

Multi-Objective Optimization of Consumer Group Autoscaling in Message Broker Systems

Diogo Landau*, Nishant Saurabh*, Xavier Andrade[‡] Jorge G Barbosa[†]

*Department of Information and Computing Sciences, Utrecht University, NL

[‡]Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Porto - FEUP, Portugal

[†]LIACC, Faculdade de Engenharia, Universidade do Porto, Portugal

*d.landau@uu.nl, *n.saurabh@uu.nl, [‡]xavier.andrade@fe.up.pt, [†]j.barbosa@fe.up.pt

Abstract—Message brokers often mediate communication between data producers and consumers by adding variable-sized messages to ordered distributed queues. Our goal is to determine the number of consumers and consumer-partition assignments needed to ensure that the rate of data consumption keeps up with the rate of data production. We model the problem as a variable item size bin packing problem. As the rate of production varies, new consumer-partition assignments are computed, which may require rebalancing a partition from one consumer to another. While rebalancing a queue, the data being produced into the queue is not read leading to additional latency costs. As such, we focus on the multi-objective optimization cost of minimizing both the number of consumers and queue migrations. We present a variety of algorithms and compare them to established bin packing heuristics for this application. Comparing our proposed consumer group assignment strategy with Kafka’s, a commonly employed strategy, our strategy presents a 90th percentile latency of 4.52s compared to Kafka’s 217s with both using the same amount of consumers. Kafka’s assignment strategy only improved the consumer group’s performance with regards to latency with configurations that used at least 60% more resources than our approach.

Index Terms—variable item size, bin packing, consumer group autoscaling, message broker

I. INTRODUCTION

BROKERS are a common tool employed to fixture communication in a distributed environment [1]. This system provides with asynchronous communication between producers and consumers, and handles some of the challenges that are common within distributed and concurrent data processing [2].

We aim to solve the consumer group autoscaling problem for a generalized message broker use, where each queue has an independent production rate, and the messages published present variable sizes. When solving for the consumer-partition assignment, the first concern is to minimize the number of consumers required, which relates to an operational cost. A second cost, is a direct consequence of a message broker’s load varying over time. This implies that to comply with service level agreements, a partition might need to migrate from one consumer to another. While migrating a partition its data is not consumed, hence a rebalance/migration cost related to latency SLA violations. The conflicting objectives of minimizing the operational and rebalance costs, make this consumer group autoscaling problem multi-objective.

Any service that reads data from a message broker via a group of consumers would benefit from a solution that elastically scales the consumers based on the current demand. This would allow reducing both the operational cost and the latency SLA violations.

However, existing approaches attempting to provide such a solution fall short as they do not consider skewed distributions in terms of the load of each queue [3], or they are only adequately modelled in scenarios where the message size is constant [4].

We consider a queue or partition to be a structure within a message broker environment where messages are appended in the same order as they were produced [5], [6]. It is also important that a queue is capable of delivering messages in the same order as they were produced. This consumption model is often a requirement to guarantee state consistency between two distinct distributed services for a specific business related entity. Common applications that read the same set of messages in their production order include event-carried state transfer (a pattern which is commonly used in microservice architectures), and system state simulation. The former consists of having two distributed services reading the same set of messages so as to replicate an entity’s state within their data store [7], [8], whereas the latter is used to simulate a system’s state at a given point in time by reproducing the messages up until that point [9], [10].

Two common message broker implementations, Kafka¹ and RabbitMQ², have different ways of guaranteeing message order on consumption. Within Kafka, all the messages produced to a partition are appended and delivered in the same order as they were published. When consuming the data, only a single consumer in a group can be assigned a partition, and therefore message ordering is guaranteed for a single partition. As for RabbitMQ, it guarantees messages toward a queue are enqueued in the same order as they were produced. Therefore, to guarantee same order message delivery, only a single consumer can be reading messages from the queue.

Considering consumers as bins and queues as items that have to be assigned a bin, this problem was modeled as a variation of the Bin Packing (BP) Problem. Since the rate

¹Kafka Message Ordering, <https://kafka.apache.org/>

²RabbitMQ Message Ordering: <https://www.rabbitmq.com/queues.html#message-ordering>

at which data is inserted into a queue varies over time, a BP item’s size also varies with time. In fact, a queue’s size correlates to its current write speed, which fluctuates based on the current system’s load. This inevitably implies that a BP solution for a given time instant may not hold true in future instants.

On account of this BP variation, a new solution has to be computed at different time instants, each having different information as to the size of each item (each queue’s write speed for that time instant). This might lead to a queue (item) being migrated to a different consumer (bin) when compared to the consumer group’s previous configuration.

Since two consumers cannot read from the same queue concurrently, there is another cost to take into account associated to rebalancing a partition [11]. This cost is related to the amount of data that is not being read while the queue is being rebalanced.

Existing heuristic bin packing algorithms do not take this rebalance cost into account, which leads to a higher number of migrations and consequently to higher migration costs. Hence, we propose four new BP heuristic algorithms that account for the rebalance costs, three of which are shown in Section VI-E to be a competitive alternative to the multi-objective optimization problem at hand. We also propose an Rscore in Sec. IV-A metric to evaluate an algorithm’s rebalance cost for each iteration.

This problem becomes more relevant within skewed distributed event queues [4], wherein the rate of production into each queue is independent, and not necessarily equal for the different queues, i.e., the event queues will present different concentrations of messages. In fact, common message broker implementations use an event’s key to deem the queue it is to be inserted in. Keys used with more frequency than others are the cause of this uneven distribution of events in the different queues.

The contributions we present in this paper are:

- Modeling the consumer group autoscaling problem for a generalized message broker use;
- The Rscore metric, which quantifies a rebalance cost between two consecutive consumer group assignments;
- Four modified approximation algorithms;
- An application of the proposed model and algorithms in a *Kafka* message broker environment;
- Evaluating the autoscaler implementation’s response time when autoscaling the consumer group in a production infrastructure.

In Section II, we present applications of the Bin Packing Problem, and a comparison of existing approximation algorithms to solve the Bin Packing problem. Section III, formally defines the problem, followed by the proposed approach in Section IV. We also present in Section V an application of autoscaling a group of consumers based on the broker’s current load within *Kafka*. Section VI evaluates the proposed algorithms, and the autoscaling model when applied to a production *Kafka* environment. Lastly, we conclude this paper in Section VII.

II. RELATED WORK

This section starts by presenting in which other contexts the bin packing model has been applied, to demonstrate its effectiveness when representing a minimization and assignment problem similar to the one being studied.

Moreover, due to bin packing’s NP-hard nature, and the real-time constraints of autoscaling a consumer group, we present existing heuristic algorithms that solve this optimization problem in polynomial time. These algorithms are also used as a comparison to our proposed algorithms in Section VI.

Lastly, we present the current state of consumer group autoscaling. Despite the the fact that the algorithms presented attempt to solve the same problem, some of their assumptions (e.g. equal production rate into queues; all messages produced having constant size) limit their applicability in most production message broker environments. Given the fact that our algorithms are not based on the same assumptions, these cannot be used for comparison without some adjustments.

A. Bin Packing Applications

There are several applications where BP is used to provide an optimal or sub-optimal solution [12]–[18]. The Virtual Machine Placement (VMP) problem, has gained more attention due to the increasing use of cloud providers to support companies’ technological infrastructure. The problem can be generalized to a set of Virtual Machines (VM), each having to be assigned one of the cloud provider’s Physical Machines (PM) while attempting to minimize the operational cost (number of PMs used).

As new VM requests arrive, each new item (VM) has to be assigned a bin (PM). Furthermore, an item that has been previously assigned can be migrated to another physical machine since migration is made available via virtualization technology. Therefore, VMP is considered a fully dynamic bin packing problem where items arrive and depart over time (online bin packing) and migrations are allowed [19]–[22]. Moreover, the migration cost at each decision interval is measured either as the number of migrations [20] or is computed based on the size of all VMs that have to be migrated [21].

Song et al. [22] and Kamali et al. [19] further investigate an additional case wherein the VMs (items) require a variable amount of resources throughout their lifetime, and therefore the size of the items varies over time. This constitutes the variable item size bin packing problem (VISBP), which is the same problem we are studying in the consumer group autoscaling context.

B. Approximation Algorithms

The Bin Packing (BP) problem is a well established research problem, and has been extensively reviewed in the literature [23]–[25]. Due to the time constraints imposed by our application, this paper gives emphasis to the Approximation Algorithms that heuristically solve the problem in low-order polynomial time, as opposed to the higher time complexity Linear Programming approach [26].

A method is presented in [27] to classify the BP problem, which will be used throughout this section. During an algorithm’s execution, a bin can find itself either *open* or *closed*. In the former, the bin can still be used to add additional items, whereas in the latter, it is no longer available and has already been used.

The list of bins is indexed from left to right, and the number of bins used by an algorithm can be computed using the index of the first empty bin in the list of bins. When creating a bin, this process can be visualized as opening the lowest index of the empty bins (left-most empty bin).

Using $A(L)$ to denote the amount of bins a certain algorithm makes use of for a configuration of items L , $OPT(L)$ to represent the amount of bins required to achieve the optimal solution, and defining Ω as the set of all possible lists, each with a different arrangement of their items, $R_A(k)$ (Eq. 1) encodes a performance metric relative to the optimal number of bins used by an algorithm.

$$R_A(k) = \sup_{L \in \Omega} \left\{ \frac{A(L)}{k} : k = OPT(L) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The Asymptotic Performance Ratio (APR) of an algorithm A (R_A^∞) is defined by Eq. 2, and will be used throughout this section to compare the algorithms’ performance [27].

$$R_A^\infty = \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} R_A(k). \quad (2)$$

The input to the consumer group autoscaling problem is a list of the production rates into each queue. Therefore, the queue-consumer mapping can be performed offline as all items’ sizes are known beforehand. However, online algorithms can still be used, albeit with an increase in operational cost compared to their offline counterparts. As a result, out of the set of classes defined in [27], the ones which are of interest for this paper, are the Offline and Any Fit algorithms. We extend the Any Fit algorithms in Sec. IV as part of our methodology, and we adapt the Offline algorithms to be applicable in this multi-objective context to serve as a baseline with which to compare the performance of our proposed algorithms in Sec. VI.

An algorithm belonging to the Any Fit class of algorithms must satisfy the following conditions [27]: *if bin j is empty, an item will not be assigned to it if the item fits into any bin to the left of j* . As shown by Coffman et al. [28], any online heuristic that fits these constraints shall have an APR as between $\frac{17}{10}$ and 2.

The Any Fit class of algorithms perform best if the list of items is sorted in decreasing order prior to assigning items to the bins. The following offline approximation algorithms, apply this sorting strategy, and all but the Next Fit Decreasing (NFD) belong to the aforementioned class. The First Fit Decreasing (FFD) places each item in the left-most bin as long as the bin’s capacity is not exceeded. As shown in [29], this algorithm’s APR is $R_{FFD}^\infty = \frac{11}{9}$.

For each item, The Worst Fit Decreasing (WFD) attempts to assign an item to the the existing bin with most slack.

If the size constraint is not satisfied, a new bin is created and assigned. This algorithm has as APR $R_{WFD}^\infty \approx 1.6910$. Similarly, the Best Fit Decreasing (BFD) differs only on its packing strategy, wherein it attempts to place the item in the bin where it fits the tightest. In case there is no open bin to fit the current item, a new bin is created where the item is inserted [30]. The BFD heuristic has an APR of $R_{BFD}^\infty = \frac{11}{9}$.

Lastly, the NFD only has a single open bin at a time, which is also the last created bin. This algorithm attempts to place the item in the right-most non-empty bin, and, if it doesn’t fit, then the bin to the right is used. As shown in [31], this algorithm has as APR $R_{NFD}^\infty \approx 1.6910$.

C. Consumer Group Autoscaling

To comply with latency service level agreements in a publish subscribe message broker environment, it is common to provide with consumer group parallelism to split the load between the elements of a group [32]–[34]. As such, when the rate of production increases and the consumer group is falling behind, it is expected that the group of consumers upscales and reassigns the partitions.

Currently, Kubernetes Horizontal Pod Autoscaler³ (HPA) paired with KEDA⁴ enables consumer group autoscaling based on average CPU, memory and event lag between the consumers of the group. These threshold-based techniques scale the consumer group incrementally, depending on the group’s current average performance with regard to the chosen strategy. Chindanonda et al. [3] devise a strategy to forecast the rate of production, which then enables computing an estimated number of consumers required in the consumer group. Given a set of consumers, the threshold-based strategies (e.g. HPA; KEDA) and the algorithm presented in [3] distribute the number of partitions evenly between the consumers. This is also the default strategy used by the state-of-the-art message broker *Kafka*. This strategy fails to load balance between the different consumers when the workload presents a skewed distribution, since the production into each event queue is independent and not necessarily equal.

Ezzeddine et al. [4] emphasize the skewed distribution problem, and resort to the consumer group lag relative to each queue to monitor the event distribution. Given a consumer’s capacity and the lag of each queue, the authors compute the partition to consumer assignments through the First Fit Decreasing Bin Packing algorithm. Although the authors present a load-aware partition-consumer assignment, using the lag as a metric to determine each queue’s production rate is inaccurate when the messages published to each queue have variable sizes. Since the consumption rate is limited by the network throughput, to improve a queue’s load model, the production and consumption rates should be measured in bytes per second (*bytes/s*). Since we study the case where messages have variable sizes, the approach provided by [4] is not directly applicable to our problem, so we modify their approach by

³<https://kubernetes.io/docs/tasks/run-application/horizontal-pod-autoscale/>

⁴<https://keda.sh/docs/2.9/scalers/apache-kafka/>

measuring the production and consumption rates in *bytes/s* and use it to compare with our proposed algorithms.

The cost of rebalancing partitions between the consumers due to data consumption downtime from the partitions being rebalanced, is also highlighted in [3]. Despite this fact, the only mitigation strategy presented was to impose a time constraint as to when the group could scale based on its last scaling decision. With regards to [4], the authors do not take the rebalance cost into account.

D. Summary

The consumer group autoscaling state of the art focuses on solving for distributed queue scenarios which rarely apply in real world production environments. The first common assumption, is that the production rate into all distributed queues is equal (attempting to assign the same number of partitions to the different consumers in a group), whereas the second, is that all messages produced into the different event queues have the same size (measuring production and consumption rates in number of events per second). Existing solutions also lack a deterministic metric to account for the rebalancing cost, and present conservative heuristic algorithms to migrate the items to different bins (in some cases items with higher cost are not migrated).

For these reasons, we propose four heuristic algorithms that simultaneously aim to minimize the operational and migration costs in Sec. IV-B, and we provide an RScore metric in Sec. IV-A to evaluate the rebalance/migration cost.

III. PROBLEM FORMULATION

A group of consumers is interested in consuming data from several partitions/queues with varying load within the message broker. The set of partitions is assigned to the different consumers of the group to simultaneously parallelize and load-balance data consumption. This problem is depicted in the Data Consumption Domain of Figure 1.




Fig. 1: Representation of data production and consumption domains within a message broker environment.

The aim of our work is to achieve a deterministic approach to determine the number of consumers required working in parallel, so as to guarantee that the rate of production into a partition is not higher than its rate of consumption by the consumer group, while minimizing the operational cost. In contrast, if this were not the case, messages would accumulate

leading to the lag between the last message inserted and the last message read by the consumer group to increase with time. Additionally, to make sure the messages are consumed in the same sequence as they were published, a single partition can only be assigned a single consumer. We also assume that each consumer in the group presents an equal maximum consumption rate.

The model for this problem fits the constraints of the single bin size Bin Packing problem, where the bins are consumers that have as capacity their maximum consumption rate, and the weights are the partitions and their respective write speeds. The problem then is to find the minimum amount of consumers where to fit all the partitions so as to make sure that the sum of the write speeds of the partitions assigned to a single consumer does not exceed its maximum capacity C .

Given a measurement of the partitions' write rate at time instant t , the problem is of minimizing the operational cost (number of consumers), while guaranteeing that each partition is assigned to a single consumer. As such, we use the Bin Packing formulation (Eq. 3 - 7) with the time variable t which accounts for the time at which the measurement and the new consumer group configuration is being computed.

$$\min \sum_{i \in B} y_i(t) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{subject to } \sum_{j \in P} \frac{s_j(t)}{C} \cdot x_{ij}(t) \leq y_i(t) \quad \forall i \in B \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i \in B} x_{ij}(t) = 1, \quad \forall j \in P \quad (5)$$

$$y_i(t) \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in B \quad (6)$$

$$x_{ij}(t) \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in B, j \in P. \quad (7)$$

Set B corresponds to the available consumers, and P as the list of partitions to be arranged into consumers. Decision variable $x_{ij}(t)$ and $y_i(t)$, indicate whether a partition j is assigned to a consumer i , and whether consumer i is used, respectively, at a time instant t . Additionally, $x_{ij}(t)$ constructs a matrix $\mathbf{X}(t)^{|B| \times |P|}$ and $y_i(t)$ provides the column vector $\mathbf{y}(t)^{|B| \times 1}$. The production rate measurement of a partition p at time t in *bytes/s* is denoted by $s_j(t)$, and C denotes the maximum consumption rate of a consumer. As for Constraints 4 and 5, the former assures that the sum of the partitions' write speed assigned to any consumer does not exceed its capacity, and the latter guarantees that each partition is assigned a consumer.

Hitherto, we have only considered the bin packing formulation for a single iteration, nevertheless we must adapt the formulation to the dynamicity present due to the production rate into each queue varying over time t . As a result, we arrive at the Variable Item Size Bin Packing (VISBP) formulation, also considered in [22] and [19].

A VISBP heuristic algorithm is executed sequentially and at discrete time instants. We use $k, k \in \mathbb{N}$, to denote the sequential iterations at which a new consumer group configuration is computed. Additionally, t_k represents an iteration's execution time instant. It is also important to note that between any

two consecutive iterations k and $k - 1$, $t_k - t_{k-1}$ is variable. This occurs because a new partition to consumer assignment is computed depending on a set of conditions, e.g., whether a single consumer has its capacity exceeded or whether a certain amount of time has exceeded since the last time a reconfiguration was evaluated. This is further described in the state machine presented in Sec. V-C.

At any time $t < t_1$, the consumer group is not yet assigned any partitions and therefore:

$$\mathbf{X}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \forall t < t_1 \quad (8)$$

Also, for any given $t_k, k > 1$, there already exists a partition-consumer assignment computed at t_{k-1} , $\mathbf{X}(t_{k-1})$. Then, we compute $\Delta(k)$ to determine which partitions have to be reassigned to different consumers in Eq. 9.

$$\Delta(k) = \mathbf{X}(t_k) - \mathbf{X}(t_{k-1}) \quad \forall k > 1, \quad (9)$$

For a cell $\delta_{ij}(k)$ in $\Delta(k)$, if its value is -1 it indicates that the consumer i should stop consuming from partition j . If $\delta_{ij}(k) = 1$, then consumer i should start consuming from partition j . Lastly, if the value is 0, then no change is made in consumer i 's assignment with regards to partition j .

Given that $\Delta(k)$ encodes which partitions have to be reassigned from one consumer to another, there is an additional cost to take into account related to rebalancing a partition. Only one consumer can be reading from a partition at a time, and therefore, when a partition is to be reassigned, that is assigning a partition to another consumer, the one it is currently assigned to has to stop consuming in order to allow the new consumer to start. Due to this process, there is some downtime where data is not being consumed from the partition being migrated.

As such, the rebalance cost has to increase with the write rate of the partitions being migrated, i.e. as the write rate of a partition being reassigned increases, the rate at which unread data accumulates during the rebalance phase, also increases.

IV. PROPOSED ALGORITHM

A. Rscore

Within this problem's context, rebalancing inevitably implies having the consumer group stop consuming from a partition while it is being reassigned from one consumer to another. There cannot be a concurrent read from the same partition by members of the same group.

This paper introduces the Rscore metric to compute the total rebalance cost of a group's reconfiguration. The metric reflects the impact of stopping the data consumption from the partitions that are being rebalanced.

A migration is evaluated between two consecutive iterations and, therefore, a partition requires rebalancing at iteration k if its column in $\Delta(k)$ contains both a 1 and a -1. When analysing whether partition j requires rebalancing, $\Delta_j(k)$ denotes the j 'th column of the matrix, which in turn is the

reassignment vector for partition j at iteration k . The column vector illustrated in Eq. 10, would indicate that consumer $|B|$ should stop reading data from partition j , so consumer 1 can start. It is worth noting that due to the Bin Packing formulation in Eq. 3 - 7, $\Delta_j(k)$ can only have non-zero values in at most 2 rows (2 consumers).

$$\Delta_j(k) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

When the column vector only has one non-zero value, if this value is -1 then the consumer group is to stop reading data from this partition at t_k (item departure). Otherwise, if the value is 1 then the consumer group has not yet assigned this partition to the group of consumers, and is to start fetching messages from this partition at t_k (item arrival). The second scenario occurs for example at t_1 when all partitions have not yet been assigned a consumer in the group.

TABLE I: Data required to compute the Rscore.

Notation	Description
P_k	set of partitions to rebalance at time t_k
$s_j(t)$	The write speed of partition j at time t (bytes/s)
C	Constant that represents the maximum consumer capacity (bytes/s)

Provided the data presented in Table I, Eq. 11 presents the rebalance cost (Rscore) for a single iteration k . As presented in [21], the migration cost can be related to the number of migrations performed, or it can be computed based on the total size of the items being migrated. Rscore considers the latter measure, as it sums the total production rate into all partitions being migrated.

$$Rscore(k) = \frac{1}{C} \sum_{j \in P_k} s_j(t_k) \quad \forall k \geq 1. \quad (11)$$

In essence, the time it takes to rebalance all partitions, combined with the Rscore, determines the amount of time a dedicated consumer requires to process the data that accumulated while migrating the partitions.

To further illustrate what the metric is evaluating, consider that at iteration $k = 2$ there are 3 partitions being rebalanced with an equal production rate of 100bytes/s, and the consumer's capacity is 100bytes/s, then $Rscore_2 = 3$. If it took the consumer group 2 seconds to rebalance, then it would take a dedicated consumer $3 * 2 = 6$ full seconds to read the data that has accumulated while migrating the partitions.

B. Modified Any Fit

The motivation to modifying the existing Any Fit algorithms, is that the existing algorithms only focus on reducing the amount of bins used to pack a set of items, disregarding the cost associated with reassigning items. Algorithm 1 illustrates the implementation of the modified any fit algorithms that

will be further described in the remainder of this section. The algorithm describes the procedure to assign partitions to consumers at time t_k of iteration k .

Algorithm 1 Modified Any Fit Algorithm

Input: current consumer group configuration C & currently unassigned partitions U & $assignStrategy$ (Best or Worst Fit) & $sortStrategy$ (cumulative or max partition sort)

Output: new consumer group configuration N

```

1:  $N \leftarrow$  new ConsumerList with  $assignStrategy$ 
2:  $S \leftarrow$  sort  $C$  with  $sortStrategy$ 
3: for  $c \in S$  do
4:    $pset \leftarrow$  partitions assigned to  $c$ 
5:    $pset \leftarrow$  sort  $pset$  in decreasing order
6:   for  $i \leftarrow pset.size() - 1$  to 0 do
7:      $p \leftarrow pset[i]$ 
8:      $result \leftarrow N.assignOpenBin(p)$ 
9:     if  $result = false$  then
10:       break
11:     end if
12:      $pset.remove(p)$ 
13:   end for
14:   if  $pset.size() = 0$  then
15:     continue
16:   end if
17:    $N.createConsumer(c)$ 
18:   for  $p \in pset$  do
19:      $result \leftarrow N.assign(c, p)$ 
20:     if  $result = false$  then
21:       break
22:     end if
23:      $pset.remove(p)$ 
24:   end for
25:    $U.extend(pset)$ 
26: end for
27:  $U \leftarrow$  sort  $U$  decreasing order
28: for  $p \in U$  do
29:    $N.assignBin(p)$ 
30: end for
31: return  $N$ 

```

Given the current consumer group’s state (the partitions assigned to each consumer), and a set of unassigned partitions, the modified algorithms differ from the decreasing versions of the Any fit algorithms described in Section II-B, wherein the former class of algorithms sorts the consumers of a consumer group instead of the set of items.

At the beginning of the algorithm, an empty consumer group is initialized, which will be modified and returned at the end of the iteration to indicate the future consumer-partition assignments.

First, the consumers (bins) in the current consumer group are sorted from biggest to smallest based on two strategies (Line 2): Sort each consumer based on the cumulative speed of all partitions assigned to it (cumulative sort); Sort each

consumer based on the partition assigned to it that has the biggest measured write speed (max partition sort). The sorting strategies present some similarities to the *ServerLoad* algorithm presented in [20], however their algorithm processes the bins from smallest to biggest. The remainder of our algorithm also differentiates our procedure.

After sorting the consumer group configuration from iteration $k - 1$ using one of the above strategies, for each consumer in the sorted group, the partitions assigned to it are sorted based on their write speed (Line 5). From smallest to biggest, each partition is inserted into one of the bins that has already been created in the new consumer group initialized at the beginning. Assigning the items from smallest to biggest focuses on migrating the partitions with lowest rates of production, which in turn reduces the migration cost. If the insert is successful, then the partition is removed from the sorted list of partitions, else (i.e. there is no existing bin that can hold the partition) then the current consumer assigned to the partition, is created (Line 17). We obtain this consumer via the index of the row in the column vector $\mathbf{x}_j(t_{k-1})$ which presents the value 1.

The remaining partitions in the sorted list are now inserted into the newly created bin, from biggest to smallest (Lines 18 - 24). The current consumer had to be created since the partitions couldn’t all be migrated, therefore, we now try to assign the biggest partitions first so their production rate does not contribute to this iteration’s rebalance cost. If a partition is inserted successfully, it is removed from the list of partitions. If a partition does not fit into the consumer it is currently assigned, then the remaining partitions are added to the set of unassigned partitions (Line 25).

After performing the same procedure over all consumers, there is now a set of partitions which have not been assigned to any of the consumers in the future assignment. The final stage (Lines 27 - 30) involves first sorting the unassigned partitions in decreasing order (based on their measured write speed), and each partition is assigned a consumer from the new consumer group using the defined fit strategy.

The proposed algorithms that aim to improve the existing Bin Packing heuristics with respect to the rebalance cost, are obtained through all combinations of the aforementioned sort and fit strategies, summarised in Table II.

TABLE II: Modified implementations of the any fit algorithms.

Algorithm	Consumer Sorting Strategy
Modified Worst Fit (MWF)	Cumulative write speed
Modified Best Fit (MBF)	Cumulative write speed
Modified Worst Fit Partition (MWFP)	Max partition write speed
Modified Best Fit Partition (MBFP)	Max partition write speed

V. KAFKA CONSUMER GROUP AUTOSCALER

In this section, we consider Kafka as the message broker for evaluation purposes, although the same methodology can be applied to other message broker systems. There are three

components, presented in Fig. 2, that interact with one another to model the BP problem, in order to provide a fully dynamic pipeline capable of autoscaling based on the current load of data being produced to the partitions of interest.

The monitor process is responsible for measuring the write speed of each partition the group is interested in consuming data from, which is equivalent to specifying the size of the items of the bin packing problem. This information is then delivered to the controller, which is responsible for managing a consumer group (creating and deleting consumer instances), and mapping each partition to a consumer. The consumers are then informed of their tasks and read the data from the partitions that were assigned to them by the controller.

This system was applied in a real world context, with the goal of extracting data published to Kafka topics to be inserted into a Datalake (source code⁵).

A. Monitor

To solve the BP problem, initially the controller requires as input the write speed of each partition the consumer group is interested in consuming data from. The monitor process is responsible for providing this information.

Kafka provides an Admin client, which can be used to administer the cluster, and also query information about it. This client/class exposes a method `describeLogDirs()` which queries the cluster for the amount of bytes each `TopicPartition` has. A `TopicPartition` is a string-integer pair, which identifies any partition (integer) within a topic (string).

Each time the partition size is queried by the admin client, a timestamp is appended to the measurement, and it is inserted to the back of a queue. Any query that is older than 30 seconds, which is guaranteed to be in the front of the queue, is removed. To obtain the write speed of a single partition, the last element of the queue and the first (representing the latest and the earliest measurement of the partition size within the last 30 seconds) are used to compute the ratio between the difference in bytes and the difference in time (*bytes/s*). This is also the average write speed over the last 30 second time window. The smaller the time window, the closer the measurement reflects a producer's network capacity as opposed to measuring the current rate of production into a partition. Also, with a small time window, 2 consecutive events arriving close to the same time, will also lead to misleading and noisier production rate measurements. Having evaluated several different sized windows, 30 seconds provides with an acceptable trade-off between the amount of noise and the time it takes for the measurement to converge to a stable production rate.

After computing the write speed for all the partitions of interest, the information has to be communicated to the controller. To benefit from an asynchronous approach, this monitor process communicates with the controller process via a Kafka topic illustrated in Fig. 2 as `monitor.writeSpeed`.

B. Consumer

The Consumer goes through four important phases within its process, to approximate its consumption rate to a constant value when being challenged to work at its peak performance. These phases repeat cyclically until the consumer is terminated by an external termination signal. Fig. 3 illustrates the consumer's process.

The consumer is configured with two important parameters, `BATCH_SIZE` and `WAIT_TIME_SECS`, which indicate respectively, the amount of bytes the consumer waits to gather in a single iteration, and the amount of time it is allowed to wait to gather the information.

The first phase has the consumer attempt to fetch `BATCH_SIZE` bytes from the partitions it is consuming data from. After this condition is satisfied or `WAIT_TIME_SECS` is exceeded, the consumer moves on to the second phase. Here the consumer deserializes and processes each individual record, and batches records that originated from the same topic together. There are different data lake tables for each topic, and therefore not all records are inserted into the same destination table. The number of topics impacts the number of batches prepared, since each table has a dedicated set of batches.

The third phase is where the consumer sends the records into the data lake, performing an asynchronous request for each topic it fetched data from in the same iteration.

Having forwarded all the records into their respective tables in the data lake, the consumer then verifies its metadata queue to verify if there are any change in state messages to be consumed. This queue is how the Controller process (Sec. V-C) informs each consumer of their assignments. If there are new messages, the consumer reads all messages in the queue, and updates its state. Only after having successfully updated its state and persisted its metadata, does the consumer send an acknowledgment back to the Controller to indicate the successful change in state. This cycle repeats until the Controller removes the consumer from its group of active consumers.

C. Controller

The controller is the component of the system which is responsible for orchestrating and managing the consumer group. The write rate of each partition computed by the monitor process is used as input to the approximation algorithm which then provides as output a new consumer group configuration. Based on this configuration, the controller creates the consumers that don't yet exist, communicates the change in assignment to each consumer in the group, followed by deleting the consumers that are not required in the new computed group's state.

As shown in Fig. 2, there are two topics that function as communication intermediaries between the three system components. The topic illustrated by `monitor.writeSpeed` is where the controller reads the partitions' write speeds, whereas the topic illustrated by `consumer.metadata` is where the controller sends messages to each consumer to inform the change in their state. Regarding the latter kafka topic, partition

⁵<https://github.com/landaudiogo/kafka-consumer-group-autoscaler>




Fig. 2: System’s architecture based on Kafka consisting of Monitor, Controller and Consumer processes.




Fig. 3: Consumer Insert Cycle.

0 is reserved for communication directed toward the controller, whereas the remaining partitions within *consumer.metadata* represent a one-to-one mapping to each consumer. Therefore, if the controller wants to communicate with consumer N , it sends a record into partition N .

This communication architecture was devised to achieve an efficient communication model, defined as the amount of information that is relevant relative to the amount of data read. With this pattern, all the data read is relevant to the reading entity.

The controller can be summarized by a state machine, intended to continuously manage a group of consumers and their assignments, illustrated by Fig. 4.




Fig. 4: Controller State Machine.

The Sentinel state has the controller read the information published by the monitor component to update its current consumer group’s state, and determine whether it has to recompute the group’s assignments. If it determines that one of the exit conditions evaluates to true, the controller transitions into the Reassign Algorithm state. This is where one of the

approximation algorithms mentioned in Sections II-B and IV-B is employed to solve the Bin Packing Problem heuristically.

The output of the approximation algorithm indicates the desired state in which the controller wants its group of consumers. As such, the first step within the Group Management state is to compute the difference between the current state of the group and the desired state. This difference encodes information regarding: the consumers to be created; the partitions each consumer has to stop consuming from; the partition each consumer has to start consuming from; and lastly, the consumers that have no assignment, and therefore can be decommissioned. First, the controller creates the new consumer instances, which involves the controller communicating with a kubernetes cluster to create the deployments related to each consumer. We chose to have different deployments for each consumer, so that the information related to which *consumer.metadata* partition the consumer had to read from, could be transmitted through the deployment’s manifest *metadata.name* attribute. Secondly, the controller informs each consumer of their change in state by transmitting the start and stop consuming messages to each consumer via their respective *consumer.metadata* partition. It is important to note that communicating the change in state is a synchronous process, to assure that while rebalancing partitions there is no more than one consumer from the group reading data from a partition. This means that for each partition being rebalanced, the controller first sends out the stop consuming message, and only after the consumer informs the controller of having acted upon the message, can the controller send out the start consuming record to the new consumer. After the consumers have reached their intended state, the controller shuts down the inactive consumers.

The Synchronize state is used to synchronize the consumer group’s real state with the controller’s perceived state. This is to guarantee the controller is capable of recovering from an unexpected termination, which can lead to an inconsistent perception of the consumer group’s state.

VI. EXPERIMENTATION

A. Approximation Algorithms Adaptation

The existing bin packing heuristic algorithms presented in Sec. II-B were developed to solve a single iteration of the bin

packing problem. When considering $t_k, k > 1$, there already exists a partition to consumer assignment given by $\mathbf{X}(t_{k-1})$.

As the algorithm is executing (assigning partitions to consumers), the list of consumers currently in use is encoded in $\mathbf{y}(t_k)$. Also as described in Sec. II-B, the list of open bins, are consumers that are already in use in iteration k ($y_i(t_k) = 1, i \in B$), that can be used to assign additional partitions. Some approximation algorithms limit the number of open bins, e.g., the NFD algorithm only allows one open bin, which is also the last bin created.

When these algorithms cannot place partition j into one of the existing open bins, then a new bin has to be created. The new bin created is commonly described as the lowest index bin which has not yet been used. Function $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow B$, defined in Eq. 12, given the current iteration k , provides the lowest indexed unused consumer.

$$f(k) = \min\{i \in B \mid y_i(t_k) = 0\} \quad (12)$$

There is no guarantee that the bin returned by $f(k)$ is the current bin assigned to partition j resulting from the consumer group computation at t_{k-1} . That is, by creating the lowest index unused bin and assigning it the partition, leads to the partition being assigned to a "random" consumer, which most of the times leads to it being rebalanced, as highlighted in [22].

For this reason, we modify the decision of which bin to create, when an item does not fit any of the existing open bins. To do so, we define $g : P \times \mathbb{N}_{\setminus\{1\}} \rightarrow B$ in Eq. 13. This function receives as input a tuple $(j, k), j \in P \wedge k \in \mathbb{N}_{\setminus\{1\}}$, where j is a partition and k the current iteration, and outputs the consumer assigned partition j from iteration $k - 1$.

$$g(j, k) = i, \text{ such that } i \in B \wedge x_{ij}(t_{k-1}) = 1. \quad (13)$$

When creating a new bin in the adapted approximation algorithm's procedure, the consumer to be started is obtained from the function $h : P \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow B$ defined in Eq. 14.

$$h(j, k) = \begin{cases} g(j, k), & \text{if } y_{g(j,k)}(t_k) = 0 \wedge k > 1 \\ f(k), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

In other words, if $y_{g(j,k)}(t_k) = 0$ and $k > 1$ (consumer $g(j, k)$ is not currently in use in iteration k and a consumer group assignment already exists from a previous iteration $k - 1$), then the consumer created is the one that is currently assigned partition j from iteration $k - 1$. Otherwise, the default strategy is used, which is the lowest index consumer that is currently not in use from the vector $\mathbf{y}(t_k)$.

It is important to note that this adaptation does not change the number of bins created by the existing approximation algorithms. It only impacts the decision of which unused bins to spawn while executing the bin packing algorithm. This procedure generally increases the frequency a partition is assigned the same consumer it was assigned in $k - 1$, and therefore reduces the resulting rebalance cost (Rscore). These adapted approximation algorithms are used as a baseline to

compare with the proposed modified algorithms from Sec. IV, with respect to the operational and rebalance cost.

B. Test Data Generation

To compare the performance of approximation algorithms, it is common to evaluate them with respect to the algorithms' average-case performance [19] and [22]. Similar to the evaluation procedure described in [19], we create streams of production rate measurements wherein from one measurement to the next, the measured production might vary up to 25% of a consumer's consumption capacity. However instead of only 5 consecutive measurements, we have 500, and instead of also focusing on the departure and arrival of items, our focus lies on the items changing sizes between 2 consecutive measurements.

Throughout this section, we use the term measurement to represent a map of values that indicate the speed for each partition of interest, and the term stream to represent a sequence of measurements in the form of a list. Each measurement of a stream simulates the items' sizes for an instance of the BP problem, which is to be fed as input to the approximation algorithms.

TABLE III: Data to generate a stream.

Symbol	Description
P	Set of partitions of interest for the consumer group.
$s_j(t_k)$	Speed for a partition $j \in P$ at iteration k .
$\phi(\delta)$	Uniform random function that selects a value between $[-\delta, \delta]$.
C	Bin Capacity for the Bin Packing Problem.

To generate a stream of measurements, given N (the number of measurements desired) and δ (maximum relative speed variation between two sequential iterations), at first the initial speed $s_j(t_1), \forall j \in P$ has to be defined. Four different approaches were tested for the partition's initial value: choosing a random value between $[0, 100]\% \cdot C$; setting the initial speed of all partitions to 0; setting the initial speed of all partitions to $50\% \cdot C$; setting the initial speed of all partitions to C . Given that there was no significant difference on the outcome with these variations, the results presented were obtained using the streams of data generated having an initial speed for all partitions that was randomly selected between $[0, 100]\% \cdot C$.

Therefore, given $s_j(t_1) \forall j \in P$, the remaining measurements were obtained using:

$$s_j(t_k) = \max\{0, s_j(t_{k-1}) + \frac{\phi(\delta)}{100} \cdot C\}, \quad (15)$$

$$\forall j \in P \wedge i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$$

Using the aforementioned procedure, 6 different streams of data were generated by setting $N = 500$ and setting δ to a value belonging to the set $\{0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}$ for each stream of data (δ does not change within a stream), which respectively indicate the number of consecutive measurements in the stream and the variability factor between two consecutive iterations.

C. Comparison with Kafka's Assignment Strategy

This section concerns itself with evaluating whether rebalancing partitions between the consumers in a group in a load-aware manner is more beneficial with respect to latency compared to simply splitting the load by assigning an equal number of partitions to each consumer. This is a direct comparison between our proposed approach from Sec. IV-B and solutions that leverage Kafka's assignment strategy such as KEDA. Throughout this section we consider the following assumptions: An iteration has a duration of $30s$; a new measurement is read every $30s$; the production rate is stable throughout a whole iteration k ; it takes $5s$ to rebalance partitions.

The following example provides a simplified model we use to measure the experienced latency by the data produced to a queue. Let's consider a consumer has a consumption rate of $10\text{bytes}/s$, and it has been assigned two partitions, each with a production rate of $8\text{bytes}/s$. Our consumer reads a byte every $\frac{1}{10} = 0.1s$ and a new message is ready to be read every $\frac{1}{8+8} = 0.0625s$. If the consumer is ready to read a new message but there is no message to be read, when a message does arrive we consider it to be read with 0 latency. This is the case for the first byte sent to the queue. The next byte is sent after $0.0625s$ seconds, however the consumer is only ready to read the next byte after $0.1s$, which implies a latency of $0.0375s$. The byte following that will be sent after $0.125s$, and the consumer will only read it after $0.2s$, which corresponds to a latency of $0.075s$, and so on for the remaining data that is produced at this rate. For this consumer, its latency model could be expressed by $l = (0.1 - 0.0625)x$. This linear equation is valid while the rate of production the consumer has to keep up with is $8 + 8\text{bytes}/s$.

To express the latency experienced by configurations that leverage Kafka's assignment strategy, we first have to understand how it performs the partition-consumer assignment. Given a number of consumers, Kafka assigns an approximately equal number of partitions to each consumer. If there are 20 consumers and 32 partitions, 12 of them would be assigned 2 partitions and 8 would be assigned 1 partition (32 partitions total). The partition-consumer assignment is random, and there are no guarantees that the total rate of production into each consumer does not exceed its consumption capacity (condition that leads to increased latency). In this case, all latency measured is a consequence of the difference between the total assignment production rate and the consumer's consumption capacity \bar{C} .

On the other hand, the bin packing algorithm procedures described in Sec. IV-B guarantee that the rate of production never exceeds the consumer's rate of consumption, leading to no latency in stable conditions. However, to comply with this condition, as the production rate into each partition varies, it might be necessary to rebalance partitions from one consumer to another, a procedure which is not performed by Kafka's assignment strategy if there is no resizing. Throughout the whole rebalance procedure, which we compute to be $5s$ in

our implementation in Sec. VI-F, the data produced into the partitions being rebalanced cannot be consumed, i.e., only after the rebalancing terminates may the consumer start reading the data from its newly assigned partitions. For this reason, any latency measured in these algorithms is a consequence of this migration.

The difference between both types of latencies requires we consider 2 distinct queues for each consumer. One queue that contains data produced into the partitions rebalanced in the considered iteration, and another for data produced into partitions carried over from the previous iteration. The first type we denote as a *rebalanced* queue and the second as a *fixed* queue.

Data produced into the rebalanced queue cannot be consumed until after $5s$ since the start of a new iteration, which corresponds to the time to rebalance the partitions. Conversely, a consumer is always consuming data from the fixed queue. As an example of the rebalanced queue's case, if there are 2 partitions being migrated to a consumer each with a production rate of $8\text{bytes}/s$, then throughout the whole iteration ($30s$) these partitions would write 480bytes ($16 \cdot 30$) into the rebalance queue. However, the consumer only has $30 - 5 = 25s$ to consume all the data written to this rebalanced queue.

Furthermore, each consumer is reading data from both their fixed and rebalanced queues. Consequently, the sum of the rate at which data is read from the fixed queue and from the rebalanced queue, may never exceed the consumer's maximum consumption rate \bar{C} . Nevertheless, in our bin packing formulations (Sec. IV-B), we refer to another capacity C , which encodes the maximum total production rate that can be assigned a single consumer. This difference is convenient for the bin packing algorithms to allow a consumer to catch up with the messages produced throughout the rebalance procedure.

To formulate the difference required between C and \bar{C} , we have to consider the worst rebalance case for a single consumer. This occurs when the sum of the write rate of the partitions being rebalanced is equal to C , the bin's capacity (it may never exceed C due to the bin packing capacity condition). Hence, the total amount of bytes produced into the rebalanced queue throughout a single iteration is $30 \cdot C$. Considering the consumer only has $25s$ to consume the data produced to the rebalanced queue, we now indicate how we should compute the bin's capacity C based on the consumer's real capacity \bar{C} to guarantee that the rebalanced queue latency reaches $0s$ within a single iteration. For this to be the case, $30 \cdot C < 25 \cdot \bar{C}$, which leads to $C < \frac{5}{6}\bar{C}$. This provides the bin's capacity to use in the bin packing algorithms based on the consumer's real capacity \bar{C} . The drawback to specifying a lower C is that it leads to an increase in the number of consumers deployed (operational cost), as the total production rate we can fit into a bin is now smaller than the consumer's real capacity (\bar{C}).

The partitions rebalanced to a consumer c in iteration k is

computed by Eq. 16.

$$P_R^k(c) = \{j \mid \Delta_{cj}(k) = 1 \wedge j \in P\}. \quad (16)$$

Condition $\Delta_{cj}(k) = 1$ guarantees a partition is assigned to consumer c at iteration k but wasn't at $k - 1$ (Sec. III). Set $P_R^k(c)$ is built upon P , which is the set of all partitions the group is interested in consuming data from.

On the other hand, Eq. 17 specifies the partitions which are carried over from the previous iteration

$$P_F^k(c) = \{j \mid \mathbf{X}_{cj}(k) = 1 \wedge j \notin P_R^k \forall j \in P\}, \quad (17)$$

wherein $\mathbf{X}_{cj}(k) = 1$ makes sure the partition is assigned to consumer c in iteration k , with the additional condition that j does not belong to the set of rebalanced partitions computed by Eq. 16.

The consumer's fixed queue contains the data produced into partitions partitions ($P_F^k(c)$), and the rebalanced queue the data produced into partitions partitions ($P_R^k(c)$). The rate at which data is produced into the rebalanced and fixed queues is computed as the sum of each partition's write rate. Hence, the rate of production into the fixed queue is expressed by Eq. 18, and the rate at which data is produced into the rebalanced queue expressed by Eq. 24.

With regards to the rate at which the consumer reads data from each queue, if the production rate into the rebalanced queue $W_R^k(c) = 0$ then the speed at which the consumer reads data from the fixed queue is $R_F^k(c) = \bar{C}$, otherwise, $R_F^k(c) = \min(\bar{C}, W_F^k(c))$. I.e. The consumer reads from the fixed queue with its full capacity if there are no rebalanced partitions or the rate of its consumption perfectly matches the rate of production into this queue (limited to its capacity). If the consumer has newly assigned partitions (rebalancing), which happens in our bin packing algorithms, all excess consumption throughput is dedicated to the rebalance queue and therefore the rate at which the consumer reads from the rebalance queue is $R_R^k(c) = \bar{C} - R_F^k(c)$.

Lastly, to express the latency equation for the fixed queue, we define two additional parameters specified by Equations 26 and 21, which respectively compute the total amount of bytes produced into the rebalanced and fixed queues at an iteration k for a consumer c . We then use Equations 22 and 27 to measure the latency on the fixed and rebalanced queues respectively.

$$W_F^k(c) = \sum_{j \in P_F^k(c)} s_j(t_k) \quad (18)$$

$$m_F^k(c) = \left(\frac{1}{R_F^k(c)} - \frac{1}{W_F^k(c)} \right) \quad (19)$$

$$b_F^k(c) = \begin{cases} L_F^{k-1}(c, T_F^{k-1}(c)), & \text{if } k > 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

$$T_F^k(c) = 30 \cdot W_F^k(c) \quad (21)$$

$$L_F^k(c, i) = \max \{ m_F^k(c) \cdot i + b_F^k(c), 0 \} \quad \forall i \in T_F^k(c) \quad (22)$$

$$(23)$$

To evaluate each algorithm over the same measurements, we first generate a stream of measurements through the procedure described in Sec. VI-B with 32 partitions, $N = 100$ measurements and $\delta = 5$. We assume that each measurement read from the stream indicates a stable production rate to each partition for the next 30s. Therefore, for a stream with 100 measurements, each experiment has a duration of $100 \cdot 30 = 3000s$. We then create consumer group configurations based on each algorithm's assignment strategy and compute the latency as per the models defined in Equations 22 and 27.

$$W_R^k(c) = \sum_{j \in P_R^k(c)} s_j(t_k) \quad (24)$$

$$m_R^k(c) = \left(\frac{1}{R_R^k(c)} - \frac{1}{W_R^k(c)} \right) \quad (25)$$

$$T_R^k(c) = 30 \cdot W_R^k(c) \quad (26)$$

$$L_R^k(c, i) = \max \{ m_R^k(c) \cdot i + 5, 0 \} \quad \forall i \in T_R^k(c) \quad (27)$$

Figure 5 provides a histogram comparing Kafka's assignment for 27 consumers (kd_27) with our Modified Worst Fit (MWF) algorithm. Since there are only 32 partitions kd_27, is 5 consumers away from the maximum number of consumers allowed for this setup. Despite this fact, it can be seen that the latency values go up to 40s. In Kafka's configuration 5 consumers have been assigned 2 partitions. The combined production rate of the partitions Kafka decides to pair together in a consumer often exceeded the consumer's consumption capacity \bar{C} . As for MWF, only after the rebalance procedure has terminated may the consumer start reading data again from the rebalanced queue. Therefore, the first bytes written to this queue will experience latencies close to 5s, but because in the worst case there is always $\bar{C} - C$ of consumption throughput the consumer can dedicate to the rebalanced queue, it can catch up with the messages produced to the rebalanced queue before the end of an iteration k .




Fig. 5: Latency histogram for MWF and kd_27.

How do these algorithms compare with respect to their operational cost? Figure 6 shows the operational cost of all evaluated algorithms computed as the average number of consumers required throughout the whole experiment. Since the Kafka algorithms (kd_1, kd_3, kd_5, etc...) do not resize

throughout the experiment, their average operational cost is equal to the integer value in their name, e.g., kd_25 used 25 consumers. In the case of MWF, it used an average of 15 consumers throughout the whole experiment.




Fig. 6: Average operational cost for all evaluated algorithms.

For each algorithm, Figure 7 plots the number of samples measured throughout an experiment where the measured latency is above 0s. This plot is to be seen in combination with Figure 8 which shows the boxplot for the latency measurements. Configurations kd_31 and kd_32 are not present in the boxplot as they present no samples with latencies above 0s. Figure 7 shows MWF is only outperformed in terms of the total amount of latency samples greater than 0s by Kafka configurations with 24, 30, 31 and 32 consumers. MWF presents a 90th percentile latency of 4.52s, whereas the aforementioned Kafka configurations present 90th percentile latency values of 2.70s, 1.11s, 0s and 0s respectively. On the other hand, these same configurations present respectively an increase in operational cost of 60%, 100%, 106.67% and 113.33% to MWF’s average use of 15 consumers. Lastly, Kafka’s configuration with the same operational cost as MWF, kd_15, has as 90th percentile latency 217s, which is 48 times the latency shown by MWF.




Fig. 7: Total samples with latency greater than 0s for each algorithm.

Counterintuitively, with Kafka’s assignment strategy, increasing the number of consumers in a group does not reliably improve the group’s performance with respect to latency, as




Fig. 8: Latency samples greater than 0s boxplot per algorithm.

shown in Fig. 8. This is a consequence of Kafka attempting to assign an equal number of partitions to each consumer without considering the total production rate it is assigning to each consumer, which more often than not, exceeds the consumer’s capacity. In other words, this highlights that simply increasing the number of consumers and leveraging Kafka’s assign strategy, as is the case for KEDA’s autoscaling solution, is an unreliable method to improve the group’s latency performance.

D. Performance Metrics

The metrics used to compare the performance between the algorithms are the Cardinal Bin Score ($CBS_{\delta}(a)$, Eq. 28) and the Average Rscore ($E(Rscore_{\delta}^a)$, Eq. 29) over all iterations of each stream.

TABLE IV: Data to compute the cardinal bin score and the expected Rscore for a stream of measurements.

Symbol	Description
A	Set of the existing and proposed approximation algorithms.
$z_a^{\delta}(i)$	number of bins used in iteration $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ of a stream defined by δ , by algorithm $a \in A$.
$Rscore_{\delta}^a(i)$	Rscore for an iteration $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ of a stream defined by δ , by algorithm $a \in A$.

The cardinal bin score is calculated using the following expression:

$$CBS_{\delta}(a) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{z_a^{\delta}(i) - \min_{b \in A} \{z_b^{\delta}(i)\}}{\min_{b \in A} \{z_b^{\delta}(i)\}}, \quad (28)$$

$$\forall a \in A \wedge \delta \in \{0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}.$$

In Eq. 28, $\min_{b \in A} \{z_b^{\delta}(i)\}$ denotes the minimum amount of bins used by any algorithm in A , for iteration i and the specified stream identified by δ . The size of the stream of measurements N , is also the number of consumer group configurations computed (bin packing algorithm executions) in this experimentation.

The CBS expresses how many more bins, on average, an algorithm $a \in A$ has compared to the algorithm that made use of the least bins, which encodes the operational cost. The closer this value is to 0, the more frequently the algorithm provided the configuration with the least amount of bins, hence

performing better than the other algorithms in A with regard to the operational cost.

The expected value of the Rscore is used to compare the rebalance cost for a single stream, and is computed as follows:

$$E(Rscore_a^\delta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Rscore_a^\delta(i), \quad (29)$$

$$\forall a \in A \wedge \delta \in \{0, 5, 10, 15, 20, 25\}.$$

Given Eq. 29, the aim is to also minimize an algorithm's Average Rscore.

E. Modified Any Fit Evaluation

Each algorithm was evaluated over a stream of measurements, persisting the Rscore and the number of bins used for each iteration. The algorithms are compared with respect to the same stream. The code that compiled the following results is made available in a public repository⁶.




Fig. 9: Cardinal Bin Score (CBS) for all implemented algorithms.

When evaluating the Cardinal Bin Score, the worst performing algorithm, as shown in Fig. 9, is the next fit followed by its decreasing version. The remaining any fit decreasing algorithms, are the ones that perform the best, with the best fit decreasing consistently presenting the best results.

As for the modified any fit algorithms (Fig. 10), due to its sorting strategy, MBFP shows the best results. It is also worth noting that for smaller variabilities, the modified algorithms behave similarly to the online versions of their any fit strategy with respect to the CBS, since the partitions aren't necessarily assigned from biggest to smallest. On the other hand, the higher the delta, the bigger the variability, which also leads to more rebalancing, having the modified algorithms behave more like the decreasing versions of their fit strategy (Line 25 and Lines 27 - 30 of Algorithm 1).

⁶https://github.com/landaudiogo/thesis_data




Fig. 10: Cardinal Bin Score (CBS) filtered to present the modified and the BFD algorithms.




Fig. 11: Impact on Rscore for different Deltas (random initial partition speed).

With regards to the Rscore, a common trend can be verified for all algorithms, where an algorithm's Average Rscore increases with the value of δ , as can be seen in Fig. 11. This should be expected as the bigger the δ , the more variability there is between the items' sizes in two consecutive measurements of a stream.

With respect to the average Rscore, the algorithms that perform the best are the Modified Any Fit algorithms and the NFD. The reason why the NFD appears within the five best algorithms, is due to adaptation described in Sec. VI-A and the increased amount of bins used by this algorithm. The partitions are assigned from biggest to smallest, and to due the reduced number of allowed open bins in the Next Fit algorithm, the chances of a partition being assigned to an existing bin are reduced. As such, the bigger partitions with less likelihood fit within their predecessor's consumer, and therefore a new bin has to be created. As a consequence of the adaptation, the new

bin created more frequently is the current consumer assigned to that partition which then leads to an improved rebalance score.

For a similar reason, the modified algorithms that perform the best with regards to the Rscore, are also the ones that perform worst (compared to the remaining modified algorithms) when evaluating the CBS. As such, on account of the added rebalance concern within the modified algorithms, these present an improvement when it comes to the rebalance cost compared to the existing approximation algorithms.

We find the pareto front, so as to determine the set of solutions that are most efficient, provided there are trade-offs within a multi-objective optimization problem. Excluding MWFP, the modified algorithms are consistently a part of the pareto front, as shown in Fig. 12, which implies these are a competitive alternative when solving this variation of the BP problem. For the tested production rate variation (δ between 5-25% of the consumers consumption capacity), the best performing Modified Any Fit algorithm with respect to the Rscore is the MWF. For a distributed set of queues that present a variability up to 25% of a consumer's consumption capacity ($\delta = 25$), MWF reduces the rebalance cost by 23% with an average increase in operational cost of 8.8%. In lower variability setups where the variation in production rate goes up by 5% of a consumer's capacity, the reduction in rebalance cost is 55% while only increasing the operational cost by 11.8%.




Fig. 12: Pareto front for different deltas comparing the Cardinal Bin Score and the Average Rscore.

F. Kafka Consumer Group Autoscaler Evaluation

The consumer group autoscaler, was developed as a proof of concept as to how this variation of the Bin Packing problem could be applied in a message broker environment. As such, we now present the results when running this system in a production environment message broker, with the compute resources utilised summarized in Table V.

One of the first assumptions, was that this problem is a variation of the single bin size bin packing problem, and therefore, the consumer should present a constant maximum capacity when challenged to work at peak performance. To validate the assumption, the consumer was tested in three very disparate conditions, specified in Table VI, all requiring the consumer to be reading the data at its maximum consumption

TABLE V: Infrastructure used for experimentation

Component	Cloud Platform	Resource Classification
Kafka Cluster (3 Nodes)	AWS	r5.xlarge
Kubernetes	GCP	GKE autopilot
Monitor	GCP	Kubernetes Deployment (GKE)
Controller	GCP	Kubernetes Deployment (GKE)
Consumer Group	GCP	As many Deployments as consumers in the group (GKE)

rate. Between each test, we varied: the average amount of bytes present in each partition; the number of destination tables in the data lake; and the number of partitions assigned to the consumer instance. Fig. 13 presents the results of having the consumer run in these conditions, and clearly shows a common mode for the maximum consumption rate, around 2.3 Mbytes/s. We therefore consider this assumption to be valid under normal conditions.




Fig. 13: Density Plot for the consumer's measured throughput in the three testing conditions.

With the goal of testing the system as a whole, we statistically summarize the time it takes the autoscaler to go through each event required to dynamically scale the group of consumers.




Fig. 14: System sequence of response events.

Initially, a measurement has to be provided by the monitor process to then be consulted by the controller (Δ_{t1}). The controller then updates the group's current state based on the new measurement, and proceeds to computing a new group configuration using one of the heuristic algorithms

TABLE VI: Testing conditions to obtain consumer maximum throughput measure.

Test ID	Total Bytes	Average Bytes	Number of Partitions	Number of Tables
Test 1	648 <i>Mbytes</i>	20 <i>Mbytes</i>	32	1
Test 2	100 <i>Mbytes</i>	0.86 <i>Mbytes</i>	116	5
Test 3	678 <i>Mbytes</i>	4 <i>Mbytes</i>	144	5

presented in Sections II-B and IV-B. This is followed by the controller calculating the difference between the new and current configuration, to determine the consumers it has to create, the ones it has to delete, and the messages that have to be communicated to each consumer to reach the intended state (Section V-C). This step terminates with the controller communicating with the Kubernetes control plane, to create the new consumer resources (Δ_{t2}).

The controller then waits for the newly created deployments to be ready (Δ_{t3}), followed by communicating with the consumer group to inform the consumers of their change in state, which only terminates as soon as all messages have been sent out to the respective consumers, and when every message has been acknowledged back to the controller (Δ_{t4}). This process is illustrated by Figure 14.

The system’s response time, starts with the monitor process measuring the current production rate of each partition. The measurement performed by the monitor component from Sec. V-A, is a moving average with a time frame of 30 seconds. As such, this component would take 30 seconds to converge to a stable rate of production. This event is represented in Fig. 14 as Δ_{t1} .

To fully evaluate the system’s response to high load variations, and to increase reproducibility, the monitor process was replaced by the stream of measurements described in Sec. VI-B. This provided more control over the production rate, to analyse the system’s response in scenarios of high and low variability ($\delta = 25$ and $\delta = 5$ respectively) of the production rate.

As for the second event Δ_{t2} , this is the time it takes the controller to compute the consumer group’s new assignment, computing the difference between the new and current states, and to send an asynchronous request to the Google Kubernetes Engine (GKE) cluster for every new consumer instance to be created. To obtain the distribution for this metric, the system was tested with the streams described in Sec. VI-B.

The time the controller takes with this procedure depends on the number of partitions to distribute between the consumer group, the algorithm the controller is executing to figure a new consumer group assignment, and the number of new consumer instances it has to create in the GKE cluster.

For the tested input data, there were at most 32 partitions to rebalance, at most 20 consumers to be created in a single iteration and the algorithm executed was the MWF. The event consistently takes less than 1 second to be executed as shown in Figure 15.

After making the asynchronous request to the GKE cluster, the autoscaler enters Δ_{t3} , where it has to wait for the control plane to schedule the consumer pods to cluster nodes, and run the containers.




Fig. 15: Distribution of Δ_{t2} for 1345 observations.

From Fig. 16, there are two main clusters of data points which can be summarized into two different scenarios in which the GKE cluster can find itself in.




Fig. 16: Histogram of Δ_{t3} for 273 observations.

The first, and most frequent (88%), has the GKE cluster taking between $[10, 50]$ seconds to have a new consumer instance ready. This is usually the case when the controller requests for the creation of new consumer instances and the Kubernetes cluster has enough resources available. As such, the event’s duration is related to the time it takes the scheduled node(s) to download the image from the container registry, and to start the containers.

The second group of data points, any time span greater than 50s (represents 12% of the data points), occurs when the Kubernetes cluster does not have any available resources. Here the actions the cluster undergoes are adding a new node to the cluster, and only then scheduling the consumer instance into the new available node. Due to the autoscaling feature of the GKE cluster, this is done automatically but it is also more

inconsistent, having data points taking up to 500s, although very sporadically.

In spite of the fact there isn't much control over the time it takes the Kubernetes cluster to schedule and start the pods, one variable that can be controlled is the size of the image which has to be downloaded by the nodes that were assigned the newly created consumer instances.

Lastly, after having the consumer instances running and ready to receive assignments, the controller has to communicate each consumer's assignment within the newly computed group configuration, which is represented by Δ_{t4} in Fig. 17.

Due to the synchronous nature of rebalancing a partition from one consumer to another, the controller has to first send out a stop consuming message for each partition that has to be rebalanced, wait for the consumer to respond, send out a start consuming message, and wait for a response. Without taking any processing and network delays into account, at worst, the controller might have to wait for two consumer cycles to be able to rebalance a partition.




Fig. 17: Distribution of Δ_{t4} for 1331 observations.

A consumer's cycle goes through the different phases mentioned in Section V-B, and only after performing its tasks does it verify the metadata queue to check if it has received any change in state message. For this reason, between two metadata reads from the `consumer.metadata` topic, it takes the consumer one whole cycle.

Having defined `BATCH_SIZE` to be `5Mbytes` and `WAIT_TIME_SECS` 1 second, and provided the results from Figure 13, which indicate the consumer has a maximum consumption rate of approximately `2Mbytes/s`, each consumer cycle can take approximately `2.5s`. Since the controller has to wait for two consumer cycles, this would imply that changing the group's state could take around 5 seconds, as can be seen in Fig. 17.

It is also worth noting that the more consumers there are in the group, the higher the probability that the controller has to wait 1 whole cycle after sending out the stop command, and another whole cycle after a start command, as the communication would have to be performed with more consumers.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

The work presented in this paper aims to achieve a deterministic approach to determine the number of consumers required working in parallel so as to guarantee that the rate of production into a set of partitions is not higher than the rate of consumption, while minimizing the operational cost.

The goal is to deterministically solve the autoscaling problem related to a group of consumers, which we model as a Bin Packing problem where the items' sizes and bin assignments can change over time. In light of these variations, items' assignments can be rebalanced (bin assignment can change), and therefore we propose the Rscore to evaluate the rebalance cost, Sec. IV-A.

Given the conflicting objectives of minimizing both the number of consumers and the rebalance cost, in Section IV-B we propose four new heuristic algorithms based on the Rscore. We present the Pareto-front for the evaluated algorithms in Section VI-E and show that three of the proposed algorithms are proven to be competitive solutions when solving the multi-objective optimization problem. In a message broker environment with high variability, MWF reduces the rebalance cost (Rscore) by 23% while increasing the operational cost by 8.8%. For lower variability setups, the Rscore is reduced even further to 55%, while only increasing the operational cost to 11.8%.

Furthermore, in Section V, the BP heuristics are applied to Kafka to automatically scale a group of consumers and manage the partition-consumer assignments. This system is integrated into a real production environment, and as expected, is capable of providing a solution that scales a group of consumers based on the system's load.

Lastly, in this paper, we challenge some of Kafka's core functionalities and provide tested alternatives that can be used as a foundation so as to improve the way in which a consumer's load is modeled and the manner in which the load (partitions) is distributed between the elements of a consumer group.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Magnoni, "Modern messaging for distributed systems," in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, vol. 608, no. 1. IOP Publishing, 2015, p. 012038.
- [2] V. John and X. Liu, "A survey of distributed message broker queues," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1704.00411*, 2017.
- [3] P. Chindanonda, V. Podolskiy, and M. Gerndt, "Self-adaptive data processing to improve slos for dynamic iot workloads," *Computers*, vol. 9, no. 1, p. 12, 2020.
- [4] M. Ezzeddine, G. Migliorini, F. Baude, and F. Huet, "Cost-efficient and latency-aware event consuming in workload-skewed distributed event queues," in *Proceedings of the 2022 6th International Conference on Cloud and Big Data Computing*, 2022, pp. 62–70.
- [5] M. Raynal, *Distributed algorithms for message-passing systems*. Springer, 2013, vol. 500.
- [6] C. Lumezanu, N. Spring, and B. Bhattacharjee, "Decentralized message ordering for publish/subscribe systems," in *Middleware 2006: ACM/I-FIP/USENIX 7th International Middleware Conference, Melbourne, Australia, November 27-December 1, 2006. Proceedings 7*. Springer, 2006, pp. 162–179.
- [7] S. Burckhardt, D. Leijen, M. Fähndrich, and M. Sagiv, "Eventually consistent transactions," in *European Symposium on Programming*. Springer, 2012, pp. 67–86.

- [8] Y.-Y. Su and J. Flinn, "Slingshot: Deploying stateful services in wireless hotspots," in *Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services*, 2005, pp. 79–92.
- [9] P. Carbone, S. Ewen, G. Fóra, S. Haridi, S. Richter, and K. Tzoumas, "State management in apache flink@: consistent stateful distributed stream processing," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 1718–1729, 2017.
- [10] A. D. Kshemkalyani, M. Raynal, and M. Singhal, "An introduction to snapshot algorithms in distributed computing," *Distributed systems engineering*, vol. 2, no. 4, p. 224, 1995.
- [11] G. van Dongen and D. Van Den Poel, "A performance analysis of fault recovery in stream processing frameworks," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 93 745–93 763, 2021.
- [12] M. Nardelli, V. Cardellini, V. Grassi, and F. L. Presti, "Efficient operator placement for distributed data stream processing applications," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 30, no. 8, pp. 1753–1767, 2019.
- [13] F. Furini, E. Malaguti, R. Medina Durán, A. Persiani, and P. Toth, "A column generation heuristic for the two-dimensional two-staged guillotine cutting stock problem with multiple stock size," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 218, no. 1, pp. 251–260, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221711009374>
- [14] M. Dell'Amico, F. Furini, and M. Iori, "A branch-and-price algorithm for the temporal bin packing problem," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 114, p. 104825, 2020.
- [15] M. Delorme, M. Iori, and S. Martello, "Logic based benders' decomposition for orthogonal stock cutting problems," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 78, pp. 290–298, 2017.
- [16] Q. Xia, W. Liang, and W. Xu, "Throughput maximization for online request admissions in mobile cloudlets," in *38th Annual IEEE Conference on Local Computer Networks*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 589–596.
- [17] V. Gulisano, R. Jimenez-Peris, M. Patino-Martinez, C. Soriente, and P. Valduriez, "Streamcloud: An elastic and scalable data streaming system," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 2351–2365, 2012.
- [18] T. Heinze, Y. Ji, Y. Pan, F. J. Grueneberger, Z. Jerzak, and C. Fetzer, "Elastic complex event processing under varying query load." *BD3@ VLDB*, vol. 1018, pp. 25–30, 2013.
- [19] S. Kamali, "Efficient bin packing algorithms for resource provisioning in the cloud," in *Algorithmic Aspects of Cloud Computing: First International Workshop, ALGO CLOUD 2015, Patras, Greece, September 14-15, 2015. Revised Selected Papers*. Springer, 2016, pp. 84–98.
- [20] L. Shi, J. Furlong, and R. Wang, "Empirical evaluation of vector bin packing algorithms for energy efficient data centers," in *2013 IEEE symposium on computers and communications (ISCC)*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 000 009–000 015.
- [21] Z. Á. Mann, "Approximability of virtual machine allocation: much harder than bin packing," 2015.
- [22] W. Song, Z. Xiao, Q. Chen, and H. Luo, "Adaptive resource provisioning for the cloud using online bin packing," *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 63, no. 11, pp. 2647–2660, 2013.
- [23] O. Hadary, L. Marshall, I. Menache, A. Pan, E. E. Greeff, D. Dion, S. Dorminey, S. Joshi, Y. Chen, M. Russinovich *et al.*, "Protean: Vm allocation service at scale," in *Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Conference on Operating Systems Design and Implementation*, 2020, pp. 845–861.
- [24] R. Panigrahy, K. Talwar, L. Uyeda, and U. Wieder, "Heuristics for vector bin packing," *research.microsoft.com*, 2011.
- [25] S. Berndt, K. Jansen, and K.-M. Klein, "Fully dynamic bin packing revisited," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 179, no. 1-2, pp. 109–155, 2020.
- [26] K. Fleszar and K. S. Hindi, "New heuristics for one-dimensional bin-packing," *Computers & operations research*, vol. 29, no. 7, pp. 821–839, 2002.
- [27] E. G. Coffman, J. Csirik, G. Galambos, S. Martello, and D. Vigo, "Bin packing approximation algorithms: survey and classification," in *Handbook of combinatorial optimization*, 2013, pp. 455–531.
- [28] E. G. Coffman, G. Galambos, S. Martello, and D. Vigo, "Bin packing approximation algorithms: Combinatorial analysis," *Handbook of Combinatorial Optimization: Supplement Volume A*, pp. 151–207, 1999.
- [29] D. S. Johnson, A. Demers, J. D. Ullman, M. R. Garey, and R. L. Graham, "Worst-case performance bounds for simple one-dimensional packing algorithms," *SIAM Journal on computing*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 299–325, 1974.
- [30] E. C. man Jr, M. Garey, and D. Johnson, "Approximation algorithms for bin packing: A survey," *Approximation algorithms for NP-hard problems*, pp. 46–93, 1996.
- [31] B. S. Baker and E. G. Coffman, Jr, "A tight asymptotic bound for next-fit-decreasing bin-packing," *SIAM Journal on Algebraic Discrete Methods*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 147–152, 1981.
- [32] S. Kamburugamuve and G. Fox, "Survey of distributed stream processing," *Bloomington: Indiana University*, p. 153, 2016.
- [33] K. M. M. Thein, "Apache kafka: Next generation distributed messaging system," *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Technology Research*, vol. 3, no. 47, pp. 9478–9483, 2014.
- [34] S. Kamburugamuve, L. Christiansen, and G. Fox, "A framework for real time processing of sensor data in the cloud," *Journal of Sensors*, vol. 2015, 2015.