

AC-DC: Adaptive Ensemble Classification for Network Traffic Identification

Xi Jiang
University of Chicago

Shinan Liu
University of Chicago

Saloua Naama
Université Savoie Mont Blanc

Francesco Bronzino
École Normale Supérieure de Lyon

Paul Schmitt
University of Hawaii, Manoa

Nick Feamster
University of Chicago

ABSTRACT

Accurate and efficient network traffic classification is important for many network management tasks, from traffic prioritization to anomaly detection. Although classifiers using pre-computed flow statistics (e.g., packet sizes, inter-arrival times) can be efficient, they may experience lower accuracy than techniques based on raw traffic, including packet captures. Past work on representation learning-based classifiers applied to network traffic captures has shown to be more accurate, but slower and requiring considerable additional memory resources, due to the substantial costs in feature preprocessing. In this paper, we explore this trade-off and develop the Adaptive Constraint-Driven Classification (AC-DC) framework to efficiently curate a pool of classifiers with different target requirements, aiming to provide comparable classification performance to complex packet-capture classifiers while adapting to varying network traffic load.

AC-DC uses an adaptive scheduler that tracks current system memory availability and incoming traffic rates to determine the optimal classifier and batch size to maximize classification performance given memory and processing constraints. Our evaluation shows that AC-DC improves classification performance by more than 100% compared to classifiers that rely on flow statistics alone; compared to the state-of-the-art packet-capture classifiers, AC-DC achieves comparable performance (less than 12.3% lower in F1-Score), but processes traffic over 150x faster.

1 INTRODUCTION

Network traffic classification is a common practice in network management that involves identifying the services and applications being used on the Internet infrastructure. Traffic classification enables network operators to carry out many crucial network operations: ISPs leverage traffic classification to monitor bandwidth utilization to prioritize certain subsets of traffic (e.g., for latency-sensitive applications) to ensure QoS or avoid network congestion, for capacity and resource planning, or to detect malicious traffic, and more [5, 23, 39, 42, 46, 48–50]. Efficient, accurate traffic classification is thus critical for effective network operations.




Figure 1: Typical phases of a network traffic classification pipeline and the range of processing time that TTD includes.

Network traffic classification research has a long history dating back decades. Early traffic classification solutions relied on heuristics developed by domain experts who derived the necessary features to infer traffic categories [36, 43, 52]. Beyond their classification performance, these methods were extremely efficient as a result of the simple features and traffic signatures they used. More explicitly, the total amount of time they required to preprocess extracted traffic data, feed the processed data to the classification method, and provide a classification answer was extremely low. We refer to this amount of time as the *time-to-decision (TTD)*, i.e., the end-to-end time from incoming traffic to a classifier decision. Unfortunately, as the Internet evolves (and, in particular, as traffic is increasingly encrypted) and consolidates (i.e., services are operated by fewer infrastructure providers), many of these classifiers have become less accurate and difficult to maintain as the engineered features become unavailable or less informative and quickly out of date.

Recent advances in machine learning techniques have enabled new classification methods that overcome some of the limitations of heuristic solutions. A first class of ML-based classification models are flow-statistics-based methods [7, 11, 17, 25, 27, 28, 38]. Similar to heuristic-based methods, these classifiers often rely strictly on engineered features and have the advantage of being fast at feature computation, making them good candidates to handle high network traffic volume with fast classification speed and minimal memory overhead. Unfortunately, they also share the limitations of previous methods, suffering from deteriorated performance upon traffic pattern changes and the Internet architecture evolutions at large.

To improve the classification performance, *i.e.*, model accuracy, of existing solutions and overcome the problems of features availability due to the increasing prevalence of encrypted traffic payloads, new solutions that employ representation learning-based methods have been developed to classify traffic based directly from raw packet captures [4, 10, 15, 33, 34, 41, 44, 51, 56, 58, 61]. A common characteristic (and often, drawback) of these classifiers is that they pay less attention to their practicality in handling realistic network traffic volumes under resource constraints. Thus, despite their high classification performance, they cannot satisfy the scale and bandwidth requirements of modern networks, becoming irrelevant against faster traffic rates.

To date, we are aware of no existing approach that can achieving high classification performance metrics coupled with the ability to meet the resource demands imposed by the larger networks they must be deployed within. In this paper, we address this critical trade-off, by considering the practical deployment setting of a traffic classifier (as shown in Figure 1). We recognize that a classifier consists of at least (1) a preprocessing component that transforms raw features into ML-usable input formats and (2) an attached trained model that makes inferences using the preprocessed data. First, we identify that the efficiency bottlenecks of packet-capture classifiers often lie in the preprocessing component, where large amounts of required raw traffic features are in need of transformation, rather than the actual model inference stage. Existing approaches [14, 26, 29, 40, 53] often aim to overcome the trade-offs by enhancing packet-capture classifiers' throughput via tactics such as adjusting the complexity of the learning algorithm and the feature representation used. Although these strategies may improve the time-complexity of the model execution component of the TTD, the preprocessing of selected features remains the main bottleneck. Furthermore, the high memory overhead associated with implementing these classifiers is often neglected, which is also a critical consideration for practical deployment.

In this paper, we focus on tackling the feature preprocessing bottleneck and propose the **Adaptive Constraint-Driven Classification (AC-DC)** framework. AC-DC takes an ensemble approach to provide a balance between classification performance and efficiency. AC-DC achieves high classifier performance while meeting system requirements by implementing three key contributions:

- (1) Rather than yielding a single classifier that demands fixed features, AC-DC maintains a pool of classifiers with different feature requirements to allow for variations in the classification speed and memory utilization. This approach diverges from conventional ensemble practices in machine learning, where multiple algorithms are utilized to address potential variations in data distributions. Instead, the focus is on providing flexible choices for

the feature requirements to adapt to traffic volumes and accommodate varying system resource constraints.

- (2) AC-DC includes a new heuristic-based feature exploration algorithm that not only optimizes for high classification performance, but also prioritizes low system overhead (*e.g.*, memory efficiency), producing feature combinations that exhibit the best trade-off between performance and efficiency. Our algorithm uses approximation techniques to quickly identify the most relevant features, enabling the generation of a more robust and efficient set of classifiers.
- (3) Finally, AC-DC computes and preserves the classification performance, TTD, and memory utilization for each classifier at various *batch sizes* (*i.e.*, the number of flows to collect and extract features from) before ingesting the flows and executing an instance of the classifier. Facing different traffic rates and memory availability on a given link, AC-DC implements an adaptive scheduler that leverages the measured information to select the optimal classifier and batch size that (1) satisfies the current memory availability and traffic rate, and (2) provides the ideal balance between performance and efficiency.

We evaluate AC-DC on a dataset of traffic flows spanning a variety of applications and services. Our results indicate that AC-DC remains robust under various traffic rates and memory constraints. Meanwhile, it consistently balances the trade-off between model performance and efficiency by outperforming conventional packet-capture classifiers by orders of magnitude in terms of throughput while largely preserving classification performance that is substantially higher than classifiers based on flow statistics.

2 MOTIVATION

In this section, we illustrate the inherent trade-offs that there exist across performance and efficiency for network traffic classification techniques. We first introduce the classification task we focus on, together with existing solutions: flow-statistics and packet-capture classifiers, selecting for each class a representative solution from the state-of-the-art. We then identify the efficiency bottlenecks of these classifiers and show that they largely occur in raw data preprocessing step rather than in the model execution/inference stages.

2.1 Traffic Classification Background

The Classification Task. Network traffic classification is a continuous process that commences with the interception of Internet traffic and ends with grouping the traffic into predefined categories, *e.g.*, normal/abnormal traffic or specific services/applications. This paper focuses on the task of application identification, which involves classifying network traffic at the flow level into corresponding applications, such as YouTube and Netflix. Figure 1 illustrates the crucial steps involved in a classifier. These steps encompass

initial operations, such as extracting raw features from the captured traffic, and more machine learning (ML)-oriented procedures, including converting these raw features into a format suitable for ML and using trained models to perform inference on flows with the processed features. Our focus is on appraising the performance and efficiency of the ML components of the classifier.

Flow-statistics-based. Flow-statistics classifiers are ML-based approaches for traffic classification, which are often inspired by previous work developed using heuristics-based techniques. These classifiers typically involve the use of computed statistics from traffic flows to make predictions, *e.g.*, throughput, packet inter-arrival times, etc. We focus on and evaluate a representative flow-statistics classifier - Gaussian Mixture Models clustering (GMM) - proposed by Bernaille *et al.* [7] to perform the classification task using the packet sizes and inter-arrival times of the first four non-zero size packets of the TCP connections of traffic flows.

Packet-capture-based. Recent ML-based traffic classifiers often make use of increased computation power, ingesting raw traffic contents (*i.e.*, packet captures) as inputs. This approach allows a more in-depth analysis of network traffic, thereby providing a comprehensive understanding of hidden patterns and characteristics that can aid in accurate traffic classification. To this end, we select for the same classification task using a packet-capture-based on a one-dimensional convolutional neural network (CNN) classifier, as described by Lotfollahi *et al.* [33]. In this classifier, only the first three packets of each flow are provided as inputs. This occurs because learning from the initial three packets from the flows already allows for the classifier to achieve F1-Scores well above 0.9. We follow the original design and feed the first 1500 bytes (including the IP header) of each packet into the classifier and, as the CNN initially performs packet-level classification, we take the majority vote of the three packet-level predictions to arrive at a flow-level classification decision.

2.2 Performance and Efficiency Trade-off

We conduct an assessment of the selected classifiers by training and testing them on a curated dataset consisted of near 20,000 individual flows spanning across ten prominent applications. The dataset is divided into train/test sets using a 50/50 split, with a relatively larger test set compared to the conventional 80/20 split. We perform the split in this way because our evaluation emphasizes not only performance but also the efficiency of the classifiers during the classification process, which demands a sufficiently large test set.

We vary the traffic rate from 10 to 7,000 flows/second by randomly sampling specified numbers of flows from the test set and examine classifiers' performance and efficiency in terms of weighted F1-Score, TTD, and in-use memory. *Traffic rate* in this study indicates the number of flows per second

that the system is able to capture and extract raw features for. As these conventional classifiers do not elaborate on the explicit number of flows that are required to be captured before initiating a new instance of the classifier, *i.e.*, the batch size, we follow the assumption that a new instance of the classifier is initiated every second to classify all traffic received in the previous second.

Classifier Type	Performance	Efficiency	
	F1-Score	TTD (seconds)	Memory Requirement (GB)
Flow-statistics	0.391	0.023 (76.3% feature preprocessing) (23.7% model execution)	0.503
Packet-capture	0.977	19.689 (74.7% feature preprocessing) (25.3% model execution)	82.463

Table 1: The flow-statistic classifier excels in efficiency but the packet-capture classifier shows significantly better classification performance.

Model Performance. As illustrated in Table 1, and consistent with previous work, our evaluation shows that the flow-statistics GMM classifier has an average F1-Score of 0.391, significantly lower than the packet-capture-based classifier with an average F1-Score of 0.977. This result is expected because the model cannot fit the complex underlying distribution of the data using the few provided features. The features used by the flow-statistics classifier also become less informative, which also reduces the classification performance. For example, the size information is becoming less distinctive: for the second packet, 56.27% of flows across 10 applications share similar sizes around 1500 bytes (detailed comparison in Figure 10 in Appendix). On the contrary, packet-capture classifiers tend to exhibit higher classification performance, due to the abundance of learnable features and the capability to automatically identify informative features without the need for manual feature selection.

Time to Decision. Table 1 shows that the packet-capture classifier exhibits average TTD that is $\sim 855\times$ higher than the flow-statistics-based GMM. To understand where the majority of time is spent, we split the TTD into the proportion of time required to process the features vs the time to execute the inference model. We observe that, for both classifiers, the TTD bottlenecks are largely caused by high feature preprocessing time, rather than at the model execution/inference steps. For both classifiers, the average model execution time never exceeds 30% of the total TTD. Although we report the average results in these efficiency trade-off analysis, we also provide fine-grained comparisons at all evaluated traffic rates which can be found in Appendix (Figures 8 and 9). The

observed trends across various traffic rates remain relatively consistent as the reported average results.

In-Usage Memory. The memory requirement in this example refers to the additional memory consumption incurred by the classifiers beyond the raw feature extraction, including storing intermediate features during preprocessing, loading trained models for classification, and generating final predictions. When dealing with a high volume of traffic, it is expected to have multiple instances of the classifiers running to mitigate delays and potential buffer overflow. In this paper, we define the memory requirement of the classifier as the minimum system memory necessary to support the concurrent execution of multiple instances of the classifiers needed at the specified traffic rate (with details in Section 3). As depicted in Table 1, on average, the packet-capture-based CNN necessitates $\sim 163\times$ more system memory than the flow-statistics-based Gaussian Mixture Model. This difference is anticipated as the feature space and computation complexity of the packet-capture classifiers are significantly higher, resulting in substantial increases in memory overhead. These results echo that generic packet-capture classifiers might incur in memory violations if deployed on systems that are not equipped with the required on-board memory.

Overall, considering the comparison results presented, we observe that there exist trade-offs between flow-statistics and packet-capture classifiers in terms of performance and efficiency. Our goal is to balance these trade-offs by introducing a new traffic classification framework to retain high performance of packet-capture classifiers while achieving better efficiency, approaching that of flow-statistics classifiers.

3 ADAPTIVE CONSTRAINT-DRIVEN CLASSIFICATION

Our evaluation of existing classifiers shows that a significant portion of the efficiency overhead in network traffic classifiers stems from the need to preprocess raw features to attain high classification performance. Nevertheless, when dealing with large volumes of network traffic, it may be acceptable to make small sacrifices in performance to achieve higher efficiency and ensure that the classifier can function properly. And, under varying system constraints, it is crucial to balance performance and efficiency without unnecessarily compromising on either metric.

To tackle this challenge, we propose the Adaptive Constraint-Driven Classification (AC-DC) framework. AC-DC leverages an ensemble approach by curating a pool of classifiers, each with varying feature requirements and, therefore, different performance-efficiency trade-offs. The proposed method is in accordance with the standard ML practices that use ensemble models for network traffic classification. However, our ensemble approach is unique because it concentrates on modifying the feature specifications to

adapt to fluctuating system-resource limitations, instead of relying on a collection of ML algorithms to accommodate diverse data distributions. This empowers us to make an informed decision on selecting the most suitable classifier with different feature requirements to implement, based on the computational resources and traffic volume that are available at the time.

As illustrated in Figure 2, the framework comprises a three-stage pipeline with the following components:

- (1) An offline bootstrapping stage that uses a heuristic feature exploration algorithm to approximate the optimal feature combinations for a balance between performance and efficiency; this stage generates a pool of classifiers, each with different feature requirements as determined by the outcome of the feature exploration algorithm (Section 3.2);
- (2) An offline stage that measures the actual performance and efficiency of the classifiers at different batch sizes when deployed on the implementing system (Section 3.3);
- (3) An online classification stage which employs an adaptive scheduler to continually monitor current traffic rates and memory availability to select the most suitable classifier and batch size for classification (Section 3.4).

In the rest of the section, we first discuss the performance and efficiency metrics that are at the core of AC-DC’s adaptive mechanisms, followed by the details of each component.

3.1 Performance and Efficiency Metrics

Before describing the details of the individual components of the framework, we first establish clear definitions for the performance and efficiency metrics used in the framework.

Classification Performance. In this paper, we compute all classifiers’ performance using the F1-Score, which is a harmonic mean of precision and recall. It is worth noting that this performance metric can be replaced with any other desired metric, depending on the specific application targets, e.g., prioritize recall to avoid false negatives avoidance.

Time-to-Decision. As shown in Figure 1, we define TTD as the total elapsed time from the initiation of the feature preprocessing step to the conclusion of the model inference step, that is, when classification decisions have been made on all flows. TTD is an important metric for classification frameworks when deployed in networking systems: large TTDs can force systems to lose packets or not have the required information in time. In this work, to obtain accurate TTD measurements, we remove all unnecessary outputs and functionalities in the classifiers, such as progress logging and metadata storage. To reflect realistic time consumption, I/O times for intermediate step, such as loading extracted raw features, are included. In the case of AC-DC, the classifier switching time is also considered in the TTD. We do




Figure 2: Adaptive Constraint-Driven Classification (AC-DC) framework overview

not consider raw feature extraction times in the TTD because the feature-extraction process tends to be relatively fast and the techniques used for extraction vary among network system implementors, making it difficult to conduct a fair comparison across different tools.

Memory Requirement. We do not measure memory requirements of the classifiers by referring to their total memory allocations under no memory constraint because such allocations reflect the *ideal* but not *minimum* memory requirements. Instead, we define the memory requirement as the minimum amount of RAM and SWAP memory that is necessary for the classifier instance to function normally. This includes ensuring that (1) the classification processes are not terminated prematurely and (2) the TTD does not increase due to insufficient memory availability. When multiple instances of the classifier are running in parallel, we calculate the aggregated minimum memory requirement to support concurrent execution of all instances. To determine such minimum memory requirements, we use Linux memory control groups (cgroup) to impose limitations on the amount of memory available to the classifier instance. Subsequently, we use a binary search algorithm to iteratively reduce memory usage to the smallest amount that does not cause the instance to behave abnormally.

3.2 Heuristics-based Feature Exploration and Classifier Generation

The performance and efficiency of network classifiers stems as much from the model in use as from the features that are fed to it. In the first stage of its pipeline, AC-DC selects candidate features across a large list of available ones to generate a pool of candidate classification models.

Preliminary Feature Selection. To carry out any feature exploration, we first need to establish an initial set of network-level features. We also need to find a tool for selective preprocessing of specified subsets of the features from raw traffic captures into machine-learning-compatible representations. In this specific implementation of AC-DC, we define the features using the header fields of the flow packets,

e.g., `IPV4_TTL`, `TCP_OPT`, etc, and use `nPrint` [22] to generate the required network data representations. This is because `nPrint` supports an easily accessible packet header field subscription interface. In this representation, each packet of the flows is encoded into a normalized, binary format preserving the underlying semantics of each packet. For future implementations, one can easily substitute `nPrint` with any desired network traffic encoder without disrupting the functionality of the AC-DC framework.

We define 37 individual features, which include the `IPV4`, `TCP`, and `UDP` header fields as well as the packet payload. And we proceed to remove the packet payload because all testing traffic are TLS encrypted and the payload should only contain noise that does not contribute to the classification task. We also remove all noticeable fields that may contribute to model over-fitting, including the IP addresses and ports for both ends of the connections. Only the header fields from the first three packets in each flow are used as they already produce sufficiently good performance. After this preliminary feature selection, we arrive at an initial list of 32 features that are available to use for feature exploration and generating the pool of classifiers. Detailed features are available in Appendix (Table 4).

Heuristic-Based Feature Exploration. Once candidate features are selected, the framework identifies feature combinations to create candidate classifiers with high (1) performance-to-TTD and (2) performance-to-memory requirement ratios. The goal is to identify candidate classifiers that strike a good balance between performance and efficiency. Traditional feature selection techniques are not ideal for this task as they are primarily optimized for identifying small feature subsets with high performance, while ignoring efficiency considerations. Additionally, they typically eliminate correlated features. However, in our scenario, correlated features may still be appropriate if they improve classification performance with minimal efficiency overhead.

A naive approach is to explore all possible feature combinations and select the top feature subsets that yield the

highest ratios. However, this would entail a massive feature exploration space that requires us to train and evaluate $\sum_{k=1}^{33} \binom{33}{k}$ classifiers, which is impractical. While there exists some non-exhaustive mechanisms for this purpose, such as hill climbing [2, 20, 21, 47], these approaches still require training/testing/evaluating a large number of intermediate classifiers during the process of computing the optimal feature subsets. And they are sometimes faraway from ideal solutions due to challenges such as oscillations in local optima.

To address this challenge, we rely on two observations: (1) When training the model that includes all 33 features and looking at the permutation shuffling feature importance, we observe a strong correlation (coefficient of 0.753) between feature importance and the marginal improvement in performance achieved by making each feature available to the classifier. (2) We observe that there exists a strong correlation (coefficient of above 0.99) between the aggregated number of bits in a feature subset and the corresponding efficiency overhead in terms of TTD and memory requirements.

Given these observations, we can approximate the expected performance and efficiency changes when incorporating a feature into the model’s feature set. Thus, we can abstract the previous mentioned optimization ratios by considering the ratio between the aggregated feature importance and number of bits for any given feature subsets. We leverage these findings and construct a heuristic-based algorithm to generate optimal feature subsets that works as follows:

- For each feature, we compute its permutation feature importance (FI_i) and total number of bits $Bits_i$. We then calculate the ratio $\frac{FI_i}{Bits_i}$ and rank features based on the calculated ratio. We show a list of example features after this step in Appendix (Table 5).
- We then determine the size of the desired pool using two parameters: *sizes*, a set of feature requirement sizes to consider; and *num_combos*, number of different combinations to generate at each feature requirement size. Thus, the total number of classifiers is $pool_size = len(sizes) \cdot num_combos$.
- Finally, for each feature requirement size (n) in the set of *sizes*, we iteratively find *num_combos* distinct combinations of n features with the highest sum of $\frac{FI_i}{Bits_i}$ ratios. This procedure yields a set of feature subsets with size equal to *pool_size* and they are subsequently used as distinct feature requirements to generate the pool of classifiers.

The heuristic-based algorithm we have developed offers several advantages over the exhaustive search approach: Firstly, its time complexity is bounded by the desired *pool_size*, which results in a significantly reduced computational load compared to exhaustive search. Secondly, the

proposed heuristic algorithm eliminates the need for training/testing/evaluating excessive amounts of classifiers during the feature subset derivation process, thereby further reducing the computational burden. Finally, the computed feature subsets are also optimized toward the performance-to-efficiency ratio per the strong correlations discovered through the observations.

Classifier Generation. We then use the computed feature subsets as the feature requirements to generate the classifiers. The goal of this paper is to improve the performance and efficiency of traffic classification by manipulating the feature space and batch size. Hence, the specific choice of the ML algorithm is less significant, as long as it is consistent with the baseline. In this paper, we choose LightGBM as an example model to provide comparable results to the nPrintml-based LightGBM baseline introduced later in Section 4. For each feature requirement, we use nPrint to preprocess the specified features and then feed them into the training of a LightGBM model to complete the generation of the classifier.

3.3 Performance and Efficiency

Measurements at Varying Batch Sizes

Upon obtaining the pool of classifiers created at the previous stage, we gather detailed metrics on their performance and efficiency by executing them at various batch sizes. We enforce the concept of batch sizes by storing extracted raw features from the test set for a number of flows equivalent to the batch size into a designated location. Then, classifier instances are initiated to preprocess and make predictions on all the raw features in a single batch.

Why Vary the Batch Size? In general machine learning, the batch size is a hyperparameter that determines the number of samples to gather before initializing an instance of the classifier to do a bulk preprocessing and classification on all input samples. In our context, the batch size refers to the number of traffic flows to collect raw features from before calling the classifier instance. As shown in Section 2 where we simply set the batch size equal to the traffic rate, increasing batch sizes can greatly impact the TTD and memory requirements, particularly for packet-capture classifiers. If the concept of batch size is not taken into account and classifier are ran periodically, for example, once per second, the associated efficiency overhead can become excessively high when the traffic rate is high. As a result, we collect measurements on the classifiers at varying batch sizes during the offline bootstrapping phase which can subsequently be utilized by the adaptive scheduler to make informed decisions when selecting the most appropriate classifier and determining the optimal batch size. Prior research [14, 30, 60] have attempted to optimize batch size for reducing model execution time. However, they do not place a significant emphasis on the adaptive adjustment of batch sizes to optimize the

overall TTD and do not account for the impact that varying batch sizes may have on memory overhead.

Memory Requirement on Concurrent Instances of Classifiers. With a pre-determined batch size, it is possible to have multiple instances of a classifier running in parallel. This occurs when the TTD of a classifier instance is greater than the time required to fill up the batch size but enough system memory is available to execute concurrent instances of the model. To determine the memory requirement necessary to execute two or more models concurrently, we evaluate required memory as the aggregate memory needed to support concurrent execution of all the classifier instances without any failure or delay.

Provided with any batch size B and classifier C , we can measure the (1) end-to-end time ($TTD_C(B)$) it takes for the classifier to arrive at the prediction and (2) the unit memory requirement ($m_C(B)$) for running one instance of C . Sequentially, given batch size B_t and traffic rate R_t at time T_t , we can formulate the maximum possible number of concurrently running instances of any classifier C with TTD_C as

$$N_t(B_t, R_t, TTD_C) = \lceil \frac{TTD_C(B_t)}{B_t/R_t} \rceil \quad (1)$$

and the total memory requirement can be expressed as

$$M_t(N_t, m_C) = N_t \cdot m_C \quad (2)$$

Given any classifier instance with a trained model and a predetermined batch size, we can calculate its total memory requirement according to the above formulation. For example, in our evaluation of the existing classifiers where the batch size is by default equal to the traffic rate at all time, their total memory requirement can be simply expressed as $[TTD_C(B_t = R_t)] \cdot m_C(B_t)$.

3.4 Adaptive Scheduler

Given the generated pool of classifiers and established their corresponding measurements, we now introduce an adaptive scheduler that continuously observes the incoming network traffic rate and memory availability, and outputs the optimal classifier and batch size with the best balance between performance and efficiency.

Optimization Goal. Facing any traffic rate, the aim of the adaptive scheduler is to determine the optimal combination of classifier and batch size that balances high performance with minimal TTD. To translate this goal into a executable optimization function, the scheduler employs an iterative approach to search through the performance and efficiency measurements and return the combination of classifier and batch size with the highest performance-to-TTD ratio.

Minimum Performance Requirement. Because the scheduler is designed to locate the classifier and batch size that yield to the highest performance-to-TTD ratio, it seeks

for a balance between the two metrics but does not necessarily guarantee a lower bound on the final performance. In practical deployments, implementing parties may have a minimum acceptable performance that they require in their classification tasks. As a result, we add the functionality to specify an *minimum performance requirement (MPR)* to the adaptive scheduler which proceeds to filter out any combination that does not meet the requirement. When no combination can meet the requirement, the scheduler defers to the one with the highest performance.

Algorithm 1 Adaptive Scheduler

Input: traffic rate, mem availability
Data: performance/efficiency measurements
 $candidates \leftarrow type(list)$
for combination in Data **do**
 if total mem requirement for combination \leq mem availability **then**
 $candidates.append(combination)$
 end if
end for
if $len(candidates) \neq 0$ **then**
 $optimal\ combination \leftarrow candidates[0]$
 for candidate in candidates **do**
 if candidate performance-to-TTD ratio $<$ optimal combination performance-to-TTD ratio **then**
 $optimal\ combination = candidate$
 end if
 end for
end if
Return optimal combination

Algorithm 1 describes the functionality of the adaptive scheduler after the MPR has been enforced. Given any constraint on the system memory resource, the scheduler observes the memory requirement of the combinations at the given traffic rate and filter out ones that result in a violation of memory availability. For example, if the memory availability is 5 GB and the traffic rate is 1500 flows/second, a combination with a classifier TTD of 1.5 seconds, a batch size of 500 flows, and a unit memory requirement of 1.5 GB is going to be eliminated as the total memory requirement (per eq. (1) and (2)) is $\lceil \frac{1.5}{500/1500} \rceil \cdot 1.5 = 6.75$ GB which exceeds the availability. After filtering out all such combinations, the scheduler conducts an iterative search procedure to identify the combination with the highest performance-to-TTD ratio. The resulting classifier and batch size determine how the incoming traffic flows are classified. As the traffic rate and memory availability change, the scheduler adjusts the chosen combination to optimize the described ratio.

4 EVALUATION

We evaluate the performance of AC-DC against state-of-the-art classifiers. All classifiers are instructed to perform flow-level application classification on a carefully selected network traffic flow dataset. Our experiments are designed to confirm if, under both memory-rich and memory-scarce environments, AC-DC balances performance and efficiency, showing better classification results than the flow-statistics classifier while maintaining classification throughput higher than conventional packet-capture classifiers. We further explore the robustness of the framework by profiling its behavior under varying traffic rates and memory availability.

4.1 Evaluation Setup

Macro Services	Total Number of Flows	Application Labels (Number of Flows)	Collection Date
Video Streaming [9]	9465	Netflix (4104) YouTube (2702) Amazon (1509) Twitch (1150)	2018-06-01
Video Conferencing [35]	6511	MS Teams (3886) Google Meet (1313) Zoom (1312)	2020-05-05
Social Media	3610	Facebook (1477) Twitter (1260) Instagram (873)	2022-02-08

Table 2: Summary of the network traffic flows dataset. We evaluate a 10-class classifier covering all applications across these three macro service types.

Dataset. There are many sources for network traces, such as the ISCX VPN-NonVPN traffic dataset [18], the CAIDA Anonymized Internet Traces [1], and the QUIC dataset [54]. However, these datasets are relatively old and may not accurately reflect the current Internet topology, particularly concerning the studied services. Additionally, many of these datasets do not have clearly defined labels for the associated applications or services at the flow level, which is essential for evaluating classifier performance. As a result, we decide to evaluate all classifiers the curated dataset described in Table 2 which consists of *video streaming* [9], *video conferencing* [35], and *social media* traffic flows spanning ten different major applications and a wide range of collection dates. The traffic is captured as pcap files and cleaned by (1) examining the DNS queries to identify IP addresses relevant to the services/applications, (2) filtering out irrelevant traffic to contain only traffic associated with the applications/services using the identified IP addresses, and (3) separating traffic into individual flows using the 5-tuple attributes (source and destination IP, source and destination port, and the protocol field). We use the application labels, such as Netflix or YouTube, for each preprocessed flow to evaluate classification performance. These traffic from the above-mentioned datasets are all TLS encrypted and we use the aggregation

of them as the general dataset for evaluating AC-DC and the baseline classifiers¹.

Testbed Setup. All experiments are conducted on a Ubuntu 20.04.4 LTS operating system with a Linux 5.4.0-135-generic kernel and an x86-64 architecture capable of running 64-bit software. The CPU is an AMD EPYC 7502P 32-Core Processor, with 64 threads, 32 cores per socket, and 2 threads per core. The system has 1 socket, 1 NUMA node, and runs at a base clock speed of 1.49GHz and boost clock speed of 2.5GHz. The system offers high flexibility to run both lightweight tasks and large, demanding workloads that require many cores and threads, such as network traffic processing and classification. All classifiers described in this study by default spread their work loads across available cores for parallel computing.

Classification Throughput. AC-DC optimizes the balance between performance and efficiency. While performance can be represented using the F1-Score, it can be difficult to grasp the efficiency-related time-to-decision. To better present our results, we convert the TTD into *classification throughput* for all evaluated classifiers and batch sizes at different traffic rates and memory availability. Classification throughput here is defined as the number of traffic flows that a classifier can preprocess and make inference decisions on within one second after raw feature extraction. A higher classification throughput serves as an indicator of better time efficiency. For example, if raw features are extracted for 7,000 flows in one second and the classifier is able to process and make decisions on 5,000 of those flows in the subsequent second, then the classification throughput would be 5,000 flows/second, 71.4% of the traffic rate. We can derive AC-DC’s classification throughput based on the measured TTD because the latter reflects the amount of time needed for the classification framework to complete preprocessing and inferencing on all flows collected in the previous second, *i.e.*, lower TTD results in higher classification throughput. Formally, the classification throughput can be calculated as $\frac{\text{traffic rate}}{\text{TTD}}$.

4.2 Performance Under No Memory Constraint

We first examine the performance and efficiency of AC-DC in resource-rich environments with abundant memory availability. Our objective is to classify network flows at varying traffic rates, which range from 100 to 15,000 flows/second. We emulate different traffic rates aggregating randomly sampled flows from the test set. We utilize the *flow-statistics classifier (GMM)* to establish an upper bound for classification throughput because it is capable of preprocessing and

¹All traces used in this paper are sanitized and contain no personally identifiable information (PII).




Figure 3: With no system memory constraint: AC-DC consistently produces classification throughput as high as the upper bound and outperforms the conventional packet-capture classifiers.

classifying flows at the same rate as the incoming traffic within the range under evaluation. On the other hand, we use two classifiers as baselines for classification throughput to represent packet-capture classifiers. These include the previously examined *Deep-Packet CNN* classifier [33] and a *nPrintml*-based *LightGBM* classifier that uses all 33 features. We include the *LightGBM* classifier as an additional example baseline as it uses the same preprocessing tool (*nPrint*) and ML model as the AC-DC implementation under evaluation. This enables us to perform a fair comparison with minimum bias from model and preprocessing tool selection. We also include the *CNN* classifier to demonstrate our classification framework can provide better performance and efficiency trade-off compared to packet-capture classifiers with different preprocessing tools and ML models.

We consider feature requirement sizes ranging from one to nine with 10 different combinations at each size, resulting in a pool of 90 distinctive classifiers each with different feature requirements. We set the maximum feature requirement size to nine, as increasing the maximum feature requirement size beyond nine creates classifiers and feature sets that are highly unlikely to be selected by the scheduler, *i.e.*, features ranked 10th or below (by the heuristic algorithm) start to deviate towards significantly high overhead in face of low performance contribution. This is largely due to the chosen feature granularity and, with finer-grained features, we can increase the maximum feature requirement size accordingly. Example classifiers in this pool are in the Appendix (Table 6).

AC-DC Outperforms Packet-Capture Classifiers in Classification Throughput. We first study the achieved classification throughput across the different classifiers. The results, shown in Figure 3, indicate that the AC-DC is able to match the throughput upper bound generated by the flow-statistics-based GMM and outperform the conventional

Classifier Type	ML Model	Processed Features	F1-Score			Avg. TTD (seconds)
			Avg.	Max.	Min.	
Flow-statistics	GMM	Integers	0.394	0.465	0.338	0.039
AC-DC	LightGBM	standardized bits	0.855	0.869	0.853	0.235
Packet-capture	LightGBM	standardized bits	0.944	0.948	0.939	96.097
	CNN	Sparse matrix	0.975	0.988	0.961	30.486

Table 3: With no system memory constraint: AC-DC outperforms flow-statistics classifier with 2x higher F1-Score and lower TTD compared to packet-capture classifiers.

packet-capture-based *LightGBM* and *CNN* by 176.95 and 48.98 times, as the traffic rate grows to 15,000 flows/second, respectively. We evaluate AC-DC’s classification throughput both with and without the minimum performance requirement set at 0.85 in F1-Score, and the framework meets the upper bound in both cases. In this scenario, the framework delivers consistently high classification throughput by selecting the classifier with the highest performance-to-TTD ratio at a batch size of one and initiating as many instances of the chosen classifier as required since no memory constraint is enforced. Thus, theoretically, the AC-DC consistently sustains a high classification throughput given enough system memory, regardless of the increasing traffic rate.

The classification throughput, defined as the number of flows that a classifier can preprocess and generate final predictions for within a one-second time window following the extraction of raw features, may not always reflect the actual TTD. Despite achieving 100% traffic rate for classification throughput, the actual TTD may be less than one second. As observed from Table 3, our framework achieves the upper bound throughput but with a lower average TTD as compared to the flow-statistics classifier. However, it still outperforms the packet-capture classifiers with a substantially lower average TTD.

AC-DC Achieves Higher Classification Performance Than the Flow-Statistics Classifier. We now evaluate AC-DC’s classification performance against existing classifiers. Overall, packet-capture classifiers have higher classification performance, while the flow-statistics-based GMM get the lowest F1 score. We first set the minimum performance requirement for AC-DC at a F1-Score of 0.85 and the evaluation results. Table 3, shows that AC-DC achieves an average F1-Score of 0.855, which is only 0.089 and 0.12 lower than the upper bound performance of *LightGBM* and *CNN*, respectively. More importantly, it outperforms the flow-statistics classifier by 117% in F1-Score. When no minimum performance requirement is specified, AC-DC still reaches an F1-Score of 0.8 which is 103% higher than the flow-statistics classifier.

These results highlights that, under no memory constraint, AC-DC is capable of outperforming packet-capture classifiers in terms of classification throughput and flow-statistic classifiers in terms of classification performance.




Figure 4: AC-DC shows significantly lower minimum memory requirements than packet-capture classifiers for both low and high traffic rates.

4.3 Suitability for Memory-Constrained Environment

Our previous results demonstrate that, with no memory constraint, AC-DC achieves 100% classification throughput with high performance for the evaluated traffic rates. We proceed by confirming that the framework can effectively maintain this balance even with low memory availability. We first examine the minimum memory that AC-DC requires for functioning and *maintaining a high 100% throughput* that matches the incoming traffic rate. In the case of the baseline packet-capture classifiers, they experience low throughput even with unlimited memory availability as shown in Figure 3. Thus, we measure their minimum memory requirement to support the maximum throughput they are able to achieve. The evaluation starts with a traffic rate of 500 flows/second which gradually increasing up to 7,000 flows/second with a granularity of 500 flows/second.

AC-DC Requires Less Memory Than Flow-Statistics Classifiers. As demonstrated in Figure 4, the minimum memory requirements of AC-DC are lower than those of both flow-statistics and packet-capture classifiers at the higher tested traffic rates (500 and 7,000 flows/second). In absence of any performance constraints on the AC-DC framework, it is evident that AC-DC is less prone to memory exhaustion and subsequent failures. This characteristic of AC-DC makes it a more suitable option for deployments where memory availability is a limiting factor. This is primarily due to heuristic-based classifier generation process, which aims to minimize TTD and memory requirements for all generated classifiers. Consequently, regardless of the classifier selected by the scheduler from the pool, the resulting memory requirement will be relatively low. Fine-grained minimum memory requirements can be found in Appendix (Figure 11).

Imposing a Minimum Performance Requirement Increases Memory Requirements. Although the absence of




Figure 5: Classifier performance and efficiency at 100% throughput and minimum memory requirements for varying traffic rates: AC-DC shows more balanced trade-offs compared to both flow-statistics and packet-capture classifiers.

minimum performance requirement on AC-DC results in minimized memory demands, it also leads to relatively low classification performance, with an average F1-Score of 0.802. Thus, we further explore the efficiency of the framework by imposing a minimum performance requirement of 0.85 in F1-Score and the result is also shown in Figure 4. With the added constraint, we observe a slight increase in the overall minimum memory requirement for maintaining 100% throughput, which grows higher than the flow-statistics classifier (starting at a traffic rate of 3,500 flows/second). This behavior is expected, as higher classification performance necessitates the selection of classifiers with more feature requirements, which occupy more memory during preprocessing and classification. However, the resulting memory requirements are still close to those of the flow-statistics classifier and significantly lower than the packet-capture classifiers. At a traffic rate of 7,000 flows/second, AC-DC’s minimum memory requirement is 118.8x and 126x less than the nPrintml-LightGBM and Deep-Packet CNN classifiers, respectively.

AC-DC Achieves Performance and Efficiency Balance, with 100% Throughput at Minimal Memory. After demonstrating that the framework is better-suited for environments with limited memory due to its relatively low memory requirements to sustain high performance and throughput, we aim to establish that AC-DC achieves a better balance between performance and efficiency when compared to the baseline classifiers. We analyze this by measuring the F1-Score and TTD of the framework at varying traffic rates up to 15,000 flows/second. The framework is only allowed to access the minimum amounts of memory needed to sustain a 100% classification throughput.




Figure 6: AC-DC capitalizes on available memory by lowering the batch size; enforcing a minimum memory requirement increases the overall batch size selections.

The results, shown in Figure 5, reveal that AC-DC consistently balances between high F1-Score and low TTD (*i.e.*, high classification throughput). Unlike the baseline classifiers that typically exhibit either high F1-Scores or low TTDs, but not both, AC-DC is capable of choosing a better combination of classifiers and batch sizes that yields both high F1-Score and low TTD without severely compromising on either metric. This is because the optimization goal enforced on our adaptive scheduler is designed to produce outcomes that lead to the highest performance-to-TTD ratio, as opposed to placing excessive emphasis on one metric over the other. At the same time, our curated pool of classifiers and the corresponding feature requirements are also pre-selected to maintain this balance.

4.4 Behaviors Under Varying Memory Constraints and Traffic Rates

Finally, we verify the behaviors under changing memory constraints and traffic rates. This is to reflect realistic deployment scenarios where traffic rates (and hence memory demands) change during the course of a day.

AC-DC Adjustments Facing Varying Memory Availability. To assess the influence of memory accessibility on AC-DC’s behavior, we conduct experiments where we fix the traffic rate to 15,000 flows/second and incrementally increase the memory available to AC-DC. Note that the selection of the fixed traffic rate is arbitrary as the goal of this experimental setup is for us to isolate and discern the relationship between memory availability and the framework’s behavior. In all subsequent results, the classification throughput maintains a consistent 100% of the incoming traffic rate. Experiments are conducted both with and without implementing a minimum performance requirement.




Figure 7: AC-DC increases batch size facing increasing traffic rate to conform to insufficient memory availability.

As depicted in Figure 6, regardless of whether the minimum performance requirement is set, AC-DC exhibits gradual increases in memory utilization and reductions in batch size as the system memory availability increases. This behavior aligns with the adaptive scheduler’s objective to maximize the performance-to-TTD ratio because reducing the batch size and choosing classifiers with smaller feature requirements can both lead to a decrease in TTD. However, to this behavior follows an increase in memory requirements, as a reduced batch size results in a higher number of concurrent classifiers.

We also observe that the selected batch sizes are generally larger when a minimum performance requirement of 0.85 in F1-Score is introduced. In this case, the classifier selection process becomes less flexible due to the necessity of selecting classifiers with better performance and, consequentially, higher unit memory requirement per classifier instance. As a result, the framework opts for larger batch sizes to reduce the number of concurrently running instances and to conform to the memory availability.

AC-DC Adjustments Facing Varying Traffic Rate. Following the same approach, we examine the effects of traffic rate on AC-DC by gradually increasing the traffic rate from 100 to 15,000 flows/second while fixing the memory availability at an indicative capacity of 10 GB (similar results can be observed at different memory capacities). As shown in Figure 7, the adaptive classification framework increases its batch size as the traffic rate grows. This confirms that the AC-DC is operating as expected. Increasing traffic rate continuously with no additional memory resource can result in an increased number of concurrently running classifier instances that will eventually violate the memory availability. As our adaptive scheduler imposes a hard constraint on conforming to current memory availability, it addresses the issue by increasing the batch size and thus reducing the number of concurrently running classifier instances to meet the memory constraint. And, following the same line of reasoning we previously analyzed, the batch sizes are comparatively higher when a minimum performance requirement is added

and this is to compensate for the higher feature requirements and memory consumption in the selected classifiers.

5 RELATED WORK

Traffic classification has been a long-standing objective for researchers and practitioners. Early methods often relied on heuristics such as TCP/UDP port numbers and packet payload signatures [3, 36, 43, 52, 59]. With the availability of large network traffic datasets and increased computing power, machine learning-based traffic classification methods emerged, consisting of two prominent categories: flow-statistics-based and packet-capture-based.

Flow-Statistics-Based Methods. Methods based on flow statistics train models using important information from network flows, such as the number and size of packets, flow duration, and inter-arrival time [7, 25, 27, 28], or relying on flow statistics made available by tools such as NetFlow [12] and IPFIX [13]. As a result, flow-statistics classifiers have low TTD and low memory requirements. However, flow-statistics classifiers are relatively brittle due to the constantly evolving nature of the Internet [8, 24, 31, 37, 45, 55, 57]. Changes over time can alter the landscape of used traffic features, as highly engineered features extracted by domain experts are static and hard to update, especially with increasing level of encryption making them unavailable or ineffective. AC-DC aims to achieve similar efficiency of flow-statistics-based methods while overcoming these limitations.

Packet-Capture-Based Methods. With advancements in computing power and more sophisticated ML models, recent studies have started applying representation learning to traffic classification [6, 7, 10, 15, 25, 33, 44, 51, 61]. This approach eliminates the need for domain experts to identify and extract features. Packet-capture classifiers are often more accurate and robust, even in the face of encryption, as they can identify complex and predictive patterns in detailed packet-level features. However, the higher classification performance comes at the cost of increased efficiency overhead [10, 15, 51, 61]. Raw network features must be preprocessed and converted into formats compatible with ML models, which is time-consuming and memory-intensive. AC-DC aims to achieve similar performance to packet-capture-based methods while overcoming these limitations.

Efficiency-Oriented Classifiers. There is a rich body of literature focused on developing low-latency network traffic classifiers. Most of these classifiers aim to improve efficiency through reducing model complexity, such as using lightweight models or simpler feature representation techniques [14, 26, 29, 40, 53]. Other approaches utilize ensemble techniques or tree-structured machine learning to improve classification efficiency using diverse families of ML algorithms [16, 19, 32]. These efforts primarily focus on the model

execution at the end of classification pipelines, with less emphasis on manipulating and introducing flexibility into the feature space and preprocessing phase. Another noticeable trend in the literature is the relatively lower priority given to optimization and conformance to computational resources, such as memory overheads, which can significantly impact the classifier’s practicality. And AC-DC attempts addresses this issue by capitalizing system memory availability without violating the system memory constraint.

6 DISCUSSION AND FUTURE WORK

Beyond Packet Headers. In this study, we have limited our evaluation to packet header-level features for the purpose of demonstrating the feasibility of using adaptive ensemble classification in network scenarios. Although this approach has shown promising results, incorporating additional network features into the evaluation has the potential to further improve the classification accuracy and efficiency. These additional features may include finer-grained bit-level features, derived features, and cross-layer features. In future work, we plan to extend the feature space and test the robustness of our proposed framework to better understand its effectiveness, to meet the needs of various networked systems.

Ensemble Models. AC-DC primarily focuses on addressing the bottleneck in preprocessing efficiency as compared to traditional ensemble-based approaches to aggregate multiple learning algorithms. However, it is also possible to enhance AC-DC by incorporating different model types and architectures for different features. The flexible feature requirements of AC-DC allow for the selection of machine learning models that are best suited to the chosen features, and incorporating a diverse set of model types and architectures may lead to improved efficiency and performance.

Encrypted Network Traffic. The widespread adoption of encryption techniques such as QUIC and VPN has created a challenge for ML classifiers, as they are often unable to interpret the content of the encrypted traffic. In light of this challenge, exploring the application of AC-DC to network traffic under varying levels of encryption is a promising avenue of research. The adaptable feature requirements of AC-DC may help to mitigate the risk of overfitting to a limited set of features, which can be a concern when the traffic is increasingly become more encrypted.

7 CONCLUSION

Classifying network traffic at varying traffic rates with limited resources is challenging for a spectrum of network management tasks. Classical solutions that use engineered flow statistics are quick but struggle with accuracy as the internet evolves, while recent representation learning is accurate but fails to be fast and memory efficient. This paper introduces a new Adaptive Constraint-Driven Classification framework

that adjusts to system resource availability and incoming traffic rate, balancing performance and classification throughput while conforming to memory availability. The framework uses a heuristic-based feature exploration algorithm to create a pool of classifiers and choose the most appropriate classifier and batch size, based on memory availability and traffic rate. The evaluation shows that the framework performs better (over 100% higher in F1-Score) than flow-statistics classifiers and has a much higher classification throughput (more than 150x) compared to conventional packet-capture classifiers. We believe that the AC-DC framework can be employed beyond traffic identification and there's a rich research avenue in its integration to other networked systems on problems beyond classification.

Ethics: This work does not raise any ethical issues.

REFERENCES

- [1] 2019. The caida anonymized internet traces dataset (April 2008 - January 2019). https://www.caida.org/catalog/datasets/passive_dataset/
- [2] Laith Mohammad Abualigah, Ahamad Tajudin Khader, Mohammed Azmi Al-Betar, Zaid Abdi Alkareem Alyasseri, Osama Ahmad Alomari, and Essam Said Hanandeh. 2017. Feature selection with β -hill climbing search for text clustering application. In *2017 Palestinian International Conference on Information and Communication Technology (PICICT)*. IEEE, 22–27.
- [3] Giuseppe Aceto, Alberto Dainotti, Walter De Donato, and Antonio Pescapé. 2010. PortLoad: taking the best of two worlds in traffic classification. In *2010 INFOCOM IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops*. IEEE, 1–5.
- [4] Iman Akbari, Mohammad A Salahuddin, Leni Ven, Noura Limam, Raouf Boutaba, Bertrand Mathieu, Stephanie Moteau, and Stephane Tuffin. 2021. A look behind the curtain: traffic classification in an increasingly encrypted web. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems* 5, 1 (2021), 1–26.
- [5] Fred Baker, Bill Foster, and Chip Sharp. 2004. Cisco architecture for lawful intercept in IP networks. *Internet Engineering Task Force, RFC* 3924 (2004).
- [6] Laurent Bernaille, Renata Teixeira, Ismael Akodkenou, Augustin Soule, and Kave Salamatian. 2006. Traffic classification on the fly. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 36, 2 (2006), 23–26.
- [7] Laurent Bernaille, Renata Teixeira, and Kave Salamatian. 2006. Early application identification. In *Proceedings of the 2006 ACM CoNEXT conference*. 1–12.
- [8] Francesco Bronzino, Nick Feamster, Shinan Liu, James Saxon, and Paul Schmitt. 2021. Mapping the digital divide: before, during, and after COVID-19. In *TPRC48: The 48th Research Conference on Communication, Information and Internet Policy*.
- [9] Francesco Bronzino, Paul Schmitt, Sara Ayoubi, Guilherme Martins, Renata Teixeira, and Nick Feamster. 2019. Inferring streaming video quality from encrypted traffic: Practical models and deployment experience. *Proceedings of the ACM on Measurement and Analysis of Computing Systems* 3, 3 (2019), 1–25.
- [10] Zhiyong Bu, Bin Zhou, Pengyu Cheng, Kecheng Zhang, and Zhen-Hua Ling. 2020. Encrypted network traffic classification using deep and parallel network-in-network models. *IEEE Access* 8 (2020), 132950–132959.
- [11] Kimberly C Claffy. 1995. Internet traffic characterization. (1995).
- [12] Benoit Claise. 2004. *Cisco systems netflow services export version 9*. Technical Report.
- [13] Benoit Claise. 2008. *Specification of the IP flow information export (IPFIX) protocol for the exchange of IP traffic flow information*. Technical Report.
- [14] Daniel Crankshaw, Xin Wang, Giulio Zhou, Michael J Franklin, Joseph E Gonzalez, and Ion Stoica. 2017. Clipper: A Low-Latency Online Prediction Serving System.. In *NSDI*, Vol. 17. 613–627.
- [15] Susu Cui, Bo Jiang, Zhenzhen Cai, Zhigang Lu, Song Liu, and Jian Liu. 2019. A session-packets-based encrypted traffic classification using capsule neural networks. In *2019 IEEE 21st International Conference on High Performance Computing and Communications; IEEE 17th International Conference on Smart City; IEEE 5th International Conference on Data Science and Systems (HPCC/SmartCity/DSS)*. IEEE, 429–436.
- [16] Kayathri Devi Devprasad, Sukumar Ramanujam, and Suresh Babu Rajendran. 2022. Context adaptive ensemble classification mechanism with multi-criteria decision making for network intrusion detection. *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience* 34, 21 (2022), e7110.
- [17] Christian Dewes, Arne Wichmann, and Anja Feldmann. 2003. An analysis of Internet chat systems. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement*. 51–64.
- [18] Gerard Draper-Gil, Arash Habibi Lashkari, Mohammad Saiful Islam Mamun, and Ali A Ghorbani. 2016. Characterization of encrypted and vpn traffic using time-related. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference on information systems security and privacy (ICISSP)*. sn, 407–414.
- [19] Dewan Md Farid, Li Zhang, Alamgir Hossain, Chowdhury Mofizur Rahman, Rebecca Strachan, Graham Sexton, and Keshav Dahal. 2013. An adaptive ensemble classifier for mining concept drifting data streams. *Expert Systems with Applications* 40, 15 (2013), 5895–5906.
- [20] Michael E Farmer, Shweta Bapna, and Anil K Jain. 2004. Large scale feature selection using modified random mutation hill climbing. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Pattern Recognition, 2004. ICPR 2004.*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 287–290.
- [21] Saptarsi Goswami, Sanjay Chakraborty, Priyanka Guha, Arunabha Tarafdar, and Aman Kedia. 2019. Filter-based feature selection methods using hill climbing approach. *Natural computing for unsupervised learning* (2019), 213–234.
- [22] Jordan Holland, Paul Schmitt, Nick Feamster, and Prateek Mittal. 2021. New directions in automated traffic analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security*. 3366–3383.
- [23] Hongbo Jiang, Andrew W Moore, Zihui Ge, Shudong Jin, and Jia Wang. 2007. Lightweight application classification for network management. In *Proceedings of the 2007 SIGCOMM workshop on Internet network management*. 299–304.
- [24] Xi Jiang, Saloua Naama Shinan Liu, Francesco Bronzino, Paul Schmitt, and Nick Feamster. [n. d.]. Towards Designing Robust and Efficient Classifiers for Encrypted Traffic in the Modern Internet. ([n. d.]).
- [25] Thomas Karagiannis, Konstantina Papagiannaki, and Michalis Faloutsos. 2005. BLINC: multilevel traffic classification in the dark. In *Proceedings of the 2005 conference on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communications*. 229–240.
- [26] Oguz Kaan Koksul, Recep Temelli, Huseyin Ozkan, and Ozgur Gurbuz. 2022. Markov Model Based Traffic Classification with Multiple Features. In *2022 International Balkan Conference on Communications and Networking (BalkanCom)*. IEEE, 173–177.
- [27] Tanja Lang, Grenville Armitage, Phillip Branch, and Hwan-Yi Choo. 2003. A synthetic traffic model for Half-Life. In *Australian Telecommunications Networks & Applications Conference*, Vol. 2003.
- [28] Tanja Lang, Philip Branch, and Grenville Armitage. 2004. A synthetic traffic model for Quake3. In *Proceedings of the 2004 ACM SIGCHI International Conference on Advances in computer entertainment technology*.

- 233–238.
- [29] Zhuohan Li, Eric Wallace, Sheng Shen, Kevin Lin, Kurt Keutzer, Dan Klein, and Joey Gonzalez. 2020. Train big, then compress: Rethinking model size for efficient training and inference of transformers. In *International Conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 5958–5968.
 - [30] Hyun-Kyo Lim, Ju-Bong Kim, Joo-Seong Heo, Kwihoon Kim, Yong-Geun Hong, and Youn-Hee Han. 2019. Packet-based network traffic classification using deep learning. In *2019 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence in Information and Communication (ICAIIIC)*. IEEE, 046–051.
 - [31] Shinan Liu, Paul Schmitt, Francesco Bronzino, and Nick Feamster. 2021. Characterizing service provider response to the COVID-19 pandemic in the United States. In *International Conference on Passive and Active Network Measurement*. Springer, 20–38.
 - [32] Zhen Liu, Nathalie Japkowicz, Ruoyu Wang, and Deyu Tang. 2019. Adaptive learning on mobile network traffic data. *Connection Science* 31, 2 (2019), 185–214.
 - [33] Mohammad Lotfollahi, Mahdi Jafari Siavoshani, Ramin Shirali Hossein Zade, and Mohammadsadeqh Saberian. 2020. Deep packet: A novel approach for encrypted traffic classification using deep learning. *Soft Computing* 24, 3 (2020), 1999–2012.
 - [34] Qianli Ma, Wei Huang, Yanliang Jin, and Jianhua Mao. 2021. Encrypted traffic classification based on traffic reconstruction. In *2021 4th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Big Data (ICAIBD)*. IEEE, 572–576.
 - [35] Kyle MacMillan, Tarun Mangla, James Saxon, and Nick Feamster. 2021. Measuring the performance and network utilization of popular video conferencing applications. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM Internet Measurement Conference*. 229–244.
 - [36] Andrew W Moore and Konstantina Papagiannaki. 2005. Toward the accurate identification of network applications. In *International workshop on passive and active network measurement*. Springer, 41–54.
 - [37] David Moore, Colleen Shannon, Douglas J Brown, Geoffrey M Voelker, and Stefan Savage. 2006. Inferring internet denial-of-service activity. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)* 24, 2 (2006), 115–139.
 - [38] Vern Paxson. 1994. Empirically derived analytic models of wide-area TCP connections. *IEEE/ACM transactions on Networking* 2, 4 (1994), 316–336.
 - [39] Vern Paxson. 1999. Bro: a system for detecting network intruders in real-time. *Computer networks* 31, 23–24 (1999), 2435–2463.
 - [40] Kun Qiu, Harry Chang, Ying Wang, Xiahui Yu, Wenjun Zhu, Yingqi Liu, Jianwei Ma, Weigang Li, Xiaobo Liu, and Shuo Dai. 2022. Traffic Analytics Development Kits (TADK): Enable Real-Time AI Inference in Networking Apps. In *2022 Thirteenth International Conference on Ubiquitous and Future Networks (ICUFN)*. IEEE, 392–398.
 - [41] Vera Rimmer, Davy Preuveneers, Marc Juarez, Tom Van Goethem, and Wouter Joosen. 2017. Automated website fingerprinting through deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.06376* (2017).
 - [42] Martin Roesch. 2005. Snort-the de facto standard for intrusion detection/prevention.
 - [43] Subhabrata Sen, Oliver Spatscheck, and Dongmei Wang. 2004. Accurate, scalable in-network identification of p2p traffic using application signatures. In *Proceedings of the 13th international conference on World Wide Web*. 512–521.
 - [44] Tal Shapira and Yuval Shavitt. 2019. Flowpic: Encrypted internet traffic classification is as easy as image recognition. In *IEEE INFOCOM 2019-IEEE Conference on Computer Communications Workshops (INFOCOM WKSHPS)*. IEEE, 680–687.
 - [45] Yuval Shavitt and Eran Shir. 2005. DIMES: Let the Internet measure itself. *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review* 35, 5 (2005), 71–74.
 - [46] Pallavi Singhal, Rajeev Mathur, and Himani Vyas. 2013. State of the Art Review of Network Traffic Classification based on Machine Learning Approach. *International Journal of Computer Applications* 975 (2013), 8887.
 - [47] David B Skalak. 1994. Prototype and feature selection by sampling and random mutation hill climbing algorithms. In *Machine Learning Proceedings 1994*. Elsevier, 293–301.
 - [48] Robin Sommer. 2003. Bro: An open source network intrusion detection system. *Security, E-learning, E-Services, 17. DFN-Arbeitsstagung über Kommunikationsnetze* (2003).
 - [49] Robin Sommer and Vern Paxson. 2010. Outside the Closed World: On Using Machine Learning for Network Intrusion Detection. In *2010 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*. 305–316. <https://doi.org/10.1109/SP.2010.25>
 - [50] Lawrence Stewart, Grenville Armitage, Philip Branch, and Sebastian Zander. 2005. An architecture for automated network control of QoS over consumer broadband links. In *TENCON 2005-2005 IEEE Region 10 Conference*. IEEE, 1–6.
 - [51] Boyu Sun, Wenyan Yang, Mengqi Yan, Dehao Wu, Yuesheng Zhu, and Zhiqiang Bai. 2020. An encrypted traffic classification method combining graph convolutional network and autoencoder. In *2020 IEEE 39th International Performance Computing and Communications Conference (IPCCC)*. IEEE, 1–8.
 - [52] Geza Szabo, Istvan Szabo, and Daniel Orincsay. 2007. Accurate Traffic Classification. In *2007 IEEE International Symposium on a World of Wireless, Mobile and Multimedia Networks*. 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/WOWMOM.2007.4351725>
 - [53] Da Tong, Yun R Qu, and Viktor K Prasanna. 2014. High-throughput traffic classification on multi-core processors. In *2014 IEEE 15th International Conference on High Performance Switching and Routing (HPSR)*. IEEE, 138–145.
 - [54] Van Tong, Hai Anh Tran, Sami Souihi, and Abdelhamid Mellouk. 2018. A novel quic traffic classifier based on convolutional neural networks. In *2018 IEEE Global Communications Conference (GLOBECOM)*. IEEE, 1–6.
 - [55] Martino Trevisan, Danilo Giordano, Idilio Drago, Marco Mellia, and Maurizio Munafo. 2018. Five Years at the Edge: Watching Internet from the ISP Network. In *CoNEXT 2018*. Heraklion, Greece.
 - [56] Maonan Wang, Kangfeng Zheng, Dan Luo, Yanqing Yang, and Xiujuan Wang. 2020. An encrypted traffic classification framework based on convolutional neural networks and stacked autoencoders. In *2020 IEEE 6th International Conference on Computer and Communications (ICCC)*. IEEE, 634–641.
 - [57] Carey Williamson. 2001. Internet traffic measurement. *IEEE internet computing* 5, 6 (2001), 70–74.
 - [58] Haipeng Yao, Chong Liu, Peiying Zhang, Sheng Wu, Chunxiao Jiang, and Shui Yu. 2019. Identification of encrypted traffic through attention mechanism based long short term memory. *IEEE Transactions on Big Data* (2019).
 - [59] Sung-Ho Yoon, Jin-Wan Park, Jun-Sang Park, Young-Seok Oh, and Myung-Sup Kim. 2009. Internet application traffic classification using fixed IP-port. In *Asia-Pacific Network Operations and Management Symposium*. Springer, 21–30.
 - [60] Wenbo Zheng, Chao Gou, Lan Yan, and Shaocong Mo. 2020. Learning to classify: A flow-based relation network for encrypted traffic classification. In *Proceedings of The Web Conference 2020*. 13–22.
 - [61] Weiping Zheng, Jianhao Zhong, Qizhi Zhang, and Gansen Zhao. 2022. MTT: an efficient model for encrypted network traffic classification using multi-task transformer. *Applied Intelligence* (2022), 1–16.

APPENDIX




Figure 8: TTD comparison of the baseline classifiers with traffic rates from 10 to 7000 flows/second




Figure 9: Minimum memory requirement comparison of the baseline classifiers with traffic rates from 10 to 7000 flows/second




Figure 10: First and second packet size features used by the flow-statistics classifier show less distinctiveness across specific applications (e.g., Netflix vs Zoom)

Header	Field	Passing Preliminary Feature Selection	Passing Heuristic Feature Selection
ipv4	ttl	Y	Y
tcp	opt	Y	Y
ipv4	dfbit	Y	Y
tcp	doff	Y	Y
tcp	wsizer	Y	Y
tcp	fin	Y	Y
ipv4	cksum	Y	Y
tcp	ackf	Y	Y
udp	len	Y	Y
tcp	cksum	Y	Y
udp	cksum	Y	Y
ipv4	tl	Y	Y
ipv4	tos	Y	Y
ipv4	proto	Y	Y
tcp	seq	Y	Y
tcp	psh	Y	Y
tcp	ackn	Y	Y
tcp	rst	Y	Y
tcp	res	Y	N
ipv4	foff	Y	N
tcp	urp	Y	N
tcp	urg	Y	N
tcp	syn	Y	N
tcp	ns	Y	N
ipv4	hl	Y	N
tcp	ece	Y	N
ipv4	mfbid	Y	N
ipv4	opt	Y	N
ipv4	rbit	Y	N
tcp	cwr	Y	N
ipv4	ver	Y	N
ipv4	id	Y	N
ipv4	sport	N	N
ipv4	dport	N	N
ipv4	sip	N	N
ipv4	dip	N	N
tcp	payload	N	N

Table 4: Summary of the remaining features after preliminary selection.

Header	Field	Number of Bits	Feature Importance
ipv4	dfbit	1	0.048111
tcp	fin	1	0.017778
ipv4	ttl	8	0.121000
tcp	doff	4	0.032667
tcp	ackf	1	0.008111
tcp	wsize	16	0.028556
tcp	psh	1	0.001333
ipv4	cksum	16	0.009889
udp	len	16	0.007778
tcp	cksum	16	0.007000
ipv4	tl	8	0.003444
tcp	opt	320	0.107000
udp	cksum	16	0.005222
ipv4	tos	8	0.002333
ipv4	proto	8	0.002222
tcp	rst	1	0.000111
tcp	seq	32	0.001444
tcp	ackn	32	0.000333

Table 5: Summary of the remaining features after heuristics-based feature selection for pool of classifier generation.

Feature Requirements	TTD (seconds)	Memory Requirement (MB per instance)	Performance (F1-Score)
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-ackf	0.303	315	0.744
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&tcp-ackf	0.318	323	0.772
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff	0.32	317	0.773
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&tcp-psh	0.326	321	0.774
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&tcp-ackf&tcp-psh	0.334	323	0.791
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl	0.293	317	0.693
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-psh	0.307	321	0.716
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&tcp-wsize	0.316	321	0.736
ipv4-dfbit&ipv4-ttl	0.282	331	0.655
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-wsize	0.357	317	0.826
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&ipv4-tos	0.352	323	0.797
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&tcp-ackf&ipv4-tos	0.354	317	0.792
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&ipv4-tl	0.362	319	0.8
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&udp-cksum	0.373	338	0.815
ipv4-dfbit&tcp-fin&ipv4-ttl&tcp-doff&tcp-ackf&udp-cksum	0.376	312	0.815

Table 6: Top 15 classifiers in the pool of classifiers generated for evaluation purpose, with the highest performance-to-efficiency ratios at a selected batch size of 500 flows.




Figure 11: Minimum memory requirement comparison of AC-DC against conventional classifiers with traffic rates from 500 to 7000 flows/second