#### Did you noticed something odd or unnatural in the talks so far?

[1] No AI, LLMs, ChatGPT so far



#### We will fix this now!

[2] No negativ results



Fine-Tuning LLMs for Predicting Energy Consumption of Configurable Software Systems

Nicole Heinimann, <u>Norbert Siegmund</u> Chair of Software Systems Applied AI and Big Data: Software Engineering







SPONSORED BY

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung FKZ: ScaDS.AI

isterium SACHSEN ung DS.AI

Diese Maßnahme wird gefördert durch die Bundesregierung aufgrund eines Beschlusses des Deutschen Bundestages. Diese Maßnahme wird mitfinanziert durch Steuermittel auf der Grundlage des von den Abgeordneten des Sächsischen Landtags beschlossenen Haushaltes.

2

#### Current State



How to scale measurements?

How to obtain reliable measurements?

How to obtain fine-grained measurements?







# Limits of Granularity



## And now?



## The Dream





#### How? You have read the title... right? ③

## The Idea

LLMs are great for code understanding, generation, and summarization



Can we adapt and fine-tune an LLM to estimate energy consumption of given code?

# Valid Assumptions

- Code, intermediate representation, and assembler code map to processor instructions that require different amounts of time
- Execution time might correspond to energy consumed (more or less)
- Using assembler might even account for compiler optimization
- If you know the impact of code on different levels of abstraction on energy consumption you might be able to generalize

### Data Collection



Time Stamp Counter (TSC) register and the Running Average Power Limit (RAPL) registers (\_amd64\_2023a)

# Total Effort

- Repeat measurements 20x
- 4400 unit tests measuremed from the top 1000 most popular Rust crates

```
"experiment": {
    "krate": {
      "name": "serde-xml-rs",
      "version": "0.6.0",
      "popularity": 358
    },
    "n_measure": 20,
    "loop_count": 100000
  },
  "results": [
    {
      "src": {
        "name": "basic_struct",
        "llvm_ir": "; round_trip::basic_struct\n; Function Attrs: noinline nonlazybind uwtable ...",
        "asm": "round_trip::basic_struct:\n\tpush r15\n\tpush r14\n\tpush r13\n\tpush r12 ...",
        "rust": "# [test] # [inline (never)] fn basic_struct () { let src = r#\"<?xml version=\"1.0\"
       ↔ encoding=\"UTF-8\"?><Item><name>Banana</name> ..."
     },
      "measurements": [
        {
          "duration": {
            "secs": 0,
            "nanos": 582710083
          },
          "tsc_delta": 1046888712,
          "pkg_pwr": 8.467697143554688,
          "cores_pwr": [
            0.01513671875,
            0.01513671875,
            0.0109100341796875,
            0.0109100341796875,
            0.007781982421875,
            0.007781982421875,
            0.010894775390625,
            0.010894775390625
          ],
          "exit_status": "exit status: 0"
        7
     ]
   }
 ]
}
```

# LLM Adaptation and Fine-Tuning



1. LoRa adaptation to reduce computational effort



2. Replacement of the last layer with a new fully connected layer that outputs a scalar number rather than token probabilities.



## LoRa Excursion

Idea:

- Track only the delta in parameter (i.e., changes that would be made to the original weights) that stem from the new data
- Decompose the large weight matrix into smaller matrices that contain only the parameters to be trained



4

=

5	1	-1	З	4
15	З	-3	9	12
35	7	-7	21	28
-20	-4	4	-12	-16
10	2	-2	6	8

# Total Parameters	Full Matrix Dimensions	Parameters in Decomposed Matrices (Rank 1)	Relative Number of Values
25	5x5	10	40%
100	10x10	20	20%
2.5k	50x50	100	4%
1M	1k x 1k	2k	0.2%
13B	114k x 114k	228k	0.001%

## Results

Majority of measurements are below 1J or 2J, which makes learning complicated.



### Bag of Words has lowest error and the LLM performs worse than a simple linear model

 Table 5.1:
 Mean Squared Error by Model Type

	Linear	BoW	LLM
LLVM IR Time LLVM IR TSC LLVM IR Power	0.0429 0.0426 0.0404	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0312 \\ 0.0322 \\ 0.0332 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{r} 0.0458 \\ 0.0486 \\ 0.0434 \end{array}$
ASM Time ASM TSC ASM Power	0.0430 0.0431 0.0408	$0.0345 \\ 0.0364 \\ 0.0362$	$\begin{array}{r} 0.04559 \\ 0.0439 \\ 0.0600 \end{array}$
Rust Source Time Rust Source TSC Rust Source Power	0.04121 0.0407 0.0399	$0.0340 \\ 0.0340 \\ 0.0344$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.0459 \\ 0.0458 \\ 0.0432 \end{array}$

# Discussion: Why????

Too few training examples: very likely

Unclear relationship between code and energy consumption: very likely

No information about control- and data-flow: very likely









6

How? You have read the title... right? ☺

#### The Idea

LLMs are great for code understanding, generation, and summarization



Can we adapt and fine-tune an LLM to estimate energy consumption of given code?

#### Thanks!

#### Data Collection



#### LLM Adaptation and Fine-Tuning



#### Results Majority of measurements are below 1J or 2J, which makes learning complicated.



Bag of Words has lowest error and the LLM performs worse that a simple linear model



