

R TU Rheinland-Pfälzische Technische Universität Kaiserslautern Landau

# Per-Flow Backlog Bounds for a FIFO Server Beyond Token-Bucket-Constrained Arrivals

Lukas Wildberger, Anja Hamscher, Jens B. Schmitt

June 5th 2025

These results will be published in QEST + FORMATS 2025

## Outline

1 Motivation

2 Backlog Bound

3 Numerical Evaluation



∜onib

## **Motivation**

1 Motivation

2 Backlog Bound

**3** Numerical Evaluation

4 Conclusion

∜onib

### What We're Up To



### What We're Up To



How to choose the free parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  in order to minimize the

Backlog bound

### What We're Up To



How to choose the free parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  in order to minimize the

- Backlog bound
- We have to solve the mathematical problem given by:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta > 0} \{ v(\alpha_1, \beta_{\theta}^1) \}$

 Literature results primarily for token-bucket arrival and rate-latency service curves [Le Boudec and Thiran, 2001]

 Literature results primarily for token-bucket arrival and rate-latency service curves [Le Boudec and Thiran, 2001]



 Literature results primarily for token-bucket arrival and rate-latency service curves [Le Boudec and Thiran, 2001]



### Function Set - PWL Concave/Convex Curves



## Function Set - PWL Concave/Convex Curves



 FIFO residual service curve is also a service curve for the foi even if it is not wide-sense increasing [Bouillard et al., 2018]

## Terminology



### Terminology



We call time where the slope of the linear segment changes "breakpoint"
 In the literature also referred to as "intersetion point" or "changepoint"

## **Backlog Bound**

1 Motivation

2 Backlog Bound

3 Numerical Evaluation

4 Conclusion

#### Lemma

Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}$  be given. Then it holds that  $v(\alpha, \beta) = v(\alpha, \beta_{\downarrow})$ , with  $\beta_{\downarrow} := \beta \overline{\oslash} 0$ .

#### Lemma

Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}$  be given. Then it holds that  $v(\alpha, \beta) = v(\alpha, \beta_{\downarrow})$ , with  $\beta_{\downarrow} := \beta \overline{\oslash} 0$ .



#### Lemma

Let  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{F}$  be given. Then it holds that  $v(\alpha, \beta) = v(\alpha, \beta_{\downarrow})$ , with  $\beta_{\downarrow} := \beta \overline{\oslash} 0$ .









 If we choose smaller/larger θ values the vertical distance will increase at some breakpoints and decrease at others



- If we choose smaller/larger θ values the vertical distance will increase at some breakpoints and decrease at others
- We cannot split the problem into token-bucket cases and take the minimum



- If we choose smaller/larger θ values the vertical distance will increase at some breakpoints and decrease at others
- We cannot split the problem into token-bucket cases and take the minimum
- We have to take care of all linear sections at once

Transform the initial problem until we are able to determine a solution

- Transform the initial problem until we are able to determine a solution
- Initial Problem:

$$\theta_{\mathsf{opt}} = \underset{\theta \ge 0}{\arg\min} \{ v \left( \alpha_1, \beta_{\theta}^1 \right) \}$$

- Transform the initial problem until we are able to determine a solution
- Initial Problem:

$$\theta_{\mathsf{opt}} = \arg\min_{\theta \ge 0} \{ v(\alpha_1, \beta_{\theta}^1) \}$$

Transformed into equivalent one:

$$\theta_{\mathsf{opt}} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\theta \ge 0} \{ \max_{t \ge 0} \{ v_t(\theta) \} \}$$

- Transform the initial problem until we are able to determine a solution
- Initial Problem:

$$\theta_{\mathsf{opt}} = \underset{\theta \ge 0}{\arg\min} \{ v \big( \alpha_1, \beta_{\theta}^1 \big) \}$$

Transformed into equivalent one:

$$\theta_{\mathsf{opt}} = \underset{\theta \ge 0}{\arg\min} \{ \max_{t \ge 0} \{ v_t(\theta) \} \}$$

$$egin{aligned} & \mathsf{v}_t( heta)\coloneqq egin{pmatrix} lpha_1(t)-eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta)\leq heta < t, \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta\geq t>h(lpha_2,eta). \end{aligned}$$



$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{v}_t( heta) \coloneqq egin{cases} lpha_1(t) - eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta) \leq heta < t, \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta \geq t > h(lpha_2,eta). \end{aligned}$$

$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{v}_t( heta)\coloneqq egin{cases} lpha_1(t)-eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta)\leq heta < t, \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta\geq t>h(lpha_2,eta). \end{aligned}$$



$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{v}_t( heta) \coloneqq egin{cases} lpha_1(t) - eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta) \leq heta < t \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta \geq t > h(lpha_2,eta) \end{aligned}$$



$$egin{aligned} \mathsf{v}_t( heta) \coloneqq egin{cases} lpha_1(t) - eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta) \leq heta < t \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta \geq t > h(lpha_2,eta) \end{aligned}$$



Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta > 0} \{\max_{t \ge 0} \{v_t(\theta)\}\}$ 

- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta \ge 0} \{\max_{t \ge 0} \{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Get a lower bound (> 0) and an upper bound for the choice of  $\theta$

- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta \ge 0} \{\max_{t \ge 0} \{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Get a lower bound (> 0) and an upper bound for the choice of  $\theta$
- Discretize t, s.t. we have a finite set of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves
  - A finite set, since only the  $v_t(\theta)$  curves of the breakpoints are relevant

- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta \ge 0} \{\max_{t \ge 0} \{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Get a lower bound (> 0) and an upper bound for the choice of  $\theta$
- Discretize t, s.t. we have a finite set of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves
  - A finite set, since only the  $v_t(\theta)$  curves of the breakpoints are relevant



- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg \min_{\theta \ge 0} \{\max_{t \ge 0} \{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Get a lower bound (> 0) and an upper bound for the choice of  $\theta$
- Discretize t, s.t. we have a finite set of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves
  - A finite set, since only the  $v_t(\theta)$  curves of the breakpoints are relevant



- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg\min\{\max\{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Solution is given by the last of all intersections of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves and  $\alpha_1(\theta)$

- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg\min\{\max\{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Solution is given by the last of all intersections of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves and  $\alpha_1(\theta)$



- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg\min\{\max\{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Solution is given by the last of all intersections of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves and  $\alpha_1(\theta)$



- Problem to solve:  $\theta_{opt} = \arg\min\{\max\{v_t(\theta)\}\}$
- Solution is given by the last of all intersections of  $v_t(\theta)$  curves and  $\alpha_1(\theta)$



## **Numerical Evaluation**

#### 1 Motivation

2 Backlog Bound

#### 3 Numerical Evaluation

#### 4 Conclusion

Setting:

- **n** Rate-latency service curve  $\beta_{R,T}$
- Multiple cross flows and foi constraint by T-Spec arrival curves

 $\alpha_i(t) = \min\{b_i^1 + r_i^1 t, b_i^2 + r_i^2 t\}$ 

Setting:

- **n** Rate-latency service curve  $\beta_{R,T}$
- Multiple cross flows and foi constraint by T-Spec arrival curves

$$\alpha_i(t) = \min\{b_i^1 + r_i^1 t, b_i^2 + r_i^2 t\}$$



Setting:

- **n** Rate-latency service curve  $\beta_{R,T}$
- Multiple cross flows and foi constraint by T-Spec arrival curves

$$\alpha_i(t) = \min\{b_i^1 + r_i^1 t, b_i^2 + r_i^2 t\}$$



Setting:

- **n** Rate-latency service curve  $\beta_{R,T}$
- Multiple cross flows and foi constraint by T-Spec arrival curves

$$\alpha_i(t) = \min\{b_i^1 + r_i^1 t, b_i^2 + r_i^2 t\}$$



#### Numerical Evaluation: Comparison

• We compare the backlog bound using our  $\theta_{opt}$  with our lower bound  $\theta = h(\alpha_2, \beta)$ 

#### Numerical Evaluation: Comparison

- We compare the backlog bound using our  $\theta_{opt}$  with our lower bound  $\theta = h(\alpha_2, \beta)$
- Choosing θ = h(α<sub>2</sub>, β) could be a reasonable choice, since it results in a continuous function

#### Numerical Evaluation: Comparison

- We compare the backlog bound using our  $\theta_{opt}$  with our lower bound  $\theta = h(\alpha_2, \beta)$
- Choosing θ = h(α<sub>2</sub>, β) could be a reasonable choice, since it results in a continuous function



### Conclusion

1 Motivation

2 Backlog Bound

**3** Numerical Evaluation



 $\blacksquare$  We are able to calculate backlog-optimal values of  $\theta$  for PWL concave/convex curves

- $\blacksquare$  We are able to calculate backlog-optimal values of  $\theta$  for PWL concave/convex curves
- Using  $\theta_{\rm opt}$  leads to reduced backlog bounds (compared to the choice of existing tools)

- $\blacksquare$  We are able to calculate backlog-optimal values of  $\theta$  for PWL concave/convex curves
- Using  $\theta_{\rm opt}$  leads to reduced backlog bounds (compared to the choice of existing tools)
- What's next?

- $\blacksquare$  We are able to calculate backlog-optimal values of  $\theta$  for PWL concave/convex curves
- Using  $\theta_{\rm opt}$  leads to reduced backlog bounds (compared to the choice of existing tools)

What's next?

- Explore (further) applications
- Consider multi-node case

...

### References

- Bouillard, A., Boyer, M., and Le Corronc, E. (2018). Deterministic Network Calculus: From Theory to Practical Implementation. John Wiley & Sons.
- Le Boudec, J.-Y. and Thiran, P. (2001). Network Calculus: A Theory of Deterministic Queuing Systems for the Internet. Springer.

## **Delay-Optimal** $\theta$ (Theoretical Result)

#### Theorem

Let S be a system that multiplexes two flows  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  according to FIFO, where the arrivals of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ ,  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ , are constrained by  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_2$  respectively. Further, assume that S offers a service curve  $\beta$  to the aggregate of the flows. If  $\alpha_1 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $\alpha_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  are concave and  $\beta \in \mathcal{F}$  is convex, then the optimal  $\theta$ , that minimizes the delay bound, is given by

$$\theta_{opt} = \underset{\theta \ge 0}{\arg\min} \{h(\alpha_1, \beta_{\theta}^1)\} = h(\alpha_{agg}, \beta).$$

 Under FIFO scheduling the delay bound of the aggregate equals the per-flow delay bound

• It can be directly shown that 
$$h(lpha_{
m agg},eta)=h\Bigl(lpha_1,eta_{{\cal H}(lpha_{
m agg},eta)}\Bigr)$$

#### Definition

$$egin{aligned} & \mathsf{v}_t( heta) \coloneqq egin{cases} lpha_1(t) - eta_ heta^1(t), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta) \le heta < t, \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta \ge t > h(lpha_2,eta), \end{aligned} \ & = egin{cases} lpha_1(t) - eta(t) + lpha_2(t- heta), & ext{if } h(lpha_2,eta) \le heta < t, \ lpha_1( heta), & ext{if } heta \ge t > h(lpha_2,eta). \end{aligned}$$

By definition we have  $\beta_{\theta}^{1} = [\beta(t) - \alpha_{2}(t - \theta)]^{+} \wedge \delta_{\theta}(t)$ . Since for  $\theta < t$  it holds that  $\delta_{\theta}(t) = 0$ , and because  $h(\alpha_{2}, \beta) \leq \theta$  ensures that  $\beta(t) \geq \alpha_{2}(t - \theta)$  for all t, both the positive part and  $\delta_{\theta}(t)$  can be omitted.

### **Application**

We are now able to properly choose flow queue sizes for a setting with flows, having their own flow queue, getting FIFO scheduled

