

#### **Application Architecture**

- Container Runtime: Docker with multi-stage builds (50MB optimized image)
- Web Server: NGINX with custom configuration for performance
- Scaling Strategy: Horizontal Pod Autoscaler (HPA) with CPU/Memory thresholds
- Security: Non-root containers with security contexts and resource limits
- Monitoring: Built-in health checks (/health, /ready, /api/status)

Component Specification

Kubernetes Platform DigitalOcean Kubernetes Service (DOKS)

Cluster Configuration 2-5 Nodes (Auto-scaled)

Node Specifications s-2vcpu-2gb (2 vCPU, 2GB RAM)

**Deployment Region**BLR1 (Bangalore)

Load Balancer DO Managed LoadBalancer (Small)

Container Registry Docker Hub



## Recommendation For Cost Optimization & Scaling

## **Cost Analysis & Optimization**

#### **Current Monthly Cost Breakdown**

#### **Base Infrastructure (24/7):**

- DOKS Control Plane: \$12.00 (Managed)
- Worker Nodes (2x s-2vcpu-2gb): \$24.00
- Load Balancer (Small): \$12.00
- Total Base Cost: \$48.00/month

#### Peak Usage (Auto-scaled):

- Additional Nodes (3x): \$36.00
- Total Peak Cost: \$84.00/month
- Average Monthly Cost: \$56.00-\$68.00

### **Scaling**

- Auto-Scaling Policies: Configure dynamic scaling based on CPU/memory usage.
- Horizontal Pod Autoscaling: Automatically adjust pod count for workload demands.
- Cluster Federation: Distribute workloads across multiple clusters for scalability.
- **GitHub Actions CI/CD**: Automate build and deploy workflows to decrease manual overhead.

Optimization	Before	After	Savings
Image Size	150MB	50MB	67% reduction
Resource Allocation	Fixed 5 pods	2-10 pods (auto)	40-60% savings
Load Balancer Strategy	Multiple LBs	Single LB	\$12-36/month
Node Utilization	30-40%	70-85%	35% efficiency gain



# Risk Assessment & Mitigation Strategies

Risk	Risk Level	Description	Current Exposure	Mitigation Strategy
1. Load Balancer Cost Overrun	<b>H</b> igh	Multiple load balancers could significantly increase costs	\$12–48/month additional costs	✓ Implemented: Single load balancer with path- based routing ○ Planned: Ingress controller implementation Ⅲ Monitoring: Monthly cost analysis and traffic review
2. Container Security Vulnerabilities	O Medium	Outdated base images or dependencies could introduce security risks	Potential security breaches, compliance issues	✓ Implemented: Non-root containers, security contexts ○ Planned: Automated image scanning with Trivy     Monitoring: Weekly vulnerability assessment reports
3. Resource Over-Utilization	O Medium	Insufficient resource limits could cause node instability	Application crashes, poor user experience	<ul> <li>✓ Implemented: Resource requests &amp; limits configured</li> <li>✓ Implemented: HPA with conservative scaling policies</li> <li>Monitoring: Real-time utilization alerts</li> </ul>
4. Scaling Delays or Failures	Low	Kubernetes autoscaling might not respond quickly enough to spikes	Potential latency during traffic bursts	<ul> <li>✓ Implemented: Aggressive scale-up (30s response)</li> <li>Monitoring: HPA events &amp; capacity alerts</li> <li>✓ Planned: Predictive scaling based on traffic</li> </ul>
5. Single Point of Failure	Low	Current single-region deployment creates availability risk	Limited redundancy if region outage occurs	<ul> <li>✓ Implemented: Multiple availability zones within region</li> <li>Monitoring: 99.95% uptime achieved (target 99.9%)</li> <li>✓ Planned: Multi-region deployment in Q4 2025</li> </ul>



## **Technical KPIs**

Metric	Current	Target	Status
Cost Savings	68%	>50%	Exceeding
Deployment Time	15 min	<30 min	Meeting
Zero-Downtime Deploys	100%	95%	Exceeding
Developer Productivity	+40%	+25%	Exceeding

## **Business KPIs**

Metric	Current	Target	Status
Availability	99.95%	99.9%	Exceeding
Response Time	65ms avg	<100ms	Meeting
Scale-up Time	45s	<60s	Meeting
Cost Efficiency	\$64/month	<\$80/month	Meeting
Security Score	95%	>90%	Meeting