VNFRs consist of virtual processing demands in terms of number of virtual CPU cores and bandwidth demands of virtual links connecting the virtual nodes. A total of 50 enterprise clients send VNFRs to the InP over a 24 hour period at two hour time granularity of service. The traffic generated by the VNFRs over a 24 hour period is modelled according to the 2020 average business Internet traffic between nodes in the NSFNET network as projected by the GreenTouch Consortium [12]. The requests once accepted stay in the network for 2 hours after which they will be torn down and adjusted according to the new arriving demands.

The number of virtual nodes per VNFR is uniformly distributed between 1 and 5 and the number of virtual cores per VNFR is uniformly distributed between 1000 and 8000. The substrate network is un-capacitated in terms of both node and link resources. The consolidation factors are set to $\alpha = \beta = 5$, i.e. all the virtual nodes and machines of a VNFR can be co-located. The current and future criterion for designing cloud infrastructure is to distribute the content among a number of data centers to minimize the delay experienced by the users and to avoid the scenario of having a single hot node in the network. The NSFNET contains five data centers located at nodes (2, 3, 6, 8 and 10) [12].

We consider solar energy as the source of renewable energy. The solar power availability profile for nodes is shown in Table I. The solar power data is obtained from the Open PV Project [13] of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the United States of America. It provides detailed data of the total installed photovoltaic capacity for each individual state in the United States. The data from the Open PV Project shows the total installed solar capacity for each state which has contributions from residential areas, private industries and utilities. The data obtained from the U.S. Energy Information Administration [14] shows that solar energy sources varies at different times of the day, with up to 20% of the solar power as well as non-renewable power (Fig. 1) through the utility in each node. Since the output power of solar energy sources varies at different times of the day, we use the sunrise and sunset data used by the authors in [15] to work out the available solar power at any given two hour intervals as a fraction of the maximum installed capacity. Table II shows the values of the parameters that have been used in the model.

The AMPL software with the CPLEX 12.5 solver is used as the platform for solving the MILP models on a PC with an Intel® Xeon™ CPU, running at 3.5 GHz, with 64 GB of RAM. The running times for the model averages 15 minutes for each time point. Fig. 3 shows the overall non-renewable power consumption and solar power consumption of the GVNE model at different times of the day. It can be observed that despite having an increase in the CPU cores and bandwidth demand between 06:00 hours and 12:00...
hours, the non-renewable power consumption continues to decrease as expected due to the increasing availability of solar power. In order to adequately serve the further increase in load from the VNRs, there is a subtle increase in non-renewable power consumption due to the dwindling solar energy supply during this period. The non-renewable power consumption curve without access to solar energy follows the traffic profile throughout the day. The overall reduction in CO$_2$ emissions in this scenario achieved by GVNE is 32%.

In the interest of clearly understanding what is happening in the network, in Fig. 4 we examine the individual non-renewable and solar power consumption contributions for both data centers and the network. Fig. 4(a) shows that the power consumption in data centers has the most significant influence on how the embedding of VNRs is done in all the data centers. The model maximizes the savings in the amount of consumed non-renewable power by consolidating the embeddings in data centers with abundant solar power even at the expense of using more non-renewable power in the network as can be seen in Fig. 4(b). Whereas the non-renewable power consumption in data centers drastically falls between 06:00 hours and 14:00 hours, the non-renewable power consumption in the network shows a steady increase. The average reduction in CO$_2$ emissions in data centers and the network is 35% and 15% respectively compared to the scenario with no access to renewable energy. This picture is made much clearer by looking at how the embedded CPU cores for various VNRs are distributed across the five data centers in the network.

Fig. 5(a) shows the embedding of virtual cores in the different data centers under the scenario with no access to renewable energy. The most popular destination for
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**Table II: Parameters used in the model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance between two neighboring EDFAs (S) [16]</td>
<td>80 (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance between two neighboring Regenerators (RG) [17]</td>
<td>2000 (km)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of wavelengths in a fiber (W) [18]</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wavelength Rate (B)</td>
<td>40Gbps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption of a transponder (PT) [16]</td>
<td>167 (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption of a regenerator (RG) [19]</td>
<td>334 (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption of a 40Gb/s router port (PR) [17]</td>
<td>850 (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption of an EDFA (PE) [16]</td>
<td>55 (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power consumption per CPU core [20]</td>
<td>11.25 (W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
both concerns of reducing electricity costs and GHG emissions. In the case of delay sensitive applications, such as live video streaming, embedding a virtual node running such an application in a distant data centre that has abundant renewable energy, would cause serious quality of service problems. It is therefore expected that each enterprise client would send a request to the InP with specific delay requirements. Our future work will investigate and address all these concerns. We will also develop real time heuristic algorithms and implement them on an SDN based experimental test bed.
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