

Benchmarking Energy Consumption of Quantum Computers

Jose Miralles, Jordi Riu, Jofre Vallès, Artur Garcia, Marta Estarellas

A team of quantum specialists





Our unique strategy to quantum advantage





CUCO



- Quantum Computing for Strategic Industries
- Funded by CDTI and supported by the Spanish Ministry of Science.

MINISTERIO DE CIENCIA E INNOVACIÓN

OBIERNO

• Qilimanjaro is responsible for QC in logistics and benchmarking.































Benchmarks



Benchmarking QC



Desired Properties¹

- Randomized
- Holistic
- Platform Independent
- Clearly Defined

Relevant Measures

- Time To Solution
- Solution Accuracy
- Energetic cost

System Level Benchmarks

- Quantum Volume
- Cross-Entropy Benchmarking
- Randomized Benchmarking (Clifford/Direct)
- ...

Application Level Benchmarks

- Q-Score
- Qpack Scores
- SupermarQ
- QED-C
- ...

Energy Benchmarks in the lab DIY



IoT energy meter

Specs

- Electrical consumption <1W
- Readout frequency 1 second
- Readout accuracy 1% error

Tracked Components

- Quantum Control and Readout Modules (QCM/QRM)
- Full Rack (rest of components)



Energy Benchmarks: system's architecture

meter

- Repository available at <u>https://github.com/gilimanjaro-tech/gi</u> <u>lisensors</u>
- Deployable into any server or controller such as RaspberryPi or Arduino due to Docker containerization
- Real-time plotting with Grafana.



Energy Benchmarks: live plotting





Energy Benchmarks: calibration plotting





- Single qubit calibration are composed of qubit characterization, single shot statistics for readout (SSRO) and randomized benchmarking experiments per qubit.
- Two qubit gate calibration composed of amplitude correction experiments per coupler.



Table of Averaged Constant Costs:

	Equipment Name	Estimated Avg Power Consumption (kW)	Estimated Total Avg Consumption (kW)
Fridge	Vacuum Pumps	$8.5 imes 10^{-1}$	
	Chillers	2	$1.73 imes10^1$
	Compressor	$1.45 imes 10^1$	
Supporting Electronics	Total	$6.7 imes 10^{-1}$	$6.7 imes10^{-1}$
Total Idle State Consumption		$1.8 imes10^1$	

Energy Benchmarks: Initial results

- Native gates are X, Y, Z, CZ
- Implementation of Z gates are 'Virtual Z Gates'¹ which in duration are equivalent to identities.
- Plot generated with two qubits (1-2).
 100 circuit executions per data point, each circuit 1k shots.
- Assumption of linear scaling since drag pulses are applied at a per qubit basis.



¹https://arxiv.org/abs/1612.00858

Energy Benchmarks: Initial results



- 5-qubits superconducting chip used with star coupling, qubit 2 at the center
- Increase in power ranges between 7-10W. The image shows the upper bound energy increase at 10W increase each.
- At low depths, largest increase in energy consumption is due to number of qubits (width).
- No noticeable increase in power metrics for up to 5 qubits aside from circuit execution duration.



Energy Benchmarks: comparison with HPC



Gather detailed metrics from HPC systems at runtime:

- Resource managing system (SLURM)
- Dedicated solutions: EAR (BSC's spin-off company EAS Energy Aware Solutions)









Energy Benchmarks: comparison with HPC



- Use of power is not a constant, with strong dependence on the activity
- Each node (2 CPU): 100-200 W sustained
- Simulations range between **10 to 30 minutes**
- CPU is using a large portion of the power consumption
- Simulations with Tensor Networks, doing exact contractions.

Metrics obtained for medium scale simulations on Marenostrum 5 with Marenostrum 4 settings (64 qubits, shallow circuit of max depth of 12):



Execution using 40 nodes

Execution using 10 nodes



Energy Benchmarks: comparison with HPC

- QC data extrapolation at BSC circuit simulation (64 qubits x 12 depth) dimension yields **an additional energy requirement of ~ 108 J**
- BSCs estimated lower bound in energy consumption of CPUs for the simulation using TNs is ~ 300 kJ while total QC energy cost is ~ 41 kJ
- Initial rough estimates indicate an energy cost decrease of ~ 86% at presented task.





- Perform **relevant applicative task comparisons** between QC and HPC
- Formal definition of a comparative benchmark of quantum systems vs HPC, considering TTS, solution accuracy, and energy consumption following ideal benchmark guidelines.
- Introduce tensor network bond dimension adjustment for **energetic study** related to error calculation.
- Obtain exhaustive, more granulated measurements with **peak CPU performance** in MareNostrum5.
- Implement **state of the art methods** in both systems for fair comparison.





https://github.com/gilimanjaro-tech/gilisensors

jose.miralles@qilimanjaro.tech jordi.riu@qilimanjaro.tech mpestarellas@qilimanjaro.tech

QUANTUM·TEC