

# **COSMOS**

#### Cultivate Resilient Smart Objects for Sustainable City Applications

#### Adapting Cloud SLA metrics approaches for supporting IoT related Use Cases

George Kousiouris, Dimosthenis Kyriazis, Andreas Menychtas, Efstathios Karanastasis, Vasiliki Andronikou and Theodora Varvarigou

#### **EuCnC 2016**





#### SLALOM Intro

#### H2020 CSA for

- Development of SLA specification terms
- Contribution to abstract metric / function applicable to different metrics
- Submission of our work to ISO-IECJTC1-SC38-WG3 for standardization in the context of the current draft standard 19086-2
- Main focus: how to enable SLAs to be completely defined and thus monitored/auditable
- Focus of this work:
  - Can we reuse it for IoT Use cases and not duplicate work for a new standard?



## ISO 19086-2 Draft Metric model



- **I** [from current version of draft standard 19086-2, to be made available in the upcoming weeks]
- **Why is this extension so important?**
- It enables us to instantiate it differently per case, thus concretely defining the sampling process per type of SLA and metric



## **Cloud Examples**

- The model has been successfully applied for describing popular Cloud SLAs such as
  - AWS EC2
  - GAE Data Store
  - Microsoft Azure Blob Storage
  - Generic vCore performance metrics

#### Does it make sense to extend it for IoT services?

```
"samples": [
                  "name": "STORAGE GET BLOCK LIST API CALL
       response time",
                  "referenceId": "SAMPLE_001",
                  "scale": "interval",
                                                                                      "name": "GET BLOCK LIST LIMIT",
                  "value limit": PARAM 003,
                                                                                      "value": "60",
                   "unit": "seconds",
                                                                                      "unit": "seconds",
                  "protocol": "REST",
                                                                                      "referenceId": "PARAM 003"
                  "operation": "GetBlockList",
                  "note": "example sample to measure the response
       time of the service"
7/7/2016
                                                                                                                    4
```



## **COSMOS & SLALOM Collaboration**

- FP7 COSMOS undertook the role of answering this as an IoT project
- Examples of our own services
- What kind of metrics could be offered
- Which ones actually make sense?
   Questionnaire circulated from March for external input



### **COSMOS** Examined cases

IoT Domain Services	Aspects per category				
Sensing Services	Quality of Data Value	Sensitivity	Battery Life	Minimum Sample Interval	
Data Delivery	Availability	Latency	Throughput	#users	
Event Processing	Event reaction time	Computed Events per second	Size of Complex rule		
Intelligence /Prediction	% of error	Prediction Horizon	Response Time		
Encryption	Key bit size	Encryption Delay	Data block size	Encryption Algorithm Selection	
Privacy	Field selection from data schema		Parametric Blurring of Values		



### **COSMOS** Examined cases

IoT Domain Services	Aspects per category				
Sensing Services	Quality of Data Value	Sensitivity	Battery Life	Minimum Sample Interval	
Data Delivery	Availability	Latency	Throughput	#users	
Event Processing	Event reaction time	Computed Events per second	Size of Complex rule		
Intelligence /Prediction	% of error	Prediction Horizon	Response Time		
Encryption	Key bit size	Encryption Delay	Data block size	Encryption Algorithm Selection	
Privacy	Field selection from data schema		Parametric Blurring of Values		



# Example of applying 19086-2 on IoT metrics (details): Missing values limit on data acquisition

```
"parameters": [=
    { 🖃
        "name": "monitoring cycle",
        "referenceId": "MC 001",
        "unit": "hour",
        "parameter": "12",
        "note": "promise to deliver 12 values per hour from each data item"
1,
"underlyingMetrics": [=
    { 🖃
        "name": "Total number of samples gathered",
        "referenceId": "COUNT 001",
        "unit": "",
        "scale": "interval".
        "expression": { 🗆
            "expression": "COUNT 001= COUNT (SAMPLE 001) +COUNT (SAMPLE 002)",
            "expressionLanguage": "ISO80000"
        },
        "samples": [=
            { 🖃
                "name": "Traffic throughput sensor Data",
                "referenceId": "SAMPLE 001",
                "scale": "interval",
                "value": "Car Throughput",
                "unit": "vehicles/hour"
            },
            { 🖃
                "name": "Traffic Speed sensor Data",
                "referenceId": "SAMPLE 002",
                "scale": "interval",
                "value": "Speed",
                "unit": "km/hour"
```

7/7/2016

# Example of applying 19086-2 on IoT metrics (higher level)



```
"name": "Sensor Service guarantee for estimated guantity of data ",
"referenceId": "QOD 001",
"scale": "NOMINAL",
"expression": { 🖃
    "expression": "PRV 001 > PARAM 002",
   "expressionLanguage": "ISO80000"
},
"parameters": [=
   { 🖃
        "name": "Unreceived values percentage limit",
        "referenceId": "PARAM 002",
        "unit": "%",
        "parameter": "10"
   },
    { 🖃
        "name": "Calculation cycle",
        "referenceId": "CC 001",
        "unit": "dav",
        "scale": "INTERVAL",
        "parameter": "1"
1,
"underlyingMetrics": []
    { 🖃
        "name": "Percentage of received values",
        "referenceId": "PRV 001",
        "unit": "%",
        "scale": "RATIO",
        "expression": {
            "expression": "PRV 001= COUNT 001/24*MC 001*LENGTH (SAMPLES)",
            "expressionLanguage": "ISO80000",
            "note": "More generic parametric expression based on size of samples
        },
        "parameters": [=
```

7/7/2016

{ 🖃



#### Conclusions

- Some of the metrics are almost identical to Cloud services
  - Availability
  - Latency
  - Throughput
- Others portray differences
  - Quality of Data Value (Qol)
    - Would be considered a must in Cloud services (no erroneous values when accessing e.g. a DB service)
    - Can be varying in IoT during data acquisition due to sensor features, transfer channels etc., and not necessary to be 100% accurate or existent
- But as a structure and logic, Cloud based standards can be used in principle to describe them if adapted to the IoT rationale



# Thank you! Any questions?

George Kousiouris (ICCS/NTUA)



#### www.iot-cosmos.eu



The research leading to these results has received funding from the EC Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2011 under Grant Agreement n° 609043