

xen characteristics of the cloudlets 40000 instructions and each input file size is 300kb and output file size of 300kb.

The experimental setup runs cloudlets from 1 to 20 and calculated the aggregate time taken by them to execute in CloudSim and Nojavacloud environments including the virtual machine actualizing the time shared and space shared [10] as shown in table 1.

Table 1. Execution time of CloudSim and Nojavacloud

Cloudlets	CloudSim		NoJavaCloud	
	Time shared	Space shared	Time shared	Space shared
1	160	160	140.96	147.008
2	160	160	140.96	147.008
3	266.666	213.33	234.932746	196.007604
4	320	240	281.92	220.512
5	415.915	288	366.421115	264.6144
6	479.99	320	422.87119	294.016
7	571.425	365.74	503.425425	336.041912
8	640	400	563.84	367.52
9	728.888	344.344	642.150328	316.3832672
10	800	480	704.8	441.024
11	887.264	523.636	781.679584	481.1167568
12	959.984	560	845.745904	514.528
13	1046.123	603.076	921.634363	554.1062288
14	1119.976	640	986.698856	588.032
15	1205.322	682.666	1061.888682	627.2335208
16	1280	720	1127.68	661.536
17	1364.688	762.352	1202.290128	700.4490176
18	1439.968	800	1268.611808	735.04
19	1524.195	842.105	1342.815795	773.726074
20	1600	880	1409.6	808.544

To evaluate the performance of Indigenous Cloud Tool and CloudSim with following parameters. The Indigenous Cloud Tool input parameters get from Journal “Cloud Computing Simulation using CloudSim” [8]. The table2 contains input parameters for CloudSim and NoJavaCloud.

Table 2. Input parameters

Properties	CloudSim	NoJavaCloud
Input File Length	40000	40000
Input File Size	300	300
VM mips	1000	1000
RAM	512MB	512MB
Number of PEs	1	1

5.2 Data flow

The Parameters set and feed to the Cloudsim and Indigenous Cloud Tool (NoJavaCloud). The input data stored in excel sheet of the NoJavaCloud tool, then just browse and insert then simulate the Indigenous Cloud Tool. The results of Start time and Finish time of both environments are shown in table 3.

In table 4 the shows the comparison result of CloudSim and NoJavaCloud and the supporting features.

Indigenous Cloud Tool produces same or better output of CloudSim therefore Indigenous Cloud Tool provides

desirable output with GUI feature.

Table 3. Results for simulation in a given environment

Ratio	CloudSim		NoJavaCloud	
	Start Time	Finish Time	Start Time	Finish Time
1.0	0.1	10.54	0.1	5.0
1.5	0.1	6.5	0.1	5.0
2.0	0.1	5.5	0.1	4.0
2.5	0.1	4.4	0.1	3.2
3.0	0.1	3.5	0.1	2.2
3.5	0.1	3.1	0.1	2.0
4.0	0.1	2.5	0.1	2.0
4.5	0.1	2.3	0.1	2.0
5.0	0.1	2.1	0.1	2.0

Table 4. CloudSim and NoJavaCloud comparison

Features	CloudSim	NoJavaCloud
Credential	NO	YES
GUI	NO	YES
Coding Structure	Very Complex	Very Simple
Back End Support	NO	YES
Level of Simulation Steps	Long	Short

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper we have effectively thought about the two fundamental cloud simulator test systems, the "cloudlet scheduler space shared" and "cloudlet scheduler time shared" and observed the degradation of execution time of NoJavaCloud than in cases of CloudSim execution time taken by the cloudlet. At last we have effectively reproduced a heterogeneous cloud environment simulator in which we have placed all the preparing elements similar to MIPS rating in the host and effectively assigned handling resources with various MIPS rating to virtual machines. We have assigned a virtual machine which have the capacity to finish the execution of cloudlet effectively and calculated the aggregate number of cloudlets executed successfully. The experiment results show that the new proposed approach outperforms the current approach as far as the aggregate number of cloudlets executed effectively.

In this paper, indigenous cloud tool (NoJavaCloud) developed has been presented. In the cloud environment it has been specifically designed for simulating the Task Scheduling. The researcher can utilize the NoJavaCloud slight programming knowledge. GUI environment is the fine feature of NoJavaCloud reduces the learning time. This feature reduces the research duration and the researcher only focuses their research area. Application security product the vital research data of the researcher. The NoJavaCloud contain backend so the user feed more data and backup the database. Hence this indigenous cloud tool (NoJavaCloud) is better than CloudSim in so many aspects.

REFERENCES

- [1] Armbrust M, Fox A, Griffith R, Joseph AD, Katz R, Konwinski A, Lee G, Patterson D, Rabkin A, Stoica I, Zaharia M. (2010). A view of cloud computing. Communications of the ACM 53(4): 50-58.
- [2] Papazoglou MP. (2003). Service-oriented computing: Concepts, characteristics and directions. In Web Information Systems Engineering 2003. WISE 2003.

- Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on, IEEE, pp. 3-12.
- [3] Dillon T, Wu C, Chang E. (2010). April. Cloud computing: Issues and challenges. In *Advanced Information Networking and Applications (AINA)*, 2010 24th IEEE International Conference on, pp. 27-33.
- [4] Upadhyaya J, Ahuja NJ. (2017). February. Quality of service in cloud computing in higher education: A critical survey and innovative model. In *I-SMAC (IoT in Social, Mobile, Analytics and Cloud)(I-SMAC)*, 2017 International Conference on, IEEE, pp. 137-140.
- [5] Calheiros RN, Rajiv R, Anton B, César AF De R, Rajkumar B. (2011). CloudSim: a toolkit for modeling and simulation of cloud computing environments and evaluation of resource provisioning algorithms. *Software: Practice and Experience* 41(1): 23-50.
- [6] Wickremasinghe B, Calheiros RN, Buyya R. (2010). Cloudanalyst: A cloudsim-based visual modeller for analysing cloud computing environments and applications. In *Advanced Information Networking and Applications (AINA)*, 2010 24th IEEE International Conference on, IEEE, pp. 446-452.
- [7] Buyya R, Ranjan R, Calheiros RN. (2009). Modeling and simulation of scalable Cloud computing environments and the CloudSim toolkit: Challenges and opportunities. In *High Performance Computing & Simulation, 2009. HPCS'09. International Conference on, IEEE*, pp. 1-11.
- [8] Goga K, Terzo O, Ruiu P, Xhafa F. (2014). Simulation, modeling, and performance evaluation tools for cloud applications. In *Complex, Intelligent and Software Intensive Systems (CISIS)*, 2014 Eighth International Conference on, IEEE, pp. 226-232.
- [9] Splieth M, Bosse S, Schulz C, Turowski K. (2015). Analyzing the effects of load distribution algorithms on energy consumption of servers in cloud data centers. In *Wirtschaftsinformatik*, 287-301.
- [10] Ghanbari S, Mohamed O. (2012). A priority based job scheduling algorithm in cloud computing. *Procedia Engineering* 50(1): 778-785.
- [11] Guo ZH, Geoffrey F, Mo Z. (2012). Investigation of data locality in mapreduce. In *Proceedings of the 2012 12th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (ccgrid 2012)*, IEEE, pp. 419-426.
- [12] Sakellari G, Loukas G. (2013). A survey of mathematical models, simulation approaches and testbeds used for research in cloud computing. *Simulation Modelling Practice and Theory* 39: 92-103.
- [13] Kaur R, Ghuman NS. (2015). A survey and comparison of various cloud simulators available for cloud environment. *Int. J. Adv. Res. Comput. Commun. Eng.* 4(5): 605-608.
- [14] Kumar P, Rai AK. (2014). An overview and survey of various cloud simulation tools. *International Journal of Global Research in Computer Science (UGC Approved Journal)* 5(1): 24-26.
- [15] Guzek M, Bouvry P, Talbi EG. (2015). A survey of evolutionary computation for resource management of processing in cloud computing. *IEEE Computational Intelligence Magazine* 10(2): 53-67.