# Objective

To intelligently and autonomously optimize CPU and memory resource limits for multiple microservices deployed in a Kubernetes environment, such that:

Application latency remains within acceptable bounds, defined as no more than certain percentage of degradation from the service-specific baseline latency under normal load.

Resource configurations adapt dynamically and continuously, without relying on statically defined Critical Reduction Points (CRPs) or manual tuning thresholds.

# Expanded Sub-Objectives

1. Resource Efficiency

* Reduce overprovisioning of CPU and memory requests/limits.
* Automatically discover and apply the minimum safe resources required to meet Service-Level Objectives (SLOs), thereby minimizing infrastructure costs.

1. SLA Adherence

* Continuously ensure that latency does not exceed a certain amount of the baseline latency observed at initial overprovisioned levels.
* Latency-aware adjustments must be consider individual behavior and load profiles.

1. Dynamic & Continuous Adaptation

* Adjust CPU and memory resource limits at runtime based on real-time telemetry (e.g., latency, request rates, usage).
* Avoid one-time profiling or offline stress testing; instead, leverage on-the-fly observations for decision-making.

1. Online Learning Without CRPs

* Replace CRP-based static analysis (which identifies “safe-to-reduce” breakpoints) with adaptive feedback control that responds continuously to observed performance impacts.
* Learn the performance/resource tradeoff implicitly over time through interaction with the system and feedback loops.

1. Service and Multi-Stage Optimization

* Support microservices with potentially diverse performance/resource characteristics.
* Allow the system to generalize and specialize across services without manual tuning heuristics.

## Overall Strategy

Instead of relying on statically identified Critical Reduction Points (CRPs) - which are brittle, labor-intensive to compute, and specific to individual services - this strategy embraces a dynamic, learning-driven control approach. It continuously adjusts resource limits based on real-time feedback, learned performance patterns, and SLA-aware policies.

This approach centers on three pillars:

**1. Online Learning of Performance–Resource Relationships**

Rather than conducting offline profiling or defining "safe" thresholds (e.g., the lowest CPU limit before latency spikes), we let the system learn how resource allocations affect performance in real-time:

* Continuously observe metrics, including:
  + CPU and memory usage
  + CPU and memory limits
  + P95/P99 Latency
* Build lightweight predictive models (e.g., regression trees, online linear models, or streaming learners likeRiver) that estimate:
  + How changes in CPU/memory limits are likely to impact latency  
    What resource setting is likely to meet the latency target under current load
* These models are continuously retrained as new data arrives, allowing the system to adapt to workload shifts, code changes, or traffic anomalies without human intervention.

**Example:** If the model observes that reducing memory from 512Mi to 384Mi causes only a 2% latency increase during normal load, it registers this as a safe trade-off and continues testing smaller limits.

**2. SLA-Aware Dynamic Feedback Control**

This layer acts like a closed-loop controller: it makes adjustments to resource settings and observes the impact, treating the system as a black box.

* At regular intervals (e.g., every 5–10 minutes), the controller:
  + Proposes small, controlled changes (e.g., reduce CPU limit by 100m)
  + Observes resulting performance impact (especially latency)
  + Evaluates change with respect to defined SLA boundaries (e.g., "latency must remain within 20% of baseline")
* **Positive feedback loop**:
  + If latency remains within acceptable bounds, and usage stays below limit → further reduce resources.
  + If latency improves or remains stable → keep reducing in smaller steps.
* **Negative feedback loop**:
  + If latency spikes beyond the SLA threshold → revert to previous settings and reduce step size.
  + If utilization becomes dangerously close to limits (e.g., CPU throttling begins) → increase limits slightly.

This forms a hill-climbing optimization loop with built-in safety mechanisms:

* The system climbs "down" in resource usage until it hits a boundary (latency breach).
* Then it rolls back slightly and tries smaller or orthogonal adjustments (e.g., reduce memory instead of CPU).

**3. Reward-Based Control System (Reinforcement Learning Agent)**

To further enhance the system’s intelligence, a Reinforcement Learning (RL) agent can be introduced. The agent learns from trial and error over time, gradually optimizing its policy to achieve long-term goals:

* **State Space**:
  + Current CPU and memory limits
  + Current CPU and memory usage
  + Observed P95 latency
  + Request rate or concurrency
  + Historical deltas (e.g., last adjustment and result)
* **Action Space**:
  + Increase, decrease, or hold CPU/memory limits (individually or jointly)
  + Adjust in small, medium, or large steps
* **Reward Function** (carefully crafted to balance goals):
  + **Positive reward** for resource savings (smaller limits, especially if underutilized)
  + **Negative reward** for SLA violations (latency > 1.2× baseline)
  + **Moderate penalty** for being too conservative (underutilization + no cost benefit)
  + **Bonus** for stability and minimal oscillations (reducing thrashing)
* The RL agent can be implemented using frameworks like Stable-Baselines3 (PPO/DDPG agents) or Ray RLlib, and it can be:
  + **Trained in a simulated environment** (using historical data or performance models)
  + **Fine-tuned in production**, continuously improving from live feedback

Over time, the RL agent develops sophisticated, service-specific optimization policies that outperform static heuristics or hand-coded strategies.

**Example**: The RL agent may learn that during peak traffic hours, reducing CPU leads to SLA violations, but memory can be trimmed — and vice versa at night.

## Summary of Overall Strategy

By combining these three components, the system forms a self-improving, SLA-aware, CRP-free resource optimizer that:

* Adjusts limits with high granularity and safety
* Learns from its own behavior
* Improves over time, even under evolving workloads
* Eliminates the need for manually defined "safe reduction points"

This architecture mirrors human intuition: observe → act → learn → refine — but at machine speed and scale.

### **Data Collection Module**: Real-Time Observability Backbone

To enable dynamic resource optimization, our system must continuously collect key runtime metrics - even from services that aren’t natively instrumented for Prometheus. This module acts as the data foundation for all learning, feedback, and control components.

**Goals**

* Observe CPU and memory usage vs. limits
* Measure latency per request (P95 or average)
* Monitor request load (rate, concurrency)

All without requiring internal application changes or native Prometheus instrumentation.

**Core Metrics to Collect**

1. CPU and Memory Usage + Limits

What to track:

* CPU usage: in millicores (mCPU)
* Memory usage: in bytes (working set, RSS)
* CPU limit and Memory limit per container

How to collect without app instrumentation:

* Use Kubernetes-native telemetry:
  + cAdvisor (via kubelet) collects container-level usage metrics.
  + Prometheus scrapes from kubelet, kube-state-metrics, or node-exporter.

Key Prometheus metrics:

* Container\_cpu\_usage\_seconds\_total
* Container\_memory\_working\_set\_bytes
* Kube\_pod\_container\_resource\_limits\_cpu\_cores
* Kube\_pod\_container\_resource\_limits\_memory\_bytes

These allow us to:

* Detect overprovisioning (usage << limit)
* Identify throttling risks (usage ~ limit)
* Feed usage-efficiency into RL/ML reward functions

1. Latency per Request (P95 or average)

**Problem**: Our applications do not expose latency metrics.

**Solution**: Use sidecar proxies, service mesh, or ingress controllers to externally observe and emit latency metrics - no code changes required.

Approaches:

**Option A: Envoy Proxy / Istio Sidecar**

* Add Istio or standalone Envoy as a sidecar proxy to each service.
* Envoy tracks per-request latency and emits metrics in Prometheus format.

*Sample Envoy metric:*envoy\_cluster\_upstream\_rq\_time\_bucket

*Then compute latency percentiles using PromQL:* histogram\_quantile(0.95, rate(envoy\_cluster\_upstream\_rq\_time\_bucket[5m]))

**Option B: Ingress Controller (NGINX, Traefik)**

* If all external traffic flows through a single ingress (e.g., NGINX), enable its Prometheus module to export:
  + Request durations
  + Response codes
  + Request counts
* This provides coarse-grained latency and load data without touching internal services.

**Option C: OpenTelemetry Collector Sidecar**

* Deploy an OpenTelemetry collector as a sidecar alongside each app.
* It can sniff traffic and record:
  + Latency
  + Throughput
  + Errors
* Pushes data to Prometheus or another backend (e.g., Tempo, Jaeger)

1. Load Monitoring (Request Rate and Concurrency)

What to track:

* Request rate (requests per second)
* Concurrency (in-flight requests)

**Collection methods**:

I. Sidecar proxies (Envoy, Istio) again prove helpful here:

* Track how many requests per second go to each backend.
* Track how many are active simultaneously.

Example Prometheus metrics:

* rate(envoy\_cluster\_upstream\_rq\_total[1m])
* envoy\_http\_downstream\_rq\_active

Ii. Ingress metrics:

* If requests go through a single entrypoint (e.g., NGINX):
  + nginx\_ingress\_controller\_requests
  + nginx\_ingress\_controller\_request\_duration\_seconds\_bucket

These load metrics let the optimizer correlate latency/resource usage with traffic intensity, enabling intelligent scaling and adaptation.

#### Tooling Stack

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Tool | Role |
| Prometheus | Scrapes kubelet, cAdvisor, sidecars, ingress, etc. |
| Grafana | Visualizes resource/latency/load trends |
| Envoy/Istio | Captures latency/load without app code |
| OpenTelemetry Collector | Optional: collect and forward latency spans or metrics |
| kube-state-metrics | Exposes current resource limits/requests for all pods |
| Node Exporter / Kubelet | Provides node- and pod-level resource usage |

##### Summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Source** | **Description** |
| CPU/Memory Usage | cAdvisor, kubelet | Native Kubernetes metrics from nodes |
| CPU/Memory Limits | kube-state-metrics | Declared values in pod specs |
| Latency (P95/P99) | Envoy / Istio / NGINX | Observed at proxy/ingress layer |
| Request Rate | Envoy / NGINX / Traefik | Measured at entry point or sidecar |
| Concurrency | Envoy / OpenTelemetry | Active connections or spans |

### 2. Online ML Predictor Using DARE(Dynamic Adaptive Resource Estimater) Architecture

The Online ML Predictor based on the DARE model is a continuously learning and adapting module that eliminates the need for explicitly identifying CRPs (Critical Reduction Points). Instead, it intelligently learns patterns and predicts the optimal CPU and memory resource limits based on real-time observations of load and latency — while staying within SLA boundaries.

**Primary Goals**

* Predict the "next safe step" for adjusting CPU and memory limits under the current load.
* Estimate the risk of latency degradation for each candidate resource configuration.
* Continuously learn from live traffic, gradually improving predictions.
* Adapt to changing usage patterns, workloads, and traffic profiles without retraining from scratch.

#### Architecture Overview (DARE)

The DARE-based predictor has three key components:

1. **Trend Learners (TL)**

The Trend Learners (TL) component is the foundational intelligence layer of the DARE system. Its job is to model, track, and predict how microservice resource consumption evolves over time, under varying load conditions. It doesn’t just react to spikes or drops in usage — it proactively learns temporal trends and estimates safe operating zones, which is essential for stable and efficient resource management.

Trend Learners use online regression models or Exponential Moving Average (EMA)-enhanced predictors to learn the mapping:

(Current Load Conditions) ⟶ (Resource Requirements)

This includes:

* How CPU and memory usage scale with changes in incoming request rate.
* Whether the current limits are higher or lower than needed (overprovisioning vs underprovisioning).
* How fast or slowly the resource demand is trending (e.g., is memory steadily increasing, or spiking erratically?).

### Model Types:

The TL can be implemented using:

1. **Online Linear Regression**

A continuously updating linear model such as:

CPU\_usage(t) ≈ a₁ \* RequestRate(t) + b₁

Memory\_usage(t) ≈ a₂ \* RequestRate(t) + b₂

Weights a₁, a₂, b₁, and b₂ are updated at each time step using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) or recursive least squares.

1. **EMA-Augmented Models**

To smooth noise and provide more stable predictions:

EMA\_CPU(t) = α \* CPU\_usage(t) + (1 - α) \* EMA\_CPU(t-1)

These models:

* Smooth out short-term fluctuations
* Highlight sustained trends in usage
* Are lightweight, perfect for edge or in-cluster deployment