End-to-end deadlines over dynamic topologies

Victor Millnert, Enrico Bini, Johan Eker

ECRTS'19







victor@control.lth.se











[https://www.gillware.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/die-cut-stickers.png] [https://compass.ie/wordpress/media/Cloud-computing-infographic.png] [https://www.pollux.com.br/index/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/sensorização.jpg]



Modeling of the network flows **A network** $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{F}\}$



A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}\$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide)



A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}\$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide) A set of flows \mathscr{F}



- A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide) A set of flows \mathscr{F}
 - follow a specific path: $p_j = \{p_j(1), p_j(2), \dots, p_j(\ell_j)\}$



A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}\$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide) A set of flows \mathscr{F}

- follow a specific path: $p_j = \{p_j(1), p_j(2), \dots, p_j(\ell_j)\}$
- end-to-end response-time: $\mathscr{R}_{i}(t)$



A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide) A set of flows \mathscr{F}

- follow a specific path: $p_j = \{p_j(1), p_j(2), \dots, p_j(\ell_j)\}$
- end-to-end response-time: $\mathscr{R}_{i}(t)$
- end-to-end deadline: \mathcal{D}_j



A network $\mathscr{G} = \{\mathscr{V}, \mathscr{F}\}$ A set of nodes \mathscr{V} (covered on next slide) A set of flows \mathscr{F}

• follow a specific path: $p_j = \{p_j(1), p_j(2), \dots, p_j(\ell_j)\}$

3

2

 $\mathcal{F} = \{1, 2, 3\}$

 $p_2 = \{1, 3, 5\}$

2

5

3

3

2

- end-to-end response-time: $\mathscr{R}_{i}(t)$
- end-to-end deadline: \mathcal{D}_j

Goal:

The goal of the work is to ensure that the end-to-end response-time of every flow is less then their end-to-end deadline:

 $\forall t \geq 0, \, \forall j \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{R}_j(t) \leq \mathcal{D}_j.$







A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

• node response-time: $R_i(t)$



A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$



A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$

Definition of response-time $R_i(t)$:

The time it takes a packet entering node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ at time *t* to be processed.



A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$

Definition of response-time $R_i(t)$:

The time it takes a packet entering node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ at time *t* to be processed.



 $\mathcal{V} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$

Comments on response-time:

A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$

Definition of response-time $R_i(t)$:

The time it takes a packet entering node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ at time *t* to be processed.

Comments on response-time:

Accounts for all possible delay within the node.
E.g., computation time, queueing delay, etc...



A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$

Definition of response-time $R_i(t)$:

The time it takes a packet entering node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ at time *t* to be processed.

Comments on response-time:

- Accounts for all possible delay within the node.
 - E.g., computation time, queueing delay, etc...
- All packets are treated the same, regardless of which flow it belongs to.



A set of nodes ${\mathscr V}$

- node response-time: $R_i(t)$
- node deadline: $D_i(t)$

Definition of response-time $R_i(t)$:

The time it takes a packet entering node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ at time *t* to be processed.

Comments on response-time:

- Accounts for all possible delay within the node.
 - E.g., computation time, queueing delay, etc...
- All packets are treated the same, regardless of which flow it belongs to.
- We do not focus on how this is computed!





Assumption (response-time control):

We assume that every node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ can guarantee that its response-time $R_i(t)$ is less than its node deadline $D_i(t)$:

 $\forall t \ge 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad R_i(t) \le D_i(t) \,.$



Assumption (response-time control):

We assume that every node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ can guarantee that its response-time $R_i(t)$ is less than its node deadline $D_i(t)$:

 $\forall t \ge 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad R_i(t) \le D_i(t) \,.$



Ways to enforce $R_i(t) \leq D_i(t)$:

- Brown-out control [18].
- Scaling of processing capacity [7].

Assumption (response-time control):

We assume that every node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ can guarantee that its response-time $R_i(t)$ is less than its node deadline $D_i(t)$:

 $\forall t \geq 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad R_i(t) \leq D_i(t) \, .$

Ways to enforce $R_i(t) \leq D_i(t)$:

- Brown-out control [18].
- Scaling of processing capacity [7].
- 18 Tommi Nylander, Marcus Thelander Andrén, Karl-Erik Årzén, and Martina Maggio. Cloud application predictability through integrated load-balancing and service time control. In 2018 IEEE International Conference on Autonomic Computing (ICAC), pages 51–60. IEEE, 2018.
- 7 Dan Henriksson, Ying Lu, and Tarek Abdelzaher. Improved prediction for web server delay control. In *Real-Time Systems, 2004. ECRTS 2004. Proceedings. 16th Euromicro Conference* on, pages 61–68. IEEE, 2004.

What's the goal here?

The goal:

1. Guarantee that the flows meet their end-to-end deadlines: $\forall t \ge 0, \forall j \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{R}_j(t) \le \mathcal{D}_j.$

2. Allow flows to be able to join the network.

What's the goal here?

The goal:

1. Guarantee that the flows meet their end-to-end deadlines: $\forall t \ge 0, \forall j \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{R}_j(t) \le \mathcal{D}_j.$

2. Allow flows to be able to join the network.

Control knobs:

1. Control the deadlines $D_i(t)$ of the nodes.

2. Control when new flows can join.

2-node example:

Assume a simple system with two nodes and two flows:

End-to-end deadline: $\mathcal{D}_1 = 6$.

2

Let's assume that node 2 wishes to change its node deadline from 5 to 1 because of a new flow joining the system.

$$D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$$

2-node example:

Assume a simple system with two nodes and two flows:

End-to-end deadline: $\mathcal{D}_1 = 6$.

Let's assume that node 2 wishes to change its node deadline from 5 to 1 because of a new flow joining the system.

$$D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$$

How should we choose $D_1(t)$?

2-node example:

Assume a simple system with two nodes and two flows:

End-to-end deadline: $\mathcal{D}_1 = 6$.

Let's assume that node 2 wishes to change its node deadline from 5 to 1 because of a new flow joining the system.

$$D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$$

How should we choose $D_1(t)$?

A naive approach: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

2-node example:

Assume a simple system with two nodes and two flows:

End-to-end deadline: $\mathcal{D}_1 = 6$.

Let's assume that node 2 wishes to change its node deadline from 5 to 1 because of a new flow joining the system.

$$D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$$

How should we choose $D_1(t)$?

A naive approach: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Gives us: $D_1(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 5$

2-node example:

Assume a simple system with two nodes and two flows:

End-to-end deadline: $\mathcal{D}_1 = 6$.

Let's assume that node 2 wishes to change its node deadline from 5 to 1 because of a new flow joining the system.

$$D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$$

How should we choose $D_1(t)$?

A naive approach: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Gives us: $D_1(t_1) = 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad D_1(t_2) = 5$

Change them linearly from $t_1 \rightarrow t_2$ $D_1(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 5$ $D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$

Does it work?

Change them linearly: $D_1(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 5$ $D_2(t_1) = 5 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 1$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t) = \mathcal{D}_1 \ (=6)$

Does it work?

Change them linearly:

 $D_{1}(t_{1}) = 1 \rightarrow D_{1}(t_{2}) = 5$ $D_{2}(t_{1}) = 5 \rightarrow D_{2}(t_{2}) = 1$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_{1}(t) + D_{2}(t) = \mathcal{D}_{1} \ (=6)$

Let's be evil and assume:

The largest possible response-time:

 $\forall t \ge 0, \quad R_i(t) = D_i(t).$


Let's be evil and assume:

The largest possible response-time:

 $\forall t \ge 0, \quad R_i(t) = D_i(t).$





Let's be evil and assume:

The largest possible response-time:

 $\forall t \ge 0, \quad R_i(t) = D_i(t).$

















Solution:

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

 $\forall t \geq 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \leq \mathcal{D}_1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

 $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

With the requirement of

 $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

$$\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$$

With the requirement of

$$D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$$

We get

$$D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

$$\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$$

With the requirement of

$$D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$$

We get

$$D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$$

Example: $\alpha = 0.5$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

$$\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$$

With the requirement of

$$D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$$

We get

$$D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$$

Example: $\alpha = 0.5$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 1.5D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

 $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$

With the requirement of

$$D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$$

We get

 $D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$

Example: $\alpha = 0.5$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 1.5D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ With the requirement of $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$

Solution:

It must hold that: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le \mathscr{D}_1$ Which is guaranteed if: $\forall t \ge 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathscr{D}_1$ and if $\forall t \ge 0, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \le \alpha \in [0, 1]$ because then $D_1(t) + D_2(t + D_1(t)) \le D_1(t) + D_2(t) + \alpha D_1(t) \le \mathscr{D}_1$

Example: $\alpha = 1$

$$\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$$

With the requirement of

$$D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$$

We get

$$D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$$

Example: $\alpha = 0.5$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 1.5D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ With the requirement of $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$ We get $D_1(t_1) = \frac{10}{3} \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = \frac{2}{3}$

$\begin{aligned} \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1 + \alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \leq \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \forall t \geq 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \leq \alpha \in [0, 1] \end{aligned}$

Example: $\alpha = 1$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ With the requirement of $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$ We get $D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$ $-D_1(t) - D_2(t)$ $\square \mathbb{D}_1(t)$ - - - packet 6 (ms) 4 time $\mathbf{2}$ 0 2 6 8 10 4 120 t_1 $t_2 \tau_1 + \mathcal{D}_1$ time (ms)

$\begin{aligned} \forall t \geq 0, \quad (1+\alpha)D_1(t) + D_2(t) \leq \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \forall t \geq 0, \, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \leq \alpha \in [0,1] \end{aligned}$

Example: $\alpha = 1$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 2D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ With the requirement of $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$ We get $D_1(t_1) = 2.5 \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = 0.5$ $-D_1(t) - D_2(t)$ $\mathbb{D}\mathbb{D}_1(t)$ - - - packet 6 (ms)4 time $\mathbf{2}$ 0 8 6 102 4 12() t_1 $t_2 \tau_1 + \mathcal{D}_1$ time (ms)

Example: $\alpha = 0.5$ $\forall t \ge 0, \quad 1.5D_1(t) + D_2(t) \le \mathcal{D}_1$ With the requirement of $D_2(t_1) = 1 \rightarrow D_2(t_2) = 5$ We get $D_1(t_1) = \frac{10}{3} \rightarrow D_1(t_2) = \frac{2}{3}$ $D_1(t) \longrightarrow D_2(t)$ $\square \mathbb{D}_1(t)$ - - - packet 6 (ms)4 time 20 2 8 6 104 12() t_1 $t_1 + \mathcal{D}_1 \quad t_t$ time (ms)

The general case

Theorem in the paper: If the rate-of-change of the node deadlines is limited by α : $\forall t \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad |\dot{D}_i(t)| \leq \alpha,$ and if the node deadlines always remain within the safe space: $\forall t \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{V}, \quad D_i(t) \in \mathbb{D}(\mathcal{G}),$ where the safe space $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{G})$ is given by: $\mathbb{D}(\mathscr{G}) = \{ D_i \in \mathbb{R}^+ : \forall j \in \mathscr{F}, \sum (1+\alpha)^{\ell_j - i} D_{p_i(i)} \le \mathscr{D}_j \},\$ i=1then no end-to-end deadlines will be missed: $\forall t \ge 0, \, \forall j \in \mathcal{F}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{i}(t) \le \mathcal{D}_{i}.$

- $p_j(i)$: the i-th node on path j
- ℓ_i : length of path j
- ${\mathscr G}$: the network
- \mathcal{F} : set of flows in the network

What about a flow joining?

New flow \Rightarrow new end-to-end deadline



What about a flow joining?

Oops!

The space of feasible node deadlines changed when we admitted the new flow!

=> we are now outside the safe space



What can we do then?

What was the problem?

We left the safe space ... => cannot guarantee that the end-to-end deadlines will be met

Solution:

Only admit the new flow when you are in the new safe region $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{G}^+)$.

What can we do then?

What was the problem?

We left the safe space ... => cannot guarantee that the end-to-end deadlines will be met

Solution:

Only admit the new flow when you are in the new safe region $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{G}^+)$.



What can we do then?

What was the problem?

We left the safe space ... => cannot guarantee that the end-to-end deadlines will be met

Solution:

Only admit the new flow when you are in the new safe region $\mathbb{D}(\mathcal{G}^+)$.



Conclusions

Take-away message:

- Movement needs space
- Never leave your safe space

Conclusions

Take-away message:

- Movement needs space
- Never leave your safe space

Also in the paper:

- How to allow nodes to leave
- Simulation results
- Protocols for:
 - controlling node deadlines
 - admitting new flows
 - allowing nodes to leave

Conclusions

Take-away message:

- Movement needs space
- Never leave your safe space

Also in the paper:

- How to allow nodes to leave
- Simulation results
- Protocols for:
 - controlling node deadlines
 - admitting new flows
 - allowing nodes to leave

Future work:

• How to enforce $R_i(t) \leq D_i(t)$

Thank you!



Victor Millnert victor@control.lth.se



Waiting time for flows...


How does it affect QoS?

