

On optimizing Inband Telemetry systems for accurate latency-based service deployments

Nataliia Koneva*, Alfonso Sánchez-Macián*, José Alberto Hernández*, Ó. González de Dios†

*Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, Spain

nkoneva@pa.uc3m.es , {alfonsan, jahgutie}@it.uc3m.es

†Telefonica I+D, Spain

oscar.gonzalezdedios@telefonica.com

Abstract—The power of Machine Learning and Artificial Intelligence algorithms based on collected datasets, along with the programmability and flexibility provided by Software Defined Networking can provide the building blocks for constructing the so-called Zero-Touch Network and Service Management systems. However, the fuel towards this goal relies on the availability of sufficient and good-quality data collected from measurements and telemetry. This article provides a telemetry methodology to collect accurate latency measurements, as a first step toward building intelligent control planes that make correct decisions based on precise information.

I. INTRODUCTION

Software-Defined Networking (SDN) paves the path to the realization of intelligent networks by enabling comprehensive network automation and zero-touch network and service management (ZSM), encompassing essential aspects of autonomous self-adaptation, self-healing mechanisms, and on-demand re-configuration [1]. Network automation has been traditionally perceived as a closed-loop process comprising three key tasks: (1) the continuous monitoring and data collection of network states, covering both optical and packet-based aspects; (2) the execution of advanced, intelligent algorithms, including AI/ML for evaluating network performance and optimizing the placement of traffic flows to enhance user quality of experience; (3) the application of recommendations generated by these intelligent algorithms. This is often referred to as the 'observe-decide-react' loop.

It is then critical to design accurate telemetry systems that collect sufficient and relevant measurements since, if the information collected in step one is not good enough, then the decisions taken in step two may be totally wrong. In this article, we focus on the such step one: monitoring and collecting information from in-band telemetry, in particular, for estimating end-to-end latency. Specifically, our focus lies in identifying the optimal methodology for gathering measurements in a manner that strikes the balance between obtaining a sufficient number of latency samples to ensure accuracy and avoiding excessive monitoring which could lead to network overload.

II. METHODOLOGY AND EXAMPLES

Indeed, latency is critical for most existing and emerging Internet applications such as video-on-demand, tele-surgery,

and metaverse-related applications [2], [3]. In particular, Tactile Internet sets 1 ms as the desired maximum end-to-end latency, while virtual reality and metaverse applications are even stricter with 0.1 ms as latency target. Often, some of these services have to traverse the access, aggregation and metro network segments, heading toward a datacenter tens of kilometers away, where such services can be processed.

Thus, measuring packet latency, either hop-by-hop or end-to-end, is critical to assess whether or not a given network is capable of supporting latency-demanding services. In this regard, Inband Telemetry strategies implemented on P4 switches (PINT) can provide the tools to monitor individual links and end-to-end paths [4]. However, telemetry consumes bandwidth resources due to its extra-headers, introduces additional forwarding operations, and it may overwhelm telemetry collectors.

Taking only a few monitoring samples of highly variable metrics (like latency) may lead to wrong conclusions, but on the other hand, too many telemetry samples may burden the network excessively. In this sense, Cochran's formula [5] for infinite populations allows the appropriate dimensioning of sampling strategies to achieve high accuracy with moderate error. The formula relates the necessary number of monitoring samples n_0 with the error e at estimating the percentage $p = 1 - q$ of packets below some delay threshold D_{th} , for some confidence level Z :

$$n_0 = \frac{Z^2 \cdot p \cdot q}{e^2}, \quad (1)$$

As an example, consider we want to estimate the percentage of packets below some latency threshold say $D_{th} = 82 \mu s$ between source Node_47 and destination nodes Node_10 and Node_19 (path1 and path2), for the Milano-net [7] topology shown in Fig. 1, with 95% confidence (i.e. $Z = 1.96$ for 95% confidence level).

In this scenario, if only $n_0 = 10$ latency measurements are collected, then the error is $e = 0.3099$ or $\pm 30.99\%$ (from eq. 1). This error value reduces to $\pm 13.86\%$ for $n_0 = 50$ measurements and $\pm 4.90\%$ for $n_0 = 400$ measurement samples. Thus, Cochran's formula allows us to identify how many samples are needed for estimating delay percentiles accurately with bounded error.

As shown in Fig. 1, the two source-destination paths have different distances (8.8 Km and 13.6 Km) and have to traverse




Fig. 1. Two-path scenario in the Milano-net [7] topology with 18.4 Km of network diameter.

multiple hops with various link loads. Queuing delays are simulated as classical M/M/1 queues, where the total delay per link T_i (including queuing and transmission) follows an exponential distribution with mean $E(T_i) = E(X) \frac{1}{1-\rho_i}$, that is, its Cumulative Distribution Function (CDF) follows:

$$F_{T_i}(t) = 1 - e^{-\frac{t}{E(T_i)}} \quad (2)$$

Here, $E(X) = 1 \mu s$ is the average packet service time at 10 Gb/s and $\rho_i \in (0,1)$ is the load of the i -th link in the network. Propagation delay is computed following the classical $5 \mu s/Km$ for silica fiber.

Fig. 2 (top) shows the Probability Density Function (PDF) of the simulated total delay (including propagation, queuing and transmission) for the two paths, along with the $82 \mu s$ delay threshold (red dashed). As shown, although the blue path has a shorter average delay ($63 \mu s$ average for blue and $73 \mu s$ for green), the green path has a smaller delay tail and is expected to meet the $82 \mu s$ requirement better than path 1 (93.7% for blue vs 99.5% for green below the threshold).

In this scenario, the control plane is assumed to receive telemetry information as a number of n_0 latency measurements and must decide which of the two paths can better guarantee the $82 \mu s$ delay threshold for a certain latency-critical application. Fig. 2 (bottom) shows the estimated percentage of times where path1 is selected (blue) vs path2 (green) in the cases where 5, 10, 50, 100, and 400 latency measurements n_0 are collected.

As depicted, if only $n_0 = 5$ measurements are collected (high error according to Cochran's formula), there is a high chance (in fact 37% of the times) that the control plane wrongly chooses path1. When the number of latency measurements is 100 or above, the control plane mostly decides that

path2 is more suitable than path1 at guaranteed delays below $82 \mu s$. Hence, if poor telemetry information is provided to the control plane, this may make wrong decisions very often.

III. FULL SIMULATION SET

Let us consider again the network topology of Fig. 1 (right) for Milano-net [7] whose network diameter is 18.4 Km. In this scenario, we are interested in evaluating whether or not each source Access Central Office (ACO) can reach any data center available in the MAN, represented as green Metro-Aggregation Central Offices (MACOs) in less than $82 \mu s$ one-way delay. The total number of source-destination pairs evaluated is 35 ACOs x 17 MACOs, i.e. 595 paths.

The heatmaps of Fig. 3 illustrate whether or not each source-destination pair in the Milano topology is below $82 \mu s$, white for true, grey for false along with the errors as red/blue dots. In other words, for a path to fulfill the latency requirements, the delay of 99% of sampled packets within that path must be below the specified threshold, $82 \mu s$ in the example. Fig. 3 (top) presents telemetry-provided information using only a sample size of 5p latency measurements.

Fig. 3 (bottom) provides the same information using 100 packets. In grey, we observe source-destination pairs not fulfilling the $82 \mu s$ requirement. The red dots indicate False Positive (FP) or False Negative (FN) errors due to the 5p sampling strategies. In particular, in the case of only 5p measurement samples, we find 73 FP and 3 FN errors. For 100p, these values reduce to 15 FP and only 1 FN. Finally, for 2500p (not depicted in Fig. 3), only 1 FP and 1 FN are obtained.

IV. CONCLUSION

This article shows the importance of collecting accurate and sufficient telemetry information, especially for random




Fig. 2. The simulated distribution of packet delays for two paths with the threshold of $82 \mu s$ (top), the percentage of times where each path is chosen as best in 10.000 experiments for the threshold of $82 \mu s$ (bottom).

metrics with high variability like latency. Accurate telemetry is critical as a step prior to Zero-Touch Networking scenarios, since insufficient measurements may lead to wrong decisions. We provide a methodology based on Cochran’s formula to find the number of measurements needed for accurate delay estimates. Future work will evaluate such telemetry strategy in a P4 Docker container over SONiC with real traffic traces.

The code used in the simulations is open-source and available in Github for the interested reading willing to reproduce the results and further extend the methodology with new scenarios and applications [8].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of Spanish projects ITACA (PDC2022-133888-I00) and 6G-INTEGRATION-3 (TSI-063000-2021-127) and EU project SEASON (grant no. 101096120).

REFERENCES

[1] J. Gallego-Madrid, “Machine learning-based zero-touch network and service management: a survey,” *Digit. Commun. Networks* no. 8, pp. 105–123 (2022).




Fig. 3. Heatmaps of source-destination pairs below $82 \mu s$: (top) with 5p and (bottom) with 100p measurements.

[2] X. Jiang, et al, “Low-latency networking: Where latency lurks and how to tame it,” *Proc. IEEE* 107, 280–306 (2019).

[3] G. Martinez, et al, “Round trip time (rtt) delay in the internet: Analysis and trends,” *IEEE Network* (2023).

[4] F. Cugini et al, “Telemetry and AI-based security P4 applications for optical networks [invited],” *J. Opt. Commun. Netw.* 15 (2023).

[5] W. Cochran, *Sampling Techniques*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics (Wiley, 1977).

[6] J. A. Hernandez et al., “On dimensioning Count-Min sketches for Telemetry and Resource Assignment in IPoWDM Networks”, in *European Conf. Networks and Communications (EuCNC)* 2023.

[7] S. Johansson et al., “A cost-effective approach to introduce an optical WDM network in the metropolitan environment,” *IEEE J. Selected Areas Communications* 16(7), pp. 1109-1122 (1998).

[8] N. Koneva, “Inband telemetry design”, https://github.com/NataliaBlueCloud/Inband_telemetry_design (2023).