#### Automated Planning for Open Network Architectures Alexey Rudenko

Advisors: Peter Reiher and Gerald J. Popek

University of California, Los Angeles June 2002

## Introduction

- Motivation
  - Distributed adaptations can improve often-poor QoS
  - How to perform adapter distribution?
  - Automated solution is preferred
- Goal
  - Allocate adapters for a connection
  - Under various constraints
- Challenge
  - Build a planning system that can be used transparently for applications in programmable networks

## Accomplishments

- Designed and implemented an automated planning system that calculates and deploys plans
- Measured the performance of the planning system
- Demonstrated advantages of planning
- Results are being published

## **Reasons for Adaptability**

- Network variability
  - Bandwidth, latency, jitter, security, reliability, monetary cost
- Network heterogeneity
  - Internet, wireless, dial-up, specialized client devices
- Some applications require at least a particular level of service
  - Real-time applications

## Adaptations

- Application data stream can be adapted with:
  - Compression
  - Distilling
  - Encryption
  - Prioritization
  - Data storage (caching, prefetching, buffering)
  - Scheduling wireless interface
  - FEC

#### **Open Network Architectures**

- Programmable networks whose behavior can be dynamically changed
  - User data adaptation
  - User data rerouting
- Active Networks, Conductor
  - Dynamic deployment of adapters

## Planned Distributed Adaptation

- Select and distribute adapters within programmable networks to effectively improve QoS of applications
- Build automated planning system for unicast connections serving adaptationunaware applications

*Plan* is a set of instructions to the connection nodes

- what adapter to use
- in what order
- with respect to available node resources

#### Secure Low-Bandwidth Web



Introduction Planning Procedure Planning Algorithm Performance Conclusion 8

FEC

#### Secure Low-Bandwidth Video



Low bandwidth Insecure Unreliable	Low bandwidth	Insecure
Adaptation: Compression Encryption	Distilling Compression	Encryption

#### **Exhaustive Search**



## Naïve Template Planning

- Adapters always on problematic links
- Example of an inefficient solution



## Naïve Template Planning 2

- Adapters always on end links
- Example of an infeasible solution



## Full-Scale Template Planning

- Exponential space of network situations is referred to a smaller number of precalculated plan templates
- Put real adapters during connection establishment
- Potentially inefficient, infeasible

# Solution: Online Automated Planning

- Allocate adapters
- Satisfy constraints
  - Keep used link resources below offered limits
  - Keep used node resource below offered limits
  - Minimize nodes' resources used

#### **Requirements to Planning**

- Planning must be fast to benefit real-time applications
- Adapters must be consistent
  - No adapter inhibits the work of another adapter
  - Semantics of data is preserved
- Adapters must be efficiently selected, ordered, and located

## Requirements (cont.)

- Extensibility of the system
  - Independent evolution of planners and adapters
- Resource management
  - Accept or reject a new connection
  - Stop, kill, or replan old connections
- Security of the planning procedure
- Fault-tolerance (what if node/adapter fails?)
- Accounting

## **General Planning Procedure**

#### • Planning data collection

- User preferences
- Application data stream requirements
- Network conditions
- Plan calculation with the planning algorithm
- Plan deployment
- Local planning and centralized planning

# Local Planning

- Local plan between two neighbor nodes
  - Assume
    - planning data collected off-line
    - adapters are locally available
  - Local planning: adapter selection and ordering
- Chain of sequential local plans
  - Can be used as a solution
  - Calculated fast
  - Potentially inefficient

## Local Planning



## **Centralized Planning**

- Collects planning data about a connection
  - Application requirements
  - Network conditions
- Calculates a plan
- Deploys the plan
- More efficient but harder to calculate



#### Centralized Planning (cont.) Planner Adapter storage site Sending user Destination Source Receiving user ONA node Planner Adapters Introduction Planning Procedure Planning Algorithm Performance Conclusion 22

### Implementation with Panda

- Panda AN system designed in our lab
- Planner and adapter storage site on the source node



## **Combined Planning Procedure**

- Local planning is first
- Switch to a new central plan when it is ready
  - Central plan may not be necessary for short (< 100 packets) connections</li>
  - Factors for longer life of local plan
    - slow machines
    - busy network
    - central plan calculation delay or failure
    - central plan deployment delay or failure

#### **Combined Planning Procedure**

- Network conditions can change during session
  - Run centralized planning again
  - Switch to a new central plan

• Now: how to calculate a plan?

# Planning Algorithm

• Planner must understand adapter data

#### Adapter data structure

Problem ID	Solution method	Low bandwidth
Effects: Efficiency of solution, impact on data size, lossless (y/n), etc.		Effects: efficiency = 0 data size coef lossless = yes
Costs: Required executional resources, execution latency, monetary cost, delivery latency, etc.		Costs: CPU, memor
Preconditions	Postconditions	Compressability = 1

#### Example of compressor data

Low bandwidth	LZ compression			
Effects: efficiency = 0.5 data size coefficient = 0.5 lossless = yes				
Costs: CPU, memory, HD				
Compressability = 1	Compressability = 0			

## Planning Data

• What data is necessary for planning?

Category	Attributes (example)
Stream characteristics	Throughput, format, encrypted (y/n), compressed (y/n
Stream requirements	Throughput, secret (y/n)
User preferences	User chooses a solution method if more than one exist
Link resources	Bandwidth, secure $(y/n)$ , reliable $(y/n)$ , etc.
Node resources	CPU, memory, HD

## Heuristic Search in Plan Space

- Run sequentially
  - Adapter selection
    - using real adapters, handle plan feasibility and adapter consistency from the beginning of a planning process
  - Adapter ordering
    - templates can be calculated off-line
  - Optimize of adapter locations in the results of adapter selection and ordering



#### Adapter Ordering

• One or more partial-order plans ordered by solution methods



## Adapter Ordering (cont.)

- Additional constraints come from:
  - Application-level protocol requirements
  - Adapter preconditions/postconditions
    - e.g., adapter requires a particular format
  - Network conditions
    - if users are not able to decrypt cached data, it should be cached unencrypted

## Adapter Ordering (cont.)

- Conflicts between real adapters during ordering
  - Detected through precondition and postcondition analysis
  - Resolved through
    - reorder, if partial order plan allows
    - adding more adapters
  - If not solvable, adapter selection must be repeated

## **Resulting Local Plans**

- Result of adapter selection and ordering
  - Chain of local per-link plans
  - The result plan works
  - But can be inefficient
    - processes data longer
    - wastes connection link resources

## **Optimization of Plan**

- Optimization is needed
  - Cover more connection hops with an adapter that improves link conditions (compression, encryption, etc.)
    - Not with FEC, wireless interface scheduler, and some other adapters!
  - Drop redundant adapters
    - also reduce the latency of adaptation
  - Stay feasible

## **Plan Optimization**

- Recursive best-first search
  - Local plan chain is the initial point
  - Transformation: merging neighboring plans
  - preserving adapter order link node nodesresources links resources - Evaluation function  $f = \sum_{k=1}^{max} \sum_{k=1}^{max} \alpha_k lr_k + \sum_{k=1}^{max} \sum_{k=1}^{max} \beta_m nr_m$
  - - $\alpha_k$ ,  $\beta_m$  weight coefficients
    - $lr_k$ ,  $nr_m$  link and node resources
  - Find minimum of the function
    - can be local

## Example of Two Plans Merging



## Plan Merging (cont.)

- Plan merge can fail
  - discouraged by an evaluation function
  - insufficient knowledge about adapters
  - unrecoverable constraint conflict
  - insufficient computational resources on connection nodes
  - time limit
- Best-effort plan is delivered

## Example of Planning



## Example of Planning



## Example of Planning (cont.)



## Example of Planning (cont.)



## Example (cont.)

#### • Chain of local plans



## Example (cont.)

- Merge AB+BC
  - DeFEC stays on B
  - Compression dropped



## Example (cont.)

- Merge AC + CD
  - Encryption dropped



#### **Performance Results**

- The planner testing on a separate machine
  - Dell Inspiron, 333 MHz, 128MB
  - Simulate connections
    - number of nodes (2 to 15)
    - problems of low bandwidth, very low bandwidth, and security for each link
    - number of adapters a node can execute (1 to 10)
  - Exhaustive search planner for heuristics search evaluation

# Heuristics/Exhaustive Planning Latency Ratio



# of adapters in non-opyimized plan

Given that an optimal plan exists, it was not found in: 1 case for 4-node connection (from 1000 tries) 3 cases for 5-node connection (from 1000 tries) 8 cases for 6-node connection (occurred in about 1 percent of tries)

## Planning Algorithm Test

#### 6 nodes, 14 adapters: 90 milliseconds at most



## Planning Algorithm Test (cont.)

#### 12 nodes, 9 adapters: 160 milliseconds at most



## **Real-time Application Test**

- HP Omnibook, 500 MHz, 128Mb
- Panda middleware with planner
- Applications
  - Connector (test application)
  - WaveVideo multimedia package [Fankhauser99]
- Adapters
  - Null adapters, resolution-drop, encryption

## Application Test (cont.)

- 2-, 3-, 4-node connections
- Link conditions
  - 150 Kbps, 800 Kbps
  - secure, insecure
- QoS is measured in dB, peak signal-to-noise ratio (PSNR)



## **PSNR** (luminance)

#### **PSNR is 10 dB higher for an adapted stream**



## Centralized vs. Local Planning



## Centralized vs. Local Planning



## Planning Procedure Latency

#### Planning procedure is 1.1 second at most 100 to150 packets under local plan before central plan is on



## **Related Work**

- Naïve Planning (mostly proxies)
  Agent-proxy Mowgli [Liuljeberg96]
- Template Planning
  - Conductor [Yarvis00]
- Online Planning
  - Adaptation: CANS [Fu01]
- Inspirational AI Planning Approaches
  - least-commitment planning [Kamphampati94]
  - RBFS [Korf93]

## Contribution

- Designed and implemented
  - Heuristic planning algorithm for unicast connections
    - adapter data structure
    - adapter selection supporting system extensibility
    - adapter ordering
    - plan optimization
  - Feasible automated planning procedure
    - Combined local and centralized planning
    - Replanning
    - Shown that real-time applications benefit

56

#### Work was presented

- Demonstrations
  - DARPA site visit
  - UCLA CSD Annual Research Review
- Publications
  - Openarch 2000
  - Dance 2002
  - Other papers in the works

## Wider Applicability

- Beneficial for rescue/military missions
  - Ad hoc networks with highly customized application protocols
- Applicable on various distributed systems
  - Open network architectures
  - Peer-to-peer networks
  - Remote code invocation systems

## Conclusion

- Feasible planning system for unicast connections is implemented
- Real-time applications benefit
- The planning system allows relatively independent development of planner and adapters
- The planning system improves active network resource distribution



Introduction Planning Procedure Planning Algorithm Performance Conclusion

60