

# An Evaluation Engine for Dynamic Ranking of Cloud Providers

Paweł Czarnul

Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdansk, Poland

E-mail: pczarnul@eti.pg.gda.pl and <http://pczarnul.eti.pg.gda.pl>

**Keywords:** cloud computing, ranking cloud providers

**Received:** December 13, 2012

*The paper focuses on creation of an effective dynamic ranking service for IaaS, PaaS and SaaS cloud providers. It considers building a quality model for this purpose along with definition of quality measurement procedures. The paper discusses several techniques known from already existing price comparison engines that could be modified and adopted for comparison of cloud providers. A technique for filtering measured data is proposed, in particular to avoid vendor lock-in issues. The paper presents a design and results from an engine for simulation of various ranking algorithms in response to streams of prices from various providers. Examples with various streams of provider prices and resulting rankings are presented that cope with the vendor lock-in issue as well as consider the impact of long or short-term price changes on the ranking.*

*Povzetek: Članek se osredotoča na izdelavo učinkovite storitve za dinamično rangiranje ponudnikov storitev tipa IaaS, PaaS in SaaS v oblaku.*

## 1 Introduction

Cloud computing has become more and more widespread and popular in today's world with many offerings regarding infrastructure, ready-to-use platforms and services [1]. These can be categorized as follows:

- IaaS – Infrastructure as a Service - making an infrastructure (computing, storage, operating system) with a given configuration available to a client, examples: Google Compute Engine<sup>1</sup>, Amazon Elastic Compute Cloud (EC2)<sup>2</sup>, RackSpace Cloud Servers<sup>3</sup>, Rack Space Cloud Files<sup>4</sup>,
- PaaS – Platform as a Service - offering a complete platform with particular software required by users; examples include: Aneka [10], Google AppEngine<sup>5</sup>, Windows Azure<sup>6</sup>, RedHat Openshift<sup>7</sup>, RackSpace Cloud Sites<sup>8</sup>,
- SaaS – Software as a Service - particular software that is managed by its provider and accessed by users from any location. Examples include Google Apps<sup>9</sup> and Salesforce<sup>10</sup>.

Following search engines and price comparison tools and engines for the traditional marketplaces, there have emerged tools for comparison of cloud offers as well. For instance, as of this writing a web search on “IaaS ranking” returns several surveys on IaaS: either static analyses<sup>11 12</sup> or rankings that depend on actual parameters of the offers (such as prices) that can change in time<sup>14 15</sup>. Platforms such as Clouorado<sup>16</sup> allow to preselect user requirements such as required processor computing capabilities or storage and return a ranking based on that. FindTheBest allows to select a cloud provider based on its type (IaaS, PaaS) but also the control interface, software license or subscription type.

It seems, however, that many of these rankings use unstructured quality comparison models, do not consider how qualities have been changing over time for providers and do not address issues such as vendor lock-in. It is a known fact that some Internet providers or shops used to offer very cheap prices to gain a market share (by being on top places in comparison rankings) only to deceive some customers later. The paper discusses a quality model for a dynamic ranking of cloud providers that addresses these issues. This work extends the concepts presented in [5] by proposing a design and implementation of a simulation engine for running various provider ranking algorithms and presentation of its results for various streams of input price offers from

<sup>1</sup><http://cloud.google.com/products/compute-engine.html>

<sup>2</sup><http://aws.amazon.com/ec2/>

<sup>3</sup>[http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud\\_hosting\\_products/servers/](http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud_hosting_products/servers/)

<sup>4</sup>[http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud\\_hosting\\_products/files/](http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud_hosting_products/files/)

<sup>5</sup><https://developers.google.com/appengine/>

<sup>6</sup><http://www.windowsazure.com>

<sup>7</sup><https://openshift.redhat.com/app/>

<sup>8</sup>[http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud\\_hosting\\_products/sites/](http://www.rackspace.com/cloud/cloud_hosting_products/sites/)

<sup>9</sup><http://www.google.com/Apps>

<sup>10</sup><http://www.salesforce.com/eu/>

<sup>11</sup><http://my-inner-voice.blogspot.com/2011/02/here-are-results.html>

<sup>12</sup><http://insidehpc.com/2011/02/10/survey-results-on-cloud-iaas-providers/>

<sup>13</sup><http://www.opsource.net/Info-Tech-Cloud-IaaS-Vendor-Landscape>

<sup>14</sup><http://www.cloudreviews.com/top-ten/cloud-hosting-services.html>

<sup>15</sup><http://cloud-computing.findthebest.com/>

<sup>16</sup><http://www.clouorado.com/>

various providers.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 discusses the problem of quality assessment of services offered on the cloud. Next, Section 3 details the design and implementation of a simulator for ranking input streams of price offers from various providers. Experiments for various input streams are presented in Section 4 which is followed by a summary in Section 5.

## 2 Quality evaluation of cloud offers

Before educated selection of services can be performed, it is necessary to incorporate measurable quality assessment of the given service. This comprises several aspects that need to be addressed:

1. a quality model/ontology that defines metrics to be measured,
2. quality measurement procedures – e.g. how frequently the metrics should be measured – this may be different for various metrics; for instance availability may require more frequent monitoring than the price,
3. filters applied on top of the measured values – such may be used to address several issues such as:
  - preventing from short-term peaks in measured values to affect output; possibly only longer lasting changes should do that,
  - preventing from one or few providers to occupy top places all the time by offering too good to be true conditions,
  - considering or not sudden changes in the history of the provider which may affect user decisions who might be afraid of similar changes in the future – it may depend on the user whether he or she wants to consider this aspect.

For metrics, it is recommended to adopt and extend the already used techniques for marketplaces in the Internet. Namely, evaluation of the providers using a numerical scale such as [0,10] which is offered for almost any price comparison engine today along with physical location of a particular provider. In this case, a quality ontology is proposed for quality service evaluation of particular IaaS, PaaS, SaaS that will incorporate the following:

*accessibility* [11] – characterizes the network between the client in location and the service, several entries of this type could be inserted,

*availability* [12, 13, 11, 2] – characterizes the availability of the service itself. It can be measured by e.g. checking its availability vs availability of other services/servers in a similar geographical/provider location,

*reputation* [12] – reputation of the provider,

*security* [11] – offered by the provider,

*fidelity* [3] or *conformance* [11] – with standards,

*cost-effectiveness* – evaluated by clients,

*reconfiguration ability* – applicable to IaaS and PaaS,

*interface* – how easy it is to access the infrastructure and upload/download/execute applications.

As suggested in Section 3, various filters can be applied on top of measured values. For instance, a one time peak in measurements of a certain value might not change the overall score of the given metric. Only a longer lasting change would initiate this. A simple average would work as a low-pass filter. The regular average suffers from the historical effect i.e. results from the past affect the final average in the same way as the last input. It may depend on the client whether to rely more just on recent measurements. This could be further extended to a running score e.g. a running average of 10 or 100 values. Alternatively, the history of the provider might be important for the given client.

In order to avoid a situation when one provider wants to dominate the given segment of the market by e.g. using too good to be true prices it is possible to consider a certain number of best offers and rotation on the first ranking places, provided that results returned for the services are closer to each other than a predefined threshold. Even one company could then try to use different providers for parts of their businesses to avoid the lock-in problem.

## 3 Proposal of an evaluation engine and visualization for ranking algorithms

In a way, the proposed approach can be seen as a solution aiding sky computing [8] as the proposed engine tries to sort out available cloud options and offer best options at a higher level of cloud integration.

As mentioned above, the goal of the engine is to be able to:

1. monitor Quality of Service (QoS) dynamically which refers to periodic measurements of quality metrics applicable to cloud services,
2. avoid potential vendor lock-in problem.

### 3.1 Proposed simulation engine

Within this paper, the author has developed a simulator implemented in C along with visualization assisted by GNU Plot. The goal of the simulator is to model cloud provider

offers over time and simulate execution of a ranking algorithm that would output certain scores for particular offers at particular moments in time. From the cloud client's point of view that gives the preference in choosing "the best" offer by selecting the top offer. If some particular needs of the client are not considered in the ranking scheme, the next best offer can be selected as well. However, from the global point of view i.e. the population of clients, the ranking algorithm is supposed to provide a solution that copes well with the vendor lock-in issue. Namely, it does not to allow selection of just one best provider at all times even if its offer seems to be the best from the QoS perspective. This is to prevent from dumping practices or similar over a certain period of time just to gain market share.

Let us focus first on one quality metric such as price. The following notation will be used:

- $p_i(t)$  – the price offered by provider  $i$  at time  $t$ ,
- $dp_i(t) = |p_i(t) - p_i(t - 1)|$  – the price difference between successive discrete points in time,
- $dap_i^a(t) = \sum_{x=a}^t dp_i(x)$  – the accumulated sum of price differences offered by the particular provider; the goal of this metric is to assess an accumulated rate of price changes over period from  $a$  until  $t$ . The larger  $t - a$  is the larger history has an impact on the current value of  $dap_i^a(t)$ .

The flow of the data through the simulation engine is shown in Figure 1. Several steps are performed including: computing the above values, then computing values  $val_i(t) = f(p_i(t), dp_i(t), dap_i^a(t))$  against which sorting will be performed such that the lower the value of  $val_i(t)$  the better place in the ranking provider  $i$  will be assigned.

Furthermore, this scheme is extensible i.e. it allows modeling of several behaviors of cloud providers as well as easily extend the ranking algorithm with:

new metrics. This can be done by extending the structure that currently contains  $p_i(t), dp_i(t), dap_i(t)$ . For instance, the metrics can include: reputation of the provider  $r_i(t)$ , availability  $a_i(t)$  etc. This leads to consideration of  $dr_i(r), dar_i(t), da_i(t), daa_i(t)$ . The final value of  $val_i(t)$  would be a function of all these metrics.

application of other digital filters in addition to  $dp$  and  $dap$  to process the data of a particular cloud provider over successive time steps and works for particular metrics. For instance, depending on the needs and particular metrics, either high or low pass filters can be used.

The whole system consists of the following programs that pass data using standard inputs and outputs as well as additional files:

1. datagenerator – generates input streams of data e.g. price offers,

2. simulator – implementing the aforementioned evaluation algorithm,
3. visualization tool – implemented using custom input scripts and the GNU Plot tool.

### 3.2 A wider perspective on QoS evaluation

From the client point of view, it would be desirable to have access to a comparison engine like Cloudorado with the aforementioned features. First of all, the engine can consider three categories of: IaaS, PaaS and SaaS. It can first match available offers in terms of functions and then evaluate based on the ranking discussed earlier. In order to make search better, two solutions are feasible:

1. categorization of features such as hardware and software parameters desired by the client:
  - memory size,
  - processor/core/GPU capabilities,
  - storage,
  - operating system,
  - particular software,
  - access interface.

This is especially suitable for IaaS and PaaS offerings.

2. full text search as in [6]. This allows formulation of desired functions in the form of human readable text. Useful mainly for SaaS as it would allow searching and presentation of SaaS offers for a particular application.

The full text search mechanism could also be applied to any type of service when looking for comments of already existing clients.

This would also naturally lead to creation of runtime registries of particular IaaS, PaaS and SaaS offers [9]. SaaS options could then be categorized into various categories. One possibility is to adopt the well know technique from photo sharing sites i.e. augmenting descriptions with tags. Then selection of particular tags would narrow search results.

## 4 Experiments

In this section a series of experiments is provided along with graphs presenting:

1. input data from cloud providers i.e. prices offered over time,
2. output ranking from the simulation algorithm using various ranking algorithms.




Figure 1: Steps for filtering input providers' offers

The basic assumptions for the following tests are as follows. There are 10 cloud providers that offer a service of a particular type (PaaS, IaaS or SaaS) and adjust their prices in successive time steps by introducing small variations to their base prices as shown in the following figures. For each of the input data streams outputs that denote ranking of particular providers are shown. For the end client, the provider that occupies the top spot at the particular moment should be selected. For each test case, several figures are shown: input streams of unmodified cloud offers, ranking by values that result from functions of the observed original prices and the latter modified by rotation of the best offers in the ranking.

#### 4.1 Stable prices with reasonably small variations over time and elimination of vendor lock-in

For the input shown in Figure 2, the prices from various providers are close to each other which results in slight changes of the ranking by sorting just by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t)$ . The ranking that resulted from sorting by the current price only is shown in Figure 3. It can be seen that although there are changes in the ranking as the price ranges of some providers overlap, some offers result in the provider occupying one spot at all times. This may result in vendor lock-in if clients would choose the best offer at all times. Figure 4, on the other hand, shows ranking after additional mixing of the three best offers to get rid of this potential problem, as the prices of these providers do not differ by a large margin in absolute terms.




Figure 2: Offers from cloud providers in successive time steps




Figure 3: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t)$




Figure 4: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t)$  and rotation of the best offers




Figure 5: Offers from cloud providers in successive time steps




Figure 6: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^0(t)$




Figure 7: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^0(t)$  and rotation of the best offers




Figure 8: Offers from cloud providers in successive time steps




Figure 9: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^{t-4}(t)$



Figure 10: Ranking of cloud providers by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^{t-4}(t)$  and rotation of the best offers

## 4.2 Considering derivatives in ranking

In the following tests, considerable changes of prices of selected cloud providers were simulated in the first 10 time steps of the simulation. This is shown in both considered inputs in Figures 5 and 8.

Two different solutions were proposed here:

1.  $dp_i(t)$ s are computed for each time step i.e. absolute values of differences in prices between successive time steps. Then the accumulated sum of  $dap_i^0(t)$  is computed. As shown in Figure 6, ranking by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^0(t)$  considers the whole past history of price changes of a particular provider. The larger the derivatives, the smaller chance the provider will occupy top spots of the ranking. It can be clearly seen that even though two providers offer the best current prices in later time steps as shown in Figure 5, the history of larger changes has put them back into further places in the ranking. Figure 7 shows additional mixing of the top three spots.
2. As shown in Figure 9, ranking by  $val_i(t) = p_i(t) + dap_i^{t-4}(t)$  considers *only the recent* history of price changes of a particular provider. It can be seen very clearly that the provider offering the best current prices in the initial time steps falls down in the ranking but then recovers to the top spot. Figure 10 shows additional mixing of the top three spots.

Obviously, additional filters and combination of various QoS metrics can be obtained and programmed analogously just by adding additional processing functions to the flow proposed in Section 3. Depending on the client needs, a ranking is then created that allows to select the best offer at any time. For instance, it can also consider the providers that the client has already been using.

## 5 Summary and future work

The paper presented an idea, design and implementation of a simulator for ranking incoming streams of provider offers that may be applicable for real world cloud offers. The simulator allows to test various algorithms for ranking providers with easy changing to other algorithms or even filters within the algorithms. Practical applications include incorporation of the idea into Internet price comparison engines, cloud service search engines as well as integrated systems for workflow management where services need to be found for workflow subtasks.

Further work will focus on extension of the simulator with new filters and development of an integrated evaluation method for various QoS metrics. Additionally the engine will be deployed in the BeesyCluster middleware for assessment of its services and then used in discovering and incorporation of such services into workflow applications on grids [4]. Such workflows can also be run on clouds [7].

## References

- [1] Rajkumar Buyya, Chee Shin Yeo, Srikumar Venugopal, James Broberg, and Ivona Brandic. Cloud computing and emerging it platforms: Vision, hype, and reality for delivering computing as the 5th utility. *Future Gener. Comput. Syst.*, 25(6):599–616, June 2009.
- [2] G. Canfora, M. Di Penta, R. Esposito, and M.L. Villani. A Lightweight Approach for QoS-Aware Service Composition, 2004. ICSOC forum paper, IBM Technical Report Draft.
- [3] Jorge Cardoso, Amit Sheth, and John Miller. Workflow quality of service. Technical report, LSDIS Lab, Department of Computer Science, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602, USA, March 2002.
- [4] Pawel Czarnul. Modeling, run-time optimization and execution of distributed workflow applications in the jee-based beesycluster environment. *The Journal of Supercomputing*, pages 1–26, 2010. 10.1007/s11227-010-0499-7, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11227-010-0499-7>.
- [5] Pawel Czarnul. Dynamic ranking of cloud providers. In *Proceedings of the 4th International Workshop on Software Services – WoSS 2012*, pages 6–8. Univerza v Ljubljani, 2012. ISBN 978-961-6884-06-8, Eds.: Vlado Stankovski and Dana Petcu.
- [6] Pawel Czarnul and Jakub Kurylowicz. Automatic conversion of legacy applications into services in beesycluster. In *Proceedings of 2nd International IEEE Conference on Information Technology ICIT'2010*, pages 21–24, Gdansk, Poland.
- [7] G. Juve and E. Deelman. *Grids, Clouds and Virtualization*, chapter Scientific Workflows in the Cloud, pages 71–91. Springer, 2010.
- [8] Katarzyna Keahey, Mauricio Tsugawa, Andrea Matsunaga, and Jose Fortes. Sky computing. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 13:43–51, 2009.
- [9] S. Pandey, D. Karunamoorthy, and R. Buyya. *Cloud Computing: Principles and Paradigms*, chapter Workflow Engine for Clouds. Wiley Press, New York, USA, 2011. ISBN-13: 978-0470887998.
- [10] Suraj Pandey, Dileban Karunamoorthy, and Rajkumar Buyya. *Cloud Computing: Principles and Paradigms*, chapter Workflow Engine for Clouds, pages 321–344. Wiley Press, New York, USA, February 2011. ISBN-13: 978-0470887998.
- [11] Chintan Patel, Kaustubh Supekar, and Yugyung Lee. A QoS Oriented Framework for Adaptive Management of Web Service based Workflows. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Database and Expert Systems Applications Conference (DEXA 2003)*, LNCS, pages 826–835, Prague, Czech Republic, September 2003.
- [12] L. Zeng, B. Benatallah, M. Dumas, J. Kalagnanam, and Q. Sheng. Quality driven web services composition. In *Proceedings of WWW 2003*, Budapest, Hungary, May 2003.
- [13] Liangzhao Zeng, Boualem Benatallah, Anne H.H. Ngu, Marlon Dumas, Jayant Kalagnanam, and Henry Chang. Qos-aware middleware for web services composition. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.*, 30(5):311–327, 2004.