

VINEVI: A Virtualized Network Vision Architecture for Smart Monitoring of Heterogeneous Applications and Infrastructures

Rodrigo Moreira, Hugo G. V. O. da Cunha, Larissa F. Rodrigues Moreira, Flávio de Oliveira Silva

Abstract Monitoring heterogeneous infrastructures and applications is essential to cope with user requirements properly, but it still lacks enhancements. The well-known state-of-the-art methods and tools do not support seamless monitoring of bare-metal, low-cost infrastructures, neither hosted nor virtualized services with fine-grained details. This work proposes Virtualized Network Vision architecture (VINEVI), an intelligent method for seamless monitoring heterogeneous infrastructures and applications. The VINEVI architecture advances state of the art with a node-embedded traffic classification agent placing physical and virtualized infrastructures enabling real-time traffic classification. VINEVI combines this real-time traffic classification with well-known tools such as Prometheus and Victoria Metrics to monitor the entire stack from the hardware to the virtualized applications. Experimental results showcased that VINEVI architecture allowed seamless heterogeneous infrastructure monitoring with a higher level of detail beyond literature. Also, our node-embedded real-time Internet traffic classifier evolved with flexibility the methods with monitoring heterogeneous infrastructures seamlessly.

Rodrigo Moreira,
Institute of Exact and Technological Sciences (IEP), Federal University of Viçosa,
Rio Paranaíba, Brazil, 38810-000, e-mail: rodrigo@ufv.br

Hugo G. V. O. da Cunha,
Faculty of Computing (FACOM), Federal University of Uberlândia,
Uberlândia, Brazil, 38400-902, e-mail: hugo.cunha@ufu.br

Larissa F. Rodrigues Moreira,
Faculty of Computing (FACOM), Federal University of Uberlândia,
Uberlândia, Brazil, 38400-902, e-mail: larissarodrigues@ufu.br

Flávio de Oliveira Silva,
Faculty of Computing (FACOM), Federal University of Uberlândia,
Uberlândia, Brazil, 38400-902, e-mail: flavio@ufu.br

1 Introduction

Understanding how Internet services and resources are used is essential to support the user experience within Service-Level Agreement (SLA) [1]. Among the Internet resources, the cloud computing infrastructures, which use virtualization and handle vast amounts of data generated by users, require the entire stack monitoring from the hardware to the virtualized applications. In 2014 [2], the cloud computing paradigm evolved to Multi-Access Edge Computing (MEC) to address the challenges of having centralized computing capabilities geographically distant from users [3].

Monitoring these infrastructures, especially cloud computing, has become essential for maintaining the service's operation, yielding users' service level agreements [4]. Also, monitoring is critical to support visibility regarding their resource consumption behavior, enabling the prediction of outages, perform performance diagnosis, and Service Level Agreement (SLA) violation [5, 6, 7]. Furthermore, due to the large amount of data that monitoring tools generate, it becomes challenging to find methods, frameworks, or tools that detail the status of infrastructure entities, especially bottlenecks, without causing a significant overhead on the system [8].

Besides, monitoring heterogeneous infrastructures Methods, technologies, and monitoring strategies found in the literature are predominantly integrated with cloud provider tools or tied to a specific SLA [9, 10, 11] and do not take into account container-native monitoring [12].

Hence, this work proposes the **VI**rtualized **NE**twork **VI**sion architecture (VINEVI) framework for seamless monitoring of heterogeneous infrastructures and services. VINEVI provides a set of entities and technological enablers that allow monitoring cloud infrastructures such as heterogeneous bare-metal (x64) and low-cost (AArc64) [13] architectures. VINEVI advances state of the art with a monitoring method based on Artificial Intelligence (AI) that monitors the infrastructures, considering their resources and services. VINEVI enables the monitoring of network traffic volume by application class for each monitored entity and service. Additionally, this paper innovates with a framework that monitors hosted or virtualized services.

Among the contributions of this work, the following stand out:

- A seamless monitoring framework for network entities, hybrid infrastructures, and hosted and virtualized services;
- A traffic volume counter customizable by application class for hybrid architectures;
- An assessment of the performance of CNNs as enabling technologies for real-time sampling network traffic classification.

This work is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the current state of the art on network monitoring. Section 3 presents the VINEVI architecture proposed in this paper, whereas the experimental setup as described in detail in Section 4. Section 5 reports results and analysis of the experimental evaluation. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2 Related Work

Currently, the literature presents different monitoring solutions for virtualized networks, and infrastructures [14] [15] [16]. Some approaches focus on networks, others on infrastructures, but none rely on seamless monitoring of low-cost and high-performance infrastructures. Also, the well-known monitoring solutions lack monitoring both running on top of virtualized infrastructures or non-virtualized. This section describes some related work considering the seamless infrastructures and network monitoring capabilities.

Borylo et al. [17] proposed and evaluated a portable monitoring module that combines monitoring capabilities to Network Function Virtualization (NFV), Software-defined Networking (SDN), and Cloud. Their solution architecture receives monitoring statistics through well-known and universal interfaces with SDN controllers, Virtualized Infrastructure Manager (VIM), host, and tenants. Unlike our work, we proposed a seamless infrastructure monitoring that considers a virtualized and non-virtualized infrastructure and its services. Although, we provide fine-grained statistical monitoring of the entire network and infrastructure.

In [18] contains the description of a seamless platform based on Prometheus and Grafana for the deployment and monitoring of containers over infrastructures. Unlike our proposal, the authors focused on monitoring containers to achieve availability and OPEX reduction. Although our monitoring proposal can monitor container-based services, we go further by intelligently monitoring network traffic. VINEVI monitors bare-metal, low-cost infrastructures, network entities, and services transparently, unlike previous approaches. Similarly, we find other monitoring architectures in [18] which take into account logs [19] while [20] takes into account flow rules.

Won & Kim [21] believe that open source tools like Prometheus and Zabbix require configuration and rely on empirical knowledge about failures, requiring administrators to set accurate thresholds for each situation. They proposed an intelligent Multi-Layer monitoring architecture based on Prometheus and machine learning to address these challenges. The authors evaluated the efficiency of some machine learning models such as Random Forest (RF), Support Vector Machine (SVM), and Deep Neural Network (DNN) for monitoring tasks. The results suggest that DNN proved to be a promising technology with reasonable accuracy for predicting CPU, RAM, and network failures. Our paper also deals with statistics gathering and proactive submission to related endpoints. However, the VINEVI framework thoroughly monitors the infrastructure, which can be bare-metal, low-cost, network entities, virtualized, or hosted services on top of those infrastructures.

In [22] we find DynAMo, an alternative monitoring approach to Prometheus that causes low computational overhead on monitored entities and services. The use case used in the evaluation refers to the communication service integrated into a railway company simulated in a software environment. Among the results reported, the low memory consumption compared to monitoring based on Prometheus stands out. Unlike the authors, VINEVI, in addition to monitoring containers in production environments, monitors the consumption of network resources of containers.

3 VINEVI Architecture

This work proposes a method for seamlessly monitoring bare-metal, low-cost infrastructures and network elements. In addition to dealing with the infrastructure, our solution can deal with the services that run on these infrastructures, directly monitoring hosted, virtualized, and nested-virtualized services.

VINEVI monitors the network elements and the traffic volume detailed by application class, services, and computing infrastructure. We present the conceptual diagram of the VINEVI framework in Fig. 1 and read it from left to right, and we see network resources, data center infrastructure, and low-cost infrastructures.

In the upper flow, the blue arrow refers to the collection of information about network traffic of resources and services running on the infrastructures. In Fig. 1 the *s0/3* interface denotes the monitoring of the traffic volume of the router network interface, which can occur live or by samples. These samples feed the previously built [23] Packet Vision component for traffic classification based on *Convolution Neural Network (CNN)*.




Fig. 1 VINEVI Monitoring Schema.

In the lower flow, information regarding the physical resources of the infrastructure feeds the event-driven statistics collector based on Prometheus [24]. In addition to physical information, the metrics collector receives information related to the service, depending on the service operator specifying what will be monitored from the application and pointing to the corresponding end-point. In addition to monitoring the infrastructure, VINEVI can monitor the service orchestrators of these infrastructures and the Virtualized Infrastructure Managers (VIMs).

The VINEVI framework combines service and resource monitoring metrics with specified traffic volume by application class. When combined, we bring novelty

with a seamless monitoring method that allows administrators and the infrastructure operations team to monitor their resources adaptively and granularly.

A critical component of the VINEVI framework is PacketVision [23], which receives sampled or live stream network packets and classifies them according to their application class. In VINEVI, we build a gauge-type counter for each predominant Internet traffic class. This counter decreases or increases over time depending on the current state of the network. The traffic classes for our VINEVI Proof-of-Concept (POC) are detailed in Section 4.2. Another fundamental component of VINEVI is Prometheus or Victoria Metrics which receive metrics by end-points and store them for temporal analysis.

For the VINEVI framework to consolidate the various monitoring metrics, each monitored entity must have a statistics publisher that runs as a daemon. This monitoring entity sends the metrics to the corresponding endpoints in Prometheus.

4 Experimental Setup

To functionally validate VINEVI, we deploy it in an experimental testbed. This testbed consisted of four (4) distinct hosts: the Monitor Server, Experimental Server, Orchestrator Server, and AI Server as in Fig. 2. Among these hosts represent the infrastructure in the VINEVI framework, the Experimental Server, a bare-metal with four vCPUs and 8 GB RAM with Ubuntu 18.04 LTS. Another type of Experimental Server admitted by VINEVI is the low-cost one. A Raspberry Pi4 is hosting virtual machines and is managed by Orchestrator Service.




Fig. 2 Intelligent Monitoring Testbed Overview.

The Monitor Server hosts the platform for viewing and supporting the monitoring data. We configure Grafana, Prometheus, and Victoria Metrics services to handle monitored entities. Besides, we configure a Virtual Private Network (VPN) service so that metric collectors publish metrics to endpoints correctly, even when they are outside the network domain. Part of our VINEVI experimental setup was deployed

on the Microsoft Azure cloud computing platform with Ubuntu 18.04 LTS with a flavor 2vCPU and 8 GB RAM.

On the other hand, Orchestrator Server runs on a bare-metal server. Among the roles of this server, the implementation of virtualized services on bare-metal and low-cost infrastructure stands out. To seamlessly deploy virtual machines on bare-metal (x86_x64) and low-cost (AArc64) infrastructures, we configured the open-source Eclipse fog05 virtual Orchestrator. This Orchestrator deals directly with the Fog5 agent running on top of Experimental Servers enabling them to launch virtual machines or containers.

4.1 Smart Traffic Monitoring

For VINEVI to monitor the volume of network traffic by application class, we incorporated the capabilities of CNNs into the framework through Packet Vision. Thus, VINEVI has an intelligent node agent for monitoring network traffic. We train CNNs to classify network traffic into seven (7) typical Internet classes: Bittorrent, Browsing, DNS, IoT, RDP, SSH, and VoIP. In this experimental setup we considered three (3) CNNs to classify traffic on the VINEVI framework: SqueezeNet [25], ResNet-18 [26] and MobileNetV2 [27].

Among these three CNNs, the SqueezeNet and MobileNetV2 architectures were explicitly designed for use in mobile and edge devices, so we hypothesized that they are good candidates to compose the VINEVI monitoring agent. SqueezeNet aimed to reduce the number of parameters through fire modules, which use the strategy of compression and expansion of activation maps in the convolution layers [25]. MobileNetV2 [27] uses separable depth convolutions, which consists of factoring the standard convolution into a depth convolution followed by a 1×1 convolution, called a point convolution.

The literature claims that it is not promising to embed large models such as AlexNet or VGG-16 in small devices because they demand high computational load [28]. However, we decided to investigate how the ResNet-18 architecture, which is the smallest network in the ResNet family (composed of ≈ 11 million parameters), behaves when embedded. ResNet is composed of residual blocks that allow accelerating convergence and better deal with the [26] overfitting problem.

A premise of the VINEVI framework is a previous CNN training to enable traffic prediction by application class for the monitoring agent. Once the model has been trained, the CNN has uploaded to the VINEVI intelligent traffic monitoring agent for future on-the-fly predictions on the infrastructures. The Torch framework allows loading previously trained models, avoiding training bottlenecks. Furthermore, due to the hardware restrictions of low-cost infrastructures, embedding the previous trained CNN model proves to be advantageous and functionally correct.

We adopted this strategy to enable the smart traffic monitoring agent on RPi4 to enrich infrastructure monitoring with application class details on traffic volume. We configured PyTorch 1.10.0 to run on AArc64 and x64 hardware, thus enabling the

loading of an already trained CNN and for the monitoring agent to predict the sample packages' application class regardless of the architecture or underlying architecture infrastructure.

4.2 Dataset Description

The dataset images evaluated in this paper were built from the Packet Vision [23] component, which considered the raw information carried in the packet, including header and payload. About 9645 images were obtained from Wireshark traces (*pcap*) from different sources. These images are categorized into seven (7) classes, as summarized in Table 1. Fig. 3 shows some images from the dataset for each class. All images are in PNG format with 224×224 pixels size.

Table 1 Descriptive Summary of the images.

Class	Samples	Source
Bit Torrent	1217	UPC Data [29]
DNS	1412	
Browsing	1225	
RDP	1271	ISCXVPN2016 [30]
SSH	1352	
IoT	1848	IoT Sentinel [31]
VoIP	1320	NASOR [32]
Total	9645	




Fig. 3 Examples of images for each class.

5 Results and Discussion

Considering the testbed presented above, we carried experiments to validate the VINEVI framework functionally. The objectives of the experiments were to answer the following questions:

1. For the VINEVI testbed, which CNN outperforms regarding accuracy for real-time network traffic prediction by application class?
2. For a real-time traffic prediction environment, where the prediction time of packets is essential, which CNN is suitable to compose the intelligent monitoring agent in AArc64 architectures?
3. When does VINEVI intelligent monitoring agent run on x64 architectures, which CNN is best suited for traffic prediction by application classes?
4. Is there differentiation in CPU consumption in the traffic class prediction process depending on CNN type and traffic class?

For VINEVI's experimental setup, and considering the dataset described above, the CNN that performed best regarding accuracy was MobileNet. The numerical results of the learning and testing process denoted that the accuracy of this CNN

was 99.90%. The learning and prediction behavior, according to Fig. 4, implies the generalization and aptitude of the model to compose the VINEVI smart traffic monitoring agent.




Fig. 4 Training and Loss values evolution for each CNN model.

When we implemented the intelligent traffic classification agent running on low-cost and bare-metal infrastructures, we noticed a different behavior for the same CNN. Intelligently monitoring the traffic class of applications on low-cost infrastructures (AArc64) can be done by pooling sampling, not in real-time because of the large amount of data in a production network. To predict a single packet regarding its application class on AArc64 architectures required $\approx 811ms$ using ResNet. Thus, ResNet was the CNN that required the shortest time to predict the application class of a given package in AArc64.

When the intelligent traffic prediction agent ran on bare-metal (x64) infrastructures, ResNet demanded the longest prediction time $\approx 77ms$, behaving differently than AArc64 architecture. In the x64 architecture, the CNN that consumed the least amount of time to predict the application class of a given package was SqueezeNet, demanding around $\approx 62ms$, according to Fig. 5. In Fig. 6 it can be seen that CNN ResNet took about $9.5\times$ less time than SqueezeNet to predict the traffic class of the same sampled network packet.

Accordingly, for VINEVI's testbed, the CNN outperforms prediction time depending on the architecture where the intelligent network traffic monitoring agent stands out. If deployed over low-cost infrastructures, the best CNN to be used will be ResNet; if deployed on bare-metal, the most recommended is SqueezeNet.




Fig. 5 x64: prediction time.




Fig. 6 AArch64: prediction time.

We investigate how the placement of intelligent traffic monitoring agents over low-cost infrastructure impacts the consumption of computational resources. In this investigation, we consider how and to what extent the prediction of different classes of applications by the three (3) CNNs considered in the VINEVI testbed affects the CPU consumption of low-cost infrastructures. According to Fig. 7 it is possible to see that MobileNet and SqueezeNet consumed on average and within the confidence interval the same amount of CPU for all application classes.




Fig. 7 Comparison of CPU consumption by classification agents.

However, with ResNet, it was observed that the average CPU consumption was $\approx 82.49\%$, being $\approx 13\%$ lower compared to other CNNs. We believe that this happened because in the process and prediction, having the CNNs already been trained, the last SoftMax layer is responsible for the forecast. Since this layer is less complex, it implies lower CPU consumption. Therefore, incorporating this CNN in the intelligent traffic monitoring agent to monitor low-cost infrastructures is proved to be more suitable.

We also assess the complexity of each CNN, and according to [33] the complexity of a CNN is measured by the amount of multiplication and addition operations that are required for the underlying architecture to perform a computation [34]. According to Table 2, the last layer of ResNet is less complex in terms of FLOPS compared with others in the same experiment. Due to this lesser complexity, we argue that the ResNet consumed less CPU than others. Also, this result suggests that embedded systems can provide better performance during feedforward prediction [35].

Table 2 Complexity of the last layer of CNNs.

CNN	No. of Parameters	Complexity (%)
SqueezeNet	0.004 M	0.082
MobileNet	0.009 M	0.003
ResNet	0.004 M	0.000

The VINEVI framework showed to be adaptable to monitor network traffic and heterogeneous infrastructure resources seamlessly, not impeding various infrastructures that exist on the Internet. Thus, when we combine the traffic class predictor with well-established state-of-the-art monitoring mechanisms, we arrive at an AI-based solution that seamlessly monitors heterogeneous infrastructure and services.

6 Conclusion

This work introduced the VINEVI framework for seamless monitoring of network traffic, hybrid infrastructures, and hosted or virtualized services. By combining the monitoring capabilities of well-established state-of-the-art tools [13] with artificial intelligence technologies, we enrich state-of-the-art with detailed monitoring of hybrid entities and services.

We proposed and functionally evaluated a counter gauge for monitoring network traffic volume by class of applications. This counter relies on CNN-based network traffic classification. In addition, we assessed the placement of the network traffic prediction agent on top of possible VINEVI monitoring architectures. We found that the traffic monitoring module must consider the underlying architecture type to load the CNN model, which takes the least time and consumes the least CPU to predict the application class of a given packet. Furthermore, seamless monitoring of infrastructures or services requires flexible solutions that are adaptable to the environment regardless of vendor, hardware, or software.

For future work, urges to try and validate other AI techniques for traffic prediction. In addition, we consider it essential to create standardized interfaces for infrastructure operation and automation solutions to use metrics monitored by VINEVI to positively impact metrics such as Mean Time to Failure (MTTF) or Mean Time to Recovery (MTR). Furthermore, we consider it necessary to study intelligent pooling and network sampling mechanisms for estimating traffic volume, class of applications, and others.

Acknowledgements This study was financed in part by the Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - Brasil (CAPES) - Finance Code 001. And we would like to thank National Education and Research Network (RNP) for financial support under the CT-Mon call.

References

1. M. Singh and G. Baranwal, "Quality of service (qos) in internet of things," in *2018 3rd International Conference On Internet of Things: Smart Innovation and Usages (IoT-SIU)*, pp. 1–6, 2018.
2. M. ETSI, "Mobile edge computing-introductory technical white paper," *etsi2014mobile, no. Issue*, 2014.
3. P. Porambage, J. Okwuibe, M. Liyanage, M. Ylianttila, and T. Taleb, "Survey on multi-access edge computing for internet of things realization," *IEEE Communications Surveys Tutorials*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 2961–2991, 2018.
4. M. N. Birje and C. Bulla, "Commercial and open source cloud monitoring tools: A review," in *Advances in Decision Sciences, Image Processing, Security and Computer Vision* (S. C. Satapathy, K. S. Raju, K. Shyamala, D. R. Krishna, and M. N. Favorskaya, eds.), (Cham), pp. 480–490, Springer International Publishing, 2020.
5. A. D'Alconzo, I. Drago, A. Morichetta, M. Mellia, and P. Casas, "A survey on big data for network traffic monitoring and analysis," *IEEE Transactions on Network and Service Management*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 800–813, 2019.
6. M. Kontsek, M. Moravcik, J. Jurc, and M. Sterbak, "Survey of the monitoring tools suitable for cc environment," in *2020 18th International Conference on Emerging eLearning Technologies and Applications (ICETA)*, pp. 330–335, 2020.
7. M. C. Calzarossa, L. Massari, and D. Tessera, *Performance Monitoring Guidelines*, p. 109–114. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2021.
8. P. F. Popiolek, K. dos Santos Machado, and O. M. Mendizabal, "Low overhead performance monitoring for shared infrastructures," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 171, p. 114558, 2021.
9. D. Dawson, R. Desmarais, H. M. Kienle, and H. A. Müller, "Monitoring in adaptive systems using reflection," in *Proceedings of the 2008 International Workshop on Software Engineering for Adaptive and Self-Managing Systems, SEAMS '08*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 81–88, Association for Computing Machinery, 2008.
10. C. Müller, M. Oriol, X. Franch, J. Marco, M. Resinas, A. Ruiz-Cortés, and M. Rodríguez, "Comprehensive explanation of sla violations at runtime," *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 168–183, 2014.
11. P. Cedillo, E. Insfran, S. Abrahão, and J. Vanderdonck, "Empirical evaluation of a method for monitoring cloud services based on models at runtime," *IEEE Access*, vol. 9, pp. 55898–55919, 2021.
12. S. Taherizadeh, A. C. Jones, I. Taylor, Z. Zhao, and V. Stankovski, "Monitoring self-adaptive applications within edge computing frameworks: A state-of-the-art review," *Journal of Systems and Software*, vol. 136, pp. 19–38, 2018.
13. H. G. V. O. da Cunha, R. Moreira, and F. de Oliveira Silva, "A comparative study between containerization and full-virtualization of virtualized everything functions in edge computing," in *Advanced Information Networking and Applications* (L. Barolli, I. Woungang, and T. Enokido, eds.), (Cham), pp. 771–782, Springer International Publishing, 2021.
14. D. Kreutz, F. M. V. Ramos, P. E. Verissimo, C. E. Rothenberg, S. Azodolmolky, and S. Uhlig, "Software-defined networking: A comprehensive survey," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 14–76, 2015.
15. P.-W. Tsai, C.-W. Tsai, C.-W. Hsu, and C.-S. Yang, "Network monitoring in software-defined networking: A review," *IEEE Systems Journal*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 3958–3969, 2018.
16. D. Zhou, Z. Yan, Y. Fu, and Z. Yao, "A survey on network data collection," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 116, pp. 9–23, 2018.
17. P. Borylo, G. Davoli, M. Rzepka, A. Lason, and W. Cerroni, "Unified and standalone monitoring module for nfv/sdn infrastructures," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 175, p. 102934, 2021.
18. H. Mfula, A. Ylä-Jääski, and J. K. Nurminen, "Seamless kubernetes cluster management in multi-cloud and edge 5g applications," in *International Conference on High Performance Computing & Simulation (HPCS 2020)*, 2021.

19. N. Sukhija, E. Bautista, O. James, D. Gens, S. Deng, Y. Lam, T. Quan, and B. Lalli, "Event management and monitoring framework for hpc environments using servicenow and prometheus," in *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Management of Digital EcoSystems, MEDES '20*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 149–156, Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
20. A. Bali and A. Gherbi, "Rule based lightweight approach for resources monitoring on iot edge devices," in *Proceedings of the 5th International Workshop on Container Technologies and Container Clouds, WOC '19*, (New York, NY, USA), p. 43–48, Association for Computing Machinery, 2019.
21. H. Won and Y. Kim, "Performance analysis of machine learning based fault detection for cloud infrastructure," in *2021 International Conference on Information Networking (ICOIN)*, pp. 877–880, 2021.
22. J. Moeyersons, S. Kerkhove, T. Wauters, F. De Turck, and B. Volckaert, "Towards cloud-based unobtrusive monitoring in remote multi-vendor environments," *Software: Practice and Experience*, vol. n/a, no. n/a, 2021.
23. R. Moreira, L. F. Rodrigues, P. F. Rosa, R. L. Aguiar, and F. d. O. Silva, "Packet vision: a convolutional neural network approach for network traffic classification," in *2020 33rd SIBGRAPI Conference on Graphics, Patterns and Images (SIBGRAPI)*, pp. 256–263, 2020.
24. N. Sukhija and E. Bautista, "Towards a framework for monitoring and analyzing high performance computing environments using kubernetes and prometheus," in *2019 IEEE SmartWorld, Ubiquitous Intelligence Computing, Advanced Trusted Computing, Scalable Computing Communications, Cloud Big Data Computing, Internet of People and Smart City Innovation (SmartWorld/SCALCOM/UIC/ATC/CBDCCom/IOP/SCI)*, pp. 257–262, 2019.
25. F. N. Iandola, M. W. Moskewicz, K. Ashraf, S. Han, W. J. Dally, and K. Keutzer, "Squeezenet: Alexnet-level accuracy with 50x fewer parameters and <1mb model size," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1602.07360, 2016.
26. K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," *CoRR*, vol. abs/1512.03385, 2015.
27. M. Sandler, A. Howard, M. Zhu, A. Zhmoginov, and L.-C. Chen, "Mobilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018.
28. C. Alippi, S. Disabato, and M. Roveri, "Moving convolutional neural networks to embedded systems: The alexnet and vgg-16 case," in *2018 17th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Information Processing in Sensor Networks (IPSN)*, pp. 212–223, 2018.
29. V. Carela-Español, T. Bujlow, and P. Barlet-Ros, "Is our ground-truth for traffic classification reliable?," in *Passive and Active Measurement* (M. Faloutsos and A. Kuzmanovic, eds.), (Cham), pp. 98–108, Springer International Publishing, 2014.
30. G. Draper-Gil, A. H. Lashkari, M. S. I. Mamun, and A. A. Ghorbani, "Characterization of encrypted and vpn traffic using time-related features," in *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Information Systems Security and Privacy - Volume 1: ICISSP*, pp. 407–414, INSTICC, SciTePress, 2016.
31. M. Miettinen, S. Marchal, I. Hafeez, N. Asokan, A.-R. Sadeghi, and S. Tarkoma, "Iot sentinel: Automated device-type identification for security enforcement in iot," in *2017 IEEE 37th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*, pp. 2177–2184, 2017.
32. R. Moreira, P. F. Rosa, R. L. A. Aguiar, and F. de Oliveira Silva, "Nasor: A network slicing approach for multiple autonomous systems," *Computer Communications*, vol. 179, pp. 131–144, 2021.
33. X. Zhang, X. Zhou, M. Lin, and J. Sun, "Shufflenet: An extremely efficient convolutional neural network for mobile devices," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2018.
34. N. Ma, X. Zhang, H.-T. Zheng, and J. Sun, "Shufflenet v2: Practical guidelines for efficient cnn architecture design," in *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Vision (ECCV)*, September 2018.
35. A. Dunder, J. Jin, B. Martini, and E. Culurciello, "Embedded streaming deep neural networks accelerator with applications," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1572–1583, 2017.