

Efficient Embedding of Virtual Networks to Distributed Clouds via Exploring Periodic Resource Demands

Zichuan Xu, *Student Member, IEEE*, Weifa Liang[✉], *Senior Member, IEEE*,
and Qiufen Xia, *Student Member, IEEE*

Abstract—Cloud computing built on virtualization technologies promises provisioning elastic computing and bandwidth resource services for enterprises that outsource their IT services as virtual networks. To share the cloud resources efficiently among different enterprise IT services, embedding their virtual networks into a distributed cloud that consists of multiple data centers, poses great challenges. Motivated by the fact that most virtual networks operate on long-term basis and have the characteristics of periodic resource demands, in this paper we study the virtual network embedding problem of embedding as many virtual networks as possible to a distributed cloud such that the revenue collected by the cloud service provider is maximized, while the service level agreements (SLAs) between enterprises and the cloud service provider are met. We first propose an efficient embedding algorithm for the problem, by incorporating a novel embedding metric that accurately models the dynamic workloads on both data centers and inter-data center links, provided that the periodic resource demands of each virtual network are given and all virtual networks have identical resource demand periods. We then show how to extend this algorithm for the problem when different virtual networks may have different resource demand periods. Furthermore, we also develop a prediction mechanism to predict the periodic resource demands of each virtual network if its resource demands are not given in advance. We finally evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms through experimental simulation based on both synthetic and real network topologies. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed algorithms outperform existing algorithms from 10 to 31 percent in terms of performance improvement.

Index Terms—Virtual network embedding, cloud resource provisioning, embedding algorithms, periodic resource demands, distributed clouds, cloud computing

1 INTRODUCTION

ENTERPRISES nowadays are embracing a new computing paradigm by outsourcing their IT service networks as virtual networks to clouds for cost savings. For example, a company operating video conferencing services could run on a virtual network with a stringent quality of service requirement, whereas a university delivering online courses for distance education service may run a virtual network for real-time online course delivery. These two different virtual networks can be accommodated by a distributed cloud, which is also referred to as the *substrate network* that consists of multiple data centers connected through high-speed optical links [35], [36], [37]. A fundamental problem for this substrate network is how to efficiently embed as many virtual networks as possible to it such that the revenue of the cloud service provider is maximized, while the Service Level Agreements (SLAs) between users and the cloud service provider are met. This problem is referred to as the *Virtual Network Embedding* (VNE)

problem, which has been extensively studied in the past few years [3], [9], [10], [16], [23], [38], [39], [44].

Most existing studies on the VNE problem in literature focused on resource provisions by reserving the maximum resource demands for a virtual network throughout its whole lifetime [8], [10], [39], [42], [44]. Such a conservative resource provision scheme however causes up to 85 percentage of the cloud resources under-utilized in most time, resulting in enormous resource wastage and economic loss [32], [35], [36]. Fortunately, nearly 90 percent of enterprise IT services exhibit the characteristics of periodic resource demands [18]. By making use of this periodic resource demand property, the utilization ratios of cloud resources can be substantially improved if the demanded resources by different virtual networks can be shared through exploring their resource demand periods, which can be illustrated by an example in Fig. 1, where a virtual network *A* providing office users with virtual desktop services usually experiences low-workloads in weekends, whereas another virtual network *B* hosting online gaming services has high-workloads in weekends. If embedding *A* and *B* to the substrate network while meeting their individual maximum demands, only one of them can be embedded. However, they both can be embedded concurrently if their time-varying resource demands are complementary. This could potentially reduce the operational cost of the cloud service provider.

- The authors are with the Research School of Computer Science, The Australian National University, Canberra ACT 0200, Australia.
E-mail: {edward.xu, qiufen.xia}@anu.edu.au, wliang@cs.anu.edu.au.

Manuscript received 8 May 2015; revised 26 Oct. 2015; accepted 6 Feb. 2016.
Date of publication 26 Feb. 2016; date of current version 31 Aug. 2018.

Recommended for acceptance by A. Walid.

For information on obtaining reprints of this article, please send e-mail to: reprints@ieee.org, and reference the Digital Object Identifier below.

Digital Object Identifier no. 10.1109/TCC.2016.2535215




Fig. 1. A motivated example of resource sharing among virtual networks with periodic resource demands.

Due to the heterogeneity of substrate resources and without the knowledge of periodic resource demands of each virtual network in advance, it poses a great challenge to embed as many virtual networks as possible into a substrate network such that the revenue collected by the cloud service provider is maximized, while meeting the SLAs of users. To efficiently embed different virtual networks to a distributed cloud with dynamic workloads on its data centers and links, an embedding metric that can accurately model the dynamic workloads of cloud resources needs to be developed, and an efficient embedding method that embeds each virtual network to the substrate network is required to be devised such that both the computing and the bandwidth demands of the virtual network are met. In this paper, we will introduce a novel embedding metric for virtual network embedding, and develop efficient algorithms for virtual network embedding by exploring the periodic resource demands of virtual networks, based on the proposed embedding metric.

Although the embedding of a single virtual network to the substrate network has been intensively studied in recent years, to the best of our knowledge, we have not been aware of any study of embedding multiple virtual networks with periodic resource demands to a distributed cloud simultaneously. We are the first to consider the embedding of multiple virtual networks with periodic resource demands while meeting the SLAs of different users, through introducing a novel embedding metric that can accurately capture the dynamic workloads of computing and bandwidth resources in a distributed cloud.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows. We first propose an embedding algorithm for the VNE problem, by employing a novel metric to capture the workloads on substrate nodes and substrate links, assuming that all virtual networks have identical resource demand periods and their resource demands are given in advance. We then extend the proposed embedding algorithm for a general setting of the problem where different virtual networks may have different resource demand periods, or such resource demand periods may not be given in advance, by developing a resource demand prediction algorithm for each virtual network. We finally evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms through experimental simulations, based

on both synthetic and real substrate network topologies. Experimental results show that the proposed algorithms outperform existing algorithms, improving the revenue of the cloud service provider from 10 to 31 percent.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces related work, followed by the system model and problem definitions in Section 3. Sections 4 and 5 propose VNE algorithms with and without the periodic resource demands of virtual networks. Section 6 evaluates the performance of the proposed algorithms through experimental simulations. The conclusion is given in Section 7.

2 RELATED WORK

Network virtualization has been recognized as a promising solution to the perceived ossification of the current Internet [1], [14], which can improve performance of inter- and intra-data center networks [2], [3], [4], [9], [11], [20], [21], [29], [33], [34]. For example, Guo et al. [20] proposed a bandwidth reservation method between every pair of virtual machines (VMs) within a single data center. Ballani et al. [2] proposed a virtual cluster model, in which all VMs are connected to a virtual switch to which an amount of bandwidth resource is allocated. Wood et al. [33] aimed to enhance seamless interconnections of applications distributed in multiple data centers, by utilizing the Virtual Private Network (VPN) technique [15]. They however did not consider joint allocations of computing and network bandwidth resources. Their approaches thus are inapplicable to resource allocations for applications that rely on both computing and network bandwidth resources.

With the advancement of cloud computing and network virtualization technologies, joint allocation of network bandwidth and computing resources becomes feasible, by utilizing virtual network embedding (VNE) technique. In general, most existing solutions to the VNE problem can be classified into two categories: *static* and *dynamic* resource provisioning. Static resource provisioning assumes that the resource demands of each virtual network do not change during the lifetime of the virtual network, whereas dynamic resource provisioning deals with the embedding of virtual networks with dynamic resource demands over time.

Existing studies in literature focused mainly on static resource provisions [6], [8], [10], [12], [13], [26], [30], [39], [42], [44]. For example, Zhu and Ammar [44] proposed a VNE algorithm for balancing the workload on both computing nodes and communication links, by introducing a node/link-stress concept, and jointly considered the workload on each node and the links incident to the node. Chowdhury et al. [10] devised an algorithm that coordinates node and link mapping, by reducing the VNE problem to a multi-commodity flow problem under the constraint that each virtual node can only be mapped to a specific set of candidate substrate nodes. Cheng et al. [8] proposed an embedding algorithm that is similar to the Google's PageRank algorithm, where both substrate and virtual nodes are ranked by their resource availabilities and the quality of link connections. Lischka and Karl [26] devised an online VNE algorithm by making use of the subgraph isomorphism detection with the aim of maximizing the revenue-to-cost ratio, where the revenue is the total amount of virtual resources requested by virtual networks, and the cost is the total amount of substrate resources spent in accommodating the virtual networks. There are other static approaches that have less constraints on nodes and links, e.g., splittable path routing [39], embedding a virtual node onto several substrate nodes [42], embedding a virtual network across different substrate networks [22], distributed and automatic embedding [23], or avoiding cloud resource fragmentation [13]. For example, Chiang et al. [39] initialized the study of the VNE problem with splittable path routing, by embedding the traffic on each virtual link to multiple substrate paths in the substrate network. Houidi [22] treated virtual network providers as brokers by allowing a virtual network to be embedded to multiple substrate networks with the aim of reducing the embedding cost of infrastructure providers while increasing the acceptance ratio of user requests.

There are several studies focusing on dynamic resource provisioning, by reallocating under-utilized resources to other virtual network requests [7], [31], [40], [41], [43]. For example, Zhang et al. [40] studied the VNE problem by considering opportunistic resource sharing and topology-aware node ranking. They assumed that each virtual network has basic and maximum demands with certain probabilities. Such an assumption may not be realistic as it is very unlikely that a user can provide the detailed resource demands of its virtual network in advance. The other dynamic resource provisioning approaches however perform periodic reconfigurations/migrations of implemented virtual networks, which may not be feasible in practice, due to high migration costs and/or violations of the agreed SLA requirements [5]. For example, Houidi et al. [24] proposed an adaptive VNE algorithm that dynamically identifies new candidate substrate resources to cater dynamic topologies and dynamic communication requirements of virtual networks. Similarly, there are approaches in [7], [43] dealing with evolving virtual networks in terms of topologies and resource demands. For example, Sun et al. [31] devised virtual network migration algorithms to deal with evolving virtual networks. Zhang and Qiu [41] studied a scenario where both the demands of virtual networks and the capacity of a substrate network change over time. Unlike these mentioned previous works, in this paper we deal with




Fig. 2. Virtual network embedding.

dynamic resource provisions for virtual networks, by exploring periodic resource demands of virtual networks. The essential differences between our work and existing ones lie in a novel embedding metric that can model the workloads of both substrate nodes and substrate links accurately over time, and the exploration of periodic resource demands of virtual networks.

3 PRELIMINARIES

In this section we first introduce the substrate and virtual networks. We then provide the revenue and cost models of virtual network embedding. We finally define the embedding problems of virtual networks precisely.

3.1 Substrate and Virtual Networks

A *substrate network* is represented by a node-and-edge weighted, undirected graph $G^s = (N^s, E^s)$, where N^s and E^s are the sets of substrate nodes and links, respectively. Denote by n^s a substrate node in N^s and e^s a substrate link in E^s . Each n^s represents a data center and each e^s denotes a communication link (or a path) between the two data centers corresponding to its two endpoints. Denote by $C(n^s)$ the capacity of computing resource in n^s and $B(e^s)$ the bandwidth capacity on e^s .

A *virtual network* can be represented by a node-and-edge weighted, undirected graph $G^v = (N^v, E^v)$, where N^v and E^v are the sets of virtual nodes and virtual links. Each virtual node $n^v \in N^v$ represents a set of virtual machines that host specific applications. Each virtual link $e^v \in E^v$ represents a communication link between two virtual nodes. Denote by $C(n^v)$ and $B(e^v)$ the *maximum amounts of computing and bandwidth resource demands* by virtual node n^v and virtual link e^v in G^v , respectively. Recall that a substrate network represents a distributed cloud, while a virtual network represents an enterprise IT service network.

Assume that time is divided into equal *intervals*, and each interval is further divided into equal numbers of *time slots*. Let i be the current interval and T the number of time slots in each interval. We assume that each interval i corresponds to *one resource demand period*. We further assume that virtual network requests arrive into the system one by one without the knowledge of future arrivals. All arrived requests between time slot $(i - 1)$ and time slot i will be examined in the beginning of time slot i , i.e., whether a request arrived during this period will be admitted (embedded) by the system will be determined in the beginning of time slot i . We say a virtual network $G^v = (N^v, E^v)$ with a duration $\tau(G^v)$ in the granularity of weeks or months if it is embedded to the substrate network, it will stay there until its duration $\tau(G^v)$ expires. Fig. 2 gives an example of virtual network embedding.

3.2 Periodic Resource Demands

Most enterprise IT services exhibit periodic resource demands [18]. For instance, an enterprise that provides university email services has weekly resource demands due to the weekly activity patterns of university users. Although periodic resource demands of a virtual network request typically are not known when the request initially arrived, they can be predicted by analyzing the resource demand history of the virtual network implementation, using offline profiling and online calibration [28].

Given an embedded virtual network $G^v(N^v, E^v)$, denote by $\hat{c}(n^v, i, t)$ and $\hat{b}(e^v, i, t)$ the predicted computing and bandwidth resource demands of a virtual node $n^v \in N^v$ and a virtual link $e^v \in E^v$ at time slot t in interval i . Let $c(n^v, i, t)$ and $b(e^v, i, t)$ be the actual amounts of demanded computing and bandwidth resources at virtual node n^v and virtual link e^v at time slot t in interval i . The *periodic computing and bandwidth resource demands* of G^v are defined as the resource demands that will be repeated in each interval, i.e., $c(n^v, i, t) = c(n^v, i', t)$ and $b(e^v, i, t) = b(e^v, i', t)$ for each time slot t at different intervals i and i' with $i \neq i'$. The amount of available resources of substrate network G^s can be derived from the accumulative resources allocated to all embedded virtual networks at time slot t in interval i . Denote by $P(n^s, i, t)$ and $P(e^s, i, t)$ the amounts of available computing and bandwidth resources in node n^s and link e^s of G^s at time slot t in interval i , where $1 \leq t \leq T$.

3.3 Revenue and Cost Models

The revenue collected by a cloud service provider by embedding virtual networks to the cloud can be defined differently, if different economic models are adopted. Similar to the revenue models in previous studies [10], [40], [44], in this paper the revenue collected by embedding a virtual network G^v to G^s is the sum of revenues of the usages of computing and bandwidth resources by G^v for its occupation period $\tau(G^v)$ in G^s , where c_c and c_b are the costs of unit computing and bandwidth resources, respectively. Denote by $\mathbb{R}(G^v)$ the revenue received by embedding G^v , then,

$$\mathbb{R}(G^v) = \left(\sum_{n^v \in N^v} C(n^v) \cdot c_c + \sum_{e^v \in E^v} B(e^v) \cdot c_b \right) \cdot \tau(G^v). \quad (1)$$

To provide the demanded computing and bandwidth resources to a virtual network $G^v = (N^v, E^v)$ while meeting its SLA, the cloud service provider consumes its resources such as electricity, software and hardware that incur the service (operational) cost. The service cost of embedding a virtual network G^v thus is defined as the sum of the usage costs of amounts of cloud resources within each time slot during its duration. Let $\mathbb{C}(G^v)$ be the service cost of an embedded virtual network G^v , then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}(G^v) = & \sum_{i=1}^{\tau(G^v)} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{n^v \in N^v} c(n^v, i, t) \cdot c_c \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{e^v \in E^v} \sum_{e^s \in E^s} l_{e^s}^{e^v} b(e^v, i, t) \cdot c_b \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $l_{e^s}^{e^v}$ is 1 if virtual link $e^v \in E^v$ is embedded to a path in G^s while $e^s \in E^s$ is a link in the path; 0 otherwise.

3.4 Problem Definitions

Given a monitoring period consisting of I intervals with each having T equal time slots, assume that virtual network requests arrive one by one without the knowledge of future arrivals. The arrived requests will be scheduled in the beginning of each time slot. Let $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ be the set of arrived virtual network requests in the beginning of time slot t in interval i , in which each virtual network G^v spans $\tau(G^v)$ intervals in the substrate network G^s . Each request exhibits periodic resource demands, i.e., it has the same amounts of computing and bandwidth resource demands in each interval i , $c(n^v, i, t) = c(n^v, i', t)$ and $b(e^v, i, t) = b(e^v, i', t)$ for any two intervals i and i' with $i \neq i'$ during its duration $\tau(G^v)$ in G^s and t is a time slot with $1 \leq t \leq T$.

The *virtual network embedding problem with the knowledge of periodic resource demands* is to embed as many virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ as possible to the substrate network G^s for a given monitoring period I , such that the revenue of the cloud service provider of G^s is maximized, subject to the resource demands of each embedded virtual network at each time slot being met, where $1 \leq i \leq I$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$.

The *virtual network embedding problem without the knowledge of periodic resource demands* can be defined similarly, which is to embed as many virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ as possible to the substrate network without the knowledge of periodic resource demands of the virtual networks for a given monitoring period I , such that the revenue of the cloud service provider of G^s is maximized, subject to the constraint that the *resource demand violation ratio* of each virtual network G^v is bounded within its threshold $\sigma(G^v)$, where the resource demand violation ratio of a virtual network G^v is the amount of its violated resource demands to the total amount of its resource demands throughout its duration $\tau(G^v)$. For example, given a virtual network demanding one unit of resource at each time slot of its 10-time-slot lifetime, its resource demand violation ratio will be 10 percent if it is provided with 0.5 unit resource for two time slots and one unit for the rest.

Table 1 summarizes the symbols used in this paper.

4 ALGORITHM WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF PERIODIC RESOURCE DEMANDS

In this section we consider virtual network embedding with the knowledge of periodic resource demands. We first devise an algorithm to embed a single virtual network $G^v = (N^v, E^v)$ to a substrate network $G^s = (N^s, E^s)$. We then propose an algorithm to embed multiple virtual networks to G^s . We finally analyze the time complexities of the proposed algorithms.

4.1 Embedding a Virtual Network with Static and Dynamic Resource Demands

To embed virtual network G^v to substrate network G^s , an embedding metric is needed. Such a metric captures not only the amounts of available resources but also the utilization ratios of the resources in G^s . In the following we first introduce a novel embedding metric. We then devise an embedding algorithm for embedding a virtual network with static resource demands, based on the proposed

TABLE 1
Symbols

Symbols	Notations
i and T	the current interval and the number of time slots of each interval
$G^s = (N^s, E^s)$	a substrate network with substrate node set N^s and substrate link set E^s
n^s and e^s	a substrate node in N^s and a substrate link in E^s
$C(n^s)$ and $B(e^s)$	the computing capacity of n^s and the bandwidth capacity of e^s
$P(n^s, i, t)$ and $P(e^s, i, t)$	the amounts of available computing and bandwidth resources in n^s and e^s at time slot t in interval i
$G^v = (N^v, E^v)$	a virtual network with virtual node set N^v and virtual link set E^v
n^v and e^v	a virtual node in N^v and a virtual link in E^v
$C(n^v)$ and $B(e^v)$	the maximum amounts of computing and network bandwidth resources demanded by n^v and e^v
$\hat{c}(n^v, i, t)$ and $\hat{b}(e^v, i, t)$	the predicted amounts of computing and bandwidth resource demands of n^v and e^v at time slot t in interval i
$c(n^v, i, t)$ and $b(e^v, i, t)$	the actual amounts of computing and bandwidth resource demands of n^v and e^v at time slot t in interval i
$\tau(G^v)$	the duration of virtual network G^v
$\mathbb{R}(G^v)$	the revenue of embedding virtual network G^v
$\mathbb{C}(G^v)$	the cost of embedding virtual network G^v
c_c and c_b	the prices for unit computing and bandwidth resources
$I_{e^s}^v$	an indicator value shows whether e^v is embedded to a path in G^s and e^s is a link in the path
$\Phi(n^s)$ and $\Phi(e^s)$	the embedding metrics that model the abilities of n^s and e^s in embedding a virtual node and link
a and b	constants for the embedding metrics $\Phi(n^s)$ and $\Phi(e^s)$ with $a > 1$ and $b > 1$
$d(e^s)$	the 'length' of a substrate link e^s which equals to $\frac{1}{\Phi(e^s)}$ if $\Phi(e^s) > 0$ and 0 otherwise
p	a path in the substrate network G^s
$d(p)$	the total 'length' of all substrate links in path p , i.e., $d(p) = \sum_{e^s \in p} d(e^s)$
$L(n^s)$	the set of substrate links incident to substrate node n^s
N_{sel}^s	candidate substrate nodes that are selected to embed virtual nodes in a virtual network
N_{emd}^v	virtual nodes that have been embedded into G^s
$NR(n^s)$ and $NR(n^v)$	the ranks of n^s and n^v that are used to select the cluster centers in G^s and G^v
n_c^s and n_c^v	the cluster centers in G^s and G^v , which have the highest values of $NR(n^s)$ and $NR(n^v)$
$\kappa(n^s)$ and $\kappa(n^v)$	the ranks of substrate nodes in G^s except n_c^s , and virtual nodes in G^v except n_c^v

metric. We finally extend the algorithm to embed a virtual network with periodic resource demands.

We start by proposing an embedding metric to capture the workloads of substrate nodes and links in G^s . For a given substrate node n^s , the amount of available computing resource at it and its utilization ratio will jointly determine the *embedding ability* of substrate node n^s . The *marginal gain* of the embedding ability of n^s will diminish with the increase of its utilization ratio, since the larger the proportion of its computing resource is being occupied, the higher the risk of the SLA violations substrate node n^s faces. We thus use an exponential function to model the embedding ability of substrate node n^s . Recall that $P(n^s, i, t)$ is the amount of available computing resource of substrate node n^s at time slot t in interval i . Denote by $\Phi(n^s)$ the embedding metric of n^s , then

$$\Phi(n^s) = P(n^s, i, t) \cdot a^{\frac{P(n^s, i, t)}{C(n^s)}}, \quad (3)$$

where a is a constant with $a > 1$, and $\frac{P(n^s, i, t)}{C(n^s)}$ is the complementary ratio to the resource utilization ratio of n^s .

The defined embedding metric $\Phi(n^s)$ favors allocating a virtual node to a substrate node that has a large amount of available resource and a low resource utilization ratio. The embedding ability $\Phi(e^s)$ of a substrate link e^s can be defined similarly,

$$\Phi(e^s) = P(e^s, i, t) \cdot b^{\frac{P(e^s, i, t)}{B(e^s)}}, \quad (4)$$

where $b > 1$ is a constant and $P(e^s, i, t)$ is the amount of available bandwidth resource on e^s .

Having defined the embedding abilities of substrate links and nodes, we now introduce an embedding metric to

embed each virtual link e^v to a substrate path p in G^s that consists of one or multiple substrate links. To this end, we first define the 'length' $d(e^s)$ of each substrate link e^s as follows:

$$d(e^s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Phi(e^s)} & \text{if } \Phi(e^s) > 0, \\ \infty & \text{if } \Phi(e^s) = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The length of a substrate link implies that the shorter the substrate link, the more available bandwidth and lower utilization ratio the link will have. In other words, a substrate link without any available bandwidth will have a longest length, and should not be used by any routing path. Similarly, the 'length' $d(p)$ of a substrate path p is the sum of lengths of its constituent substrate links, which is defined as follows:

$$d(p) = \sum_{e^s \in p} d(e^s). \quad (6)$$

A shorter path p will have more available bandwidth on its constituent substrate links, thereby having a higher embedding ability.

We now embed a virtual network $G^v(N^v, E^s)$ with static resource demands to the substrate network $G^s(N^s, E^s)$, using the proposed embedding metrics as follows.

We embed each virtual node in N^v to a different substrate node N^s , followed by embedding each virtual link in E^v to a substrate path in G^s . To embed virtual nodes in N^v , we construct a cluster of substrate nodes for the virtual nodes through adding substrate nodes into the cluster one by one. Specifically, we first identify a *cluster center* with the greatest embedding ability in G^s to embed a virtual node with the maximum resource demand in G^v , and then find other substrate nodes one by one iteratively with a shorter

path to the selected substrate nodes, by adopting a strategy similar to the one in [44]. Intuitively, each added substrate node in the cluster has not only the great embedding ability but also a shorter path to the other substrate nodes in the cluster, since a shorter path between two selected substrate nodes implies more available bandwidth between them. Therefore, to find the cluster center, we assign each substrate node $n^s \in N^s$ a rank that is jointly determined by its embedding ability and the accumulative embedding ability of the links incident to it. Let $L(n^s)$ be the set of substrate links incident to substrate node $n^s \in N^s$. The rank $NR(n^s)$ of n^s is defined as the product of its embedding ability $\Phi(n^s)$ and the accumulative embedding ability of links in $L(n^s)$, i.e.,

$$NR(n^s) = \Phi(n^s) \cdot \sum_{e^s \in L(n^s)} \Phi(e^s). \quad (7)$$

The rank $NR(n^v)$ of each virtual node $n^v \in N^v$ can be defined similarly as the product of its computing resource demand and the accumulative bandwidth resource demand of the virtual links incident to it, i.e.,

$$NR(n^v) = C(n^v) \cdot \sum_{e^v \in L(n^v)} B(e^v). \quad (8)$$

Let n_c^s and n_c^v be the chosen cluster center and virtual node by Eqs. (7) and (8), respectively. Then, n_c^v is embedded into n_c^s . Having embedded n_c^v to n_c^s , the other $|N^v| - 1$ cluster members will be identified one by one iteratively. During each iteration, a virtual node is embedded to a substrate node with high embedding ability and the minimum distance to one of the selected substrate nodes in the cluster. To this end, rank those not yet selected substrate nodes by the product of the inverse of $\Phi(n^s)$ and the accumulative length from substrate node n^s to all the substrate nodes selected. Denote by $\kappa(n^s)$ the rank of n^s , then,

$$\kappa(n^s) = \frac{1}{\Phi(n^s)} \cdot \sum_{m^s \in N_{sel}^s} d(p_{n^s, m^s}), \quad (9)$$

where N_{sel}^s is the set of selected substrate nodes in the cluster, and p_{n^s, m^s} is the shortest path between substrate nodes n^s and $m^s \in N_{sel}^s$.

The rank of a yet-to-be embedded virtual node $n^v \in N^v$ can be defined similarly, i.e.,

$$\kappa(n^v) = \frac{1}{C(n^v)} \cdot \sum_{m^v \in N_{emd}^v} \sum_{e^v \in p_{n^v, m^v}} d(e^v), \quad (10)$$

where N_{emd}^v denotes the set of embedded virtual nodes, $d(e^v)$ is the length of virtual link defined by $\frac{1}{B(e^v)}$, and p_{m^v, n^v} is the shortest path between virtual nodes $m^v \in N_{emd}^v$ and n^v (w.r.t. the accumulative length of its virtual links). The rationale behind the definition of length metric $d(e^v)$ is that the length of virtual link e^v is inversely proportional to its demand B_v . Intuitively speaking, a shortest path between an embedded virtual node and the next virtual node to be embedded is a path with the maximum accumulated resource demands on the path. A virtual node n^v with the minimum value of $\kappa(n^v)$ will be chosen as the next virtual node to be embedded to the substrate node n^s with the

lowest rank $\kappa(n^s)$. If there is such a virtual node in G^v that has never been embedded after considering all substrate nodes, then G^v will not be admitted.

The embedding of virtual links in E^v can be dealt with similarly. Let p be a shortest path in G^s between two substrate nodes for virtual link e^v . If p does not have enough bandwidth to meet the bandwidth demand of e^v , the substrate link in p with the minimum available bandwidth is then removed, the next shortest path will be found until there is not such a path. The detailed procedure for a single virtual network embedding is detailed in procedure EmbedOneVN-Static.

Having shown how to embed a virtual network with static resource demands to the substrate network G^s , we here show how to embed a virtual network $G^v(N^v, E^v)$ with periodic resource demands to G^s as follows.

Procedure 1. EmbedOneVN-Static()

Input: $G^v(N^v, E^v)$, $G^s(N^s, E^s)$

Output: Embed G^v or reject it

- 1: /* Stage one: embed virtual nodes */
 - 2: Find the cluster center n_c^s with the maximum rank in substrate network G^s by Eq. (7);
 - 3: Find the virtual node n_c^v with the maximum rank in virtual network G^v by Eq. (8);
 - 4: Embed virtual node n_c^v to the cluster center n_c^s ;
 - 5: $N_{emd}^v \leftarrow \{n_c^v\}$; /* the set of embedded virtual nodes */
 - 6: $N_{sel}^s \leftarrow \{n_c^s\}$; /* the set of selected substrate nodes */
 - 7: Embed virtual nodes in $N^v - N_{emd}^v$ to G^s one by one iteratively. Within an iteration, a virtual node with the minimum $\kappa(n^v)$ is embedded into a substrate node with the minimum $\kappa(n^s)$;
 - 8: **if** $N^s \setminus N_{sel}^s = \emptyset$ and $N^v \setminus N_{emd}^v \neq \emptyset$ **then**
 - 9: Reject G^v ; **exit**;
 - 10: /* Stage two: embed virtual links */
 - 11: **for** each virtual link $e^v \in E^v$ **do**
 - 12: Update the weight of substrate link e^s by Eq. (5);
 - 13: Let n_1^s and n_2^s be the substrate nodes that embed the two virtual nodes connected by e^v ;
 - 14: Find a shortest path p from node n_1^s to n_2^s ;
 - 15: **if** p cannot satisfy the resource demand $B(e^v)$ of e^v **then**
 - 16: Find the next shortest path from n_1^s to n_2^s ;
 - 17: **if** no path can satisfy the demand of e^v **then**
 - 18: Reject G^v ; **exit**;
 - 19: Embed the virtual network G^v .
-

We construct $T + 1$ auxiliary graphs with each having different resource demands at a different time slot in one interval, and ‘pre-embed’ each of the graphs by procedure EmbedOneVN-Static. Virtual network G^v will be embedded to G^s exactly by adopting one of the $T + 1$ pre-embeddings that leads to the maximum revenue. Specifically, we construct T auxiliary graphs with each having the resource demands of G^v at time slot t' in an interval with $1 \leq t' \leq T$, and another auxiliary graph G_m^v having the average resource demands within an interval. Denote by $G^v(t') = (N_{t'}^v, E_{t'}^v)$ the auxiliary graph with resource demands of G^v at time slot t' . Then, $G^v(t')$ is constructed by setting $N_{t'}^v = N^v$, $E_{t'}^v = E^v$, $C(n^v) = c(n^v, i', t')$ for each $n^v \in N_{t'}^v$, $B(e^v) = b(e^v, i', t')$ for each $e^v \in E_{t'}^v$, where i' is one interval of the duration $\tau(G^v)$ of G^v . Similarly, $G_m^v = (N_m^v, E_m^v)$ with

$N_m^v = N^v$ and $E_m^v = E^v$ denotes the virtual network G^v with average resource demands within an interval, i.e., the demands of its each virtual node and link are as follows:

$$C(n^v) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t'=1}^T c(n^v, i', t'), \text{ for each } n^v \in N_m^v, \quad (11)$$

and

$$B(e^v) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t'=1}^T b(e^v, i', t'), \text{ for each } e^v \in E_m^v. \quad (12)$$

Let $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ be the set of constructed $T + 1$ graphs, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{pre} = \{G^v(t') \mid 1 \leq t' \leq T\} \cup \{G_m^v\}$. A pre-embedding of a graph in $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ is *feasible* only if it can be embedded into G^s while the resource demands of G^v at each time slot are met. Let G_{max}^v be the graph among the $T + 1$ auxiliary graphs that results in the maximum revenue. The detailed algorithm is given by procedure EmbedOneVN-Periodic.

Procedure 2. EmbedOneVN-Periodic()

Input: $G^v(N^v, E^v)$, $G^s(V^s, E^s)$

Output: Embed G^v or reject it

- 1: Construct $T + 1$ auxiliary graphs for G^v with the first T graphs corresponding to its resource demands at each of the T time slots, and the last one denotes the average resource demand in one resource demand period. Denote by $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ be the set of the $T + 1$ graphs, i.e., $\mathcal{G}_{pre} \leftarrow \{G^v(t') \mid 1 \leq t' \leq T\} \cup \{G_m^v\}$;
 - 2: $G_{max}^v \leftarrow NIL$; /* $G_{max}^v \in \mathcal{G}_{pre}$ is the graph that achieves the maximum revenue*/
 - 3: $\mathbb{R}_{max} \leftarrow 0$ /*the revenue by the embedding of G_{max}^v */;
 - 4: **for** each graph G in $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ **do**
 - 5: Pre-embed each graph in $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ by invoking EmbedOneVN-Static, where a pre-embedding is feasible if the embedding satisfies the resource demands of G^v at each time slot in an interval;
 - 6: Calculate the revenue $\mathbb{R}(G)$ of the pre-embedding of G ;
 - 7: **if** $\mathbb{R}_{max} < \mathbb{R}(G)$ **then**
 - 8: $\mathbb{R}_{max} \leftarrow \mathbb{R}(G)$;
 - 9: $G_{max}^v \leftarrow G$;
 - 10: **if** all graphs in $\mathcal{G}_{pre}$ are rejected
 - 11: Reject G^v ;
 - 12: **exit**;
 - 13: Embed G^v to G^s by the embedding of G_{max}^v with the maximum revenue.
-

4.2 Algorithm for Embedding Multiple Virtual Networks with Identical Resource Demand Periods

We now embed a set $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ of virtual networks with identical resource demand periods to a substrate network G^s at time slot t within an interval i . To be specific, we first embed a virtual network $G^{v_1} \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ that results in the maximum revenue. Let $\mathcal{G}_2(i, t) = \mathcal{G}(i, t) - \{G^{v_1}\}$. We then embed the next virtual network in $\mathcal{G}_2(i, t)$ that leads to the maximum revenue, and so on. This procedure continues until either $\mathcal{G}_k(i, t)$ is empty or none of virtual networks in it can be embedded due to lack of cloud resources.

The detailed description of the embedding algorithm is given by Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1. Embedding a Set $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ of Virtual Networks with Identical Resource Demand Periods

Input: G^s , $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$

Output: Virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ to be embedded into G^s

- 1: All virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ are unmarked;
 - 2: **while** $\mathcal{G}(i, t) \neq \emptyset$ or there are unmarked virtual networks **do**
 - 3: $G_{max}^v \leftarrow NIL$; /* $G_{max}^v \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ is the virtual network that achieves the maximum revenue*/
 - 4: $\mathbb{R}_{max} \leftarrow 0$ /*the revenue by the embedding of G_{max}^v */;
 - 5: **for** each virtual network $G^v \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ **do**
 - 6: Pre-embed G^v by invoking EmbedOneVN-Periodic;
 - 7: **if** G^v is rejected by EmbedOneVN-Periodic **then**
 - 8: G^v is marked as unembeddable;
 - 9: **else**
 - 10: Let $\mathbb{R}(G^v)$ be the revenue by embedding of G^v ;
 - 11: **if** $\mathbb{R}_{max} < \mathbb{R}(G^v)$ **then**
 - 12: $\mathbb{R}_{max} \leftarrow \mathbb{R}(G^v)$;
 - 13: $G_{max}^v \leftarrow G^v$;
 - 14: Embed G_{max}^v by invoking EmbedOneVN-Periodic;
 - 15: $\mathcal{G}(i, t) \leftarrow \mathcal{G}(i, t) \setminus \{G_{max}^v\}$.
-

4.3 Algorithm for Embedding Multiple Virtual Networks with Different Resource Demand Periods

So far we have assumed that all virtual networks have identical resource demand periods. In reality, different virtual networks may have different resource demand periods. For example, some enterprise IT services (e.g., virtual desktop services) have weekly resource demands, whereas others (such as pay-roll services) have fortnightly or monthly resource demands. We here deal with this general case of the problem by extending Algorithm 1 to solve it.

Given a set $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ of virtual networks with different resource demand periods at time slot t in interval i , the basic idea of the proposed algorithm is to classify virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ into different categories (types), by their resource demand periods, and each virtual network in the same type x will have the same resource demand period T_x . Denote by X the number of different types of virtual networks. Intuitively, the more types of virtual networks, the more difficult embedding these virtual networks to the substrate network will be. To reduce the number of types (i.e., the number of resource demand periods), we merge one type of virtual networks with a shorter resource demand period to another type with a longer resource demand period if the longer one is divisible by the shorter one. The rationale behind this is that the longer resource demand period can be considered as a *super-period* that consists of multiple shorter periods. For example, a virtual network with weekly resource demands can be seen as a virtual network with fortnightly resource demands. Let T_{max} be the maximum resource demand period among the virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$. The merge procedure iteratively finds the maximum number of resource demand periods having a Least Common Multiple (LCM) T_{lcm} that is no greater than T_{max} , and merge the types corresponding to the found resource demand periods into one type that has resource demand period T_{lcm} . This merge procedure continues until no further merge is possible. Let Y be the number of types after the merging. We

then proceed embedding virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ type by type, starting with the type of virtual networks with the longest resource demand period. That is, for virtual networks in type T_y we embed them by invoking Algorithm 1 for all y with $1 \leq y \leq Y$. The detailed algorithm description is given in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2. Embedding a Set $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ of Virtual Networks with Different Resource Demand Periods to the Cloud

Input: $G^s, \mathcal{G}(i, t), T(G^v)$ for each $G^v \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$

Output: Virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ to be embedded into G^s

- 1: Classify virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ into different types of classes by their resource demand periods;
 - 2: For each resource demand period T_x , if there is a larger T_x that is a multiple of T_x , merge the type of virtual networks with the resource demand period T_x to the type one with the resource demand period T_x ;
 - 3: Sort sequences of different types of virtual networks into increasing order by resource demand periods, i.e., $T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{max}$;
 - 4: **while** $LCM(T_1, T_2) > T_{max}$ **do**
 - 5: Find the maximum number of resource demand periods having a Least Common Multiple T_{lcm} that is no greater than T_{max} ;
 - 6: Replace the found resource demand periods with T_{lcm} ;
 - 7: Get the number Y of different types of resource demand periods;
 - 8: **for** $y \leftarrow 1$ to Y **do**
 - 9: Embed virtual networks with the resource demand period T_y by invoking Algorithm 1;
-

4.4 Algorithm Analysis

The rest is to analyze the time complexity of the proposed embedding algorithms Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 for multiple virtual network embedding.

Theorem 1. Given a distributed cloud $G^s = (V^s, E^s)$ and a monitoring period consisting of I intervals with each having T equal time slots, let $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ be the set of virtual network requests arrived in the beginning of time slot t in interval i with each having an identical resource demand period. There is an algorithm, Algorithm 1, for the virtual network embedding problem with the knowledge of identical resource demand periods, which takes $O(\sum_{i=1}^I |\mathcal{G}(i, t)|^2 (|N_{max}^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3))$, where $|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|$ is the number of virtual network requests in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$, $|N_{max}^v|$ is the maximum number of virtual nodes of a virtual network for each i and t , with $1 \leq i \leq I$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. We start by analyzing the time complexity of procedure EmbedOneVN-Static that consists of two stages. Recall that, in stage one, virtual nodes in each virtual network $G^v(N^v, E^v) \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ are embedded into substrate nodes in the substrate network $G^s(N^s, E^s)$ by iteratively selecting a substrate node with the highest rank $\kappa(n^s)$ for the virtual node n^v with the highest rank $\kappa(n^v)$. To calculate $\kappa(n^s)$ and $\kappa(n^v)$ for each substrate node n^s and virtual node n^v , all pairs of shortest paths in both G^s and G^v are found, which takes $O(|N^s|^3)$ and $O(|N^v|^3)$ time, respectively. In addition, finding a substrate node for each

virtual node in N^v takes $O(|N^v| |N^s|)$ time. Stage one thus takes $O(|N^s|^3 + |N^v|^3 + |N^v| |N^s|) = O(|N^s|^3)$ time, since $|N^v| < |N^s|$. In stage two, each virtual link e^v is embedded into a substrate path in G^s . Since the shortest path between two substrate nodes that correspond to the two endpoints of e^v may not have enough bandwidth to meet the bandwidth requirement of e^v , the bottleneck edge with the minimum available bandwidth in the path then is removed, and the next shortest path for each virtual link e^v is then found. This procedure continues until a shortest path with enough available bandwidth is found, or no such a shortest path exists. If there is no such a path meeting the bandwidth requirement, the virtual network request will be rejected. This procedure takes $O(|E^s| |N^s|^2)$ time, as there are $|E^v|$ virtual links in G^v , stage two takes $O(|E^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2)$ time. Thus, procedure EmbedOneVN-Static takes $O(|N^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3)$ time.

We then analyze the time complexity of procedure EmbedOneVN-Periodic, this procedure treats each virtual network $G^v(N^v, E^v)$ with periodic resource demands as $T + 1$ virtual networks with static resource demands at each time slot as well as the average resource demand at each interval. These $T + 1$ virtual networks are ‘pre-embedded’, and G^v will be embedded exactly as one of these $T + 1$ pre-embeddings that leads to the maximum revenue. Thus, embedding a virtual network G^v with periodic resource demands takes $O(T(|N^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3))$ time.

We finally analyze the time complexity of Algorithm 1. There are $|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|$ virtual networks with periodic resource demands. Recall that Algorithm 1 chooses a virtual network that will lead to the maximum revenue among yet-to-be embedded virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$. To find the virtual network with the maximum revenue, the algorithm pre-embeds each virtual network by invoking procedure EmbedOneVN-Periodic. In total, there are $O(|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|^2)$ attempts of calling the procedure. Thus, Algorithm 1 takes $O(|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|^2 T (|N^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3))$ time to embed all virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$, which is $O(|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|^2 (|N_{max}^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3))$ as only the maximum number $|N_{max}^v|$ of virtual nodes of a virtual network in $\cup_{i=1}^I \cup_{t=1}^T \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ needs to be considered and, T usually is constant, i.e., $T = O(1)$. The theorem holds. $\square$

Theorem 2. Given a distributed cloud $G^s = (V^s, E^s)$ and a monitoring period consisting of I intervals with each having T equal time slots, let $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ be the set of arrived virtual networks in the beginning of time slot t in interval i with each having a different resource demand period $T(G^v)$. There is an algorithm, Algorithm 2, for the virtual network embedding problem with the knowledge of different resource demand periods, which takes $O(\sum_{i=1}^I |\mathcal{G}(i, t)|^3 (|N_{max}^v| |E^s| |N^s|^2 + |N^s|^3))$ time, where $|\mathcal{G}(i, t)|$ is the number of virtual network requests in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$, $|N_{max}^v|$ is the maximum number of virtual nodes of a virtual network for each t and i with $1 \leq i \leq I$ and $1 \leq t \leq T$.

Proof. The proof of Theorem 2 is similar to the proof of Theorem 1, omitted. $\square$

5 ALGORITHM WITHOUT THE KNOWLEDGE OF PERIODIC RESOURCE DEMANDS OF VIRTUAL NETWORK REQUESTS

The proposed algorithms so far assumed that the periodic resource demands of each virtual network are given in advance. In reality, very few users know the resource demand periods of their virtual networks. Instead, users normally just specify their maximum resource demands. If the cloud service provider embeds each virtual network by user specified maximum resource demands, the resource utilization will be low, as shown in Fig. 1. Alternatively, the cloud service provider can allocate its resources intelligently by predicting the periodic resource demands of each admitted virtual network. This can be achieved through analyzing the historic resource demands of the virtual network. In the following we propose a prediction algorithm for this purpose.

The basic idea behind the prediction algorithm is to embed a newly admitted virtual network to meet its maximum resource demands initially, by procedure `EmbedOneVN-Static`. The algorithm adjusts the amounts of the resources allocated to the virtual network periodically. Specifically, let $K(G^v)$ be the number of intervals after which the resource demands of a virtual network G^v will be adjusted. The amounts of resources allocated to G^v thus will be adjusted every $K(G^v)$ intervals until its duration $\tau(G^v)$ expires. In total, there will be $\lfloor \frac{\tau(G^v)}{K(G^v)} \rfloor$ adjustments of demanded resources for an embedded virtual network G^v during its lifetime $\tau(G^v)$.

The key in the prediction is how to adjust the amounts of resources allocated to G^v . To this end, we record its actual resource demands of G^v at the past $K(G^v)$ intervals, and use these historic data to predict its resource demands in the current interval i . We then allocate the predicted amounts of resources to G^v . Recall that $\hat{c}(n^v, i, t)$ is the predicted computing resource demand of virtual node n^v at time slot t in interval i , which can be derived by an autoregressive moving average prediction method [25] as follows:

$$\hat{c}(n^v, i, t) = \sum_{k=1}^{K(G^v)} \beta_{i-k} c(n^v, i-k, t), \quad (13)$$

where β_{i-k} is a given constant related to the resource demands in interval $i-k$, and $\sum_{k=1}^{K(G^v)} \beta_{i-k} = 1$ with $\beta_{i-k} \geq \beta_{i-k-1}$ and $0 < \beta_{i-k} < 1$. This prediction model gives an insight that the resource demands G^v at the current interval i are related to its resource demands in its previous $K(G^v)$ intervals. The embedding algorithm is described by Algorithm 3.

Notice that it is sufficient to modify step 9 of Algorithm 2 by invoking Algorithm 3 in order to embed a virtual network G^v with different resource demand periods and without the knowledge of periodic resource demands. Due to space limitation, the description of this algorithm is omitted.

6 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

In this section, we evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms and investigate the impact of different parameters on the algorithm performance.

Algorithm 3. Embedding a Set $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ of Virtual Networks with Identical Resource Demand Periods and without the Periodic Resource Demands

Input: $G^s, \mathcal{G}(i, t), K(G^v)$ for each $G^v \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$

Output: Virtual networks in $\mathcal{G}(i, t)$ to be embedded into G^s and resource allocation adjustments for embedded virtual networks

- 1: Embed each $G^v \in \mathcal{G}(i, t)$ by allocating it with its maximum resource demands by invoking `EmbedOneVN-Static`;
 - 2: **for** each embedded virtual network G_{emd}^v in G^s **for**
 - 3: Calculate the number of intervals that G_{emd}^v spanned in G^s so far, and let i' be the number;
 - 4: **if** $i' > 0$ and $(i' \bmod K(G^v)) = 0$ **do**
 - 5: Predict the computing resource demand of each n^v of its virtual nodes, $\hat{c}(n^v, i, t')$, and the bandwidth resource demand of each e^v of its virtual links, $\hat{b}(e^v, i, t')$ by Eq. (13), for the current interval i , where $1 \leq t' \leq T$;
 - 6: Reserve $\hat{c}(n^v, i, t)$, the amount of computing resource for n^v , and $\hat{b}(e^v, i, t)$, the amount of bandwidth resource for e^v in the next $K(G^v)$ intervals;
-

6.1 Simulation Settings

We adopt both synthetic and real network topologies for the substrate network G^s . Specifically, we generate G^s by the GT-ITM tool [19], which consists of 50 substrate nodes, and there is an edge between each pair of nodes with a probability of 0.1, following the similar settings in [10], [39], [44]. We also adopt a real network topology, GÉANT consisting of 40 nodes and 61 edges for the substrate network G^s [17]. The computing capacity of each substrate node in G^s is randomly drawn from 2,000 to 5,000 GHz, and the bandwidth capacity of each substrate link in G^s is drawn from 10 to 1,000 Mbps [2], [11], [20], [27]. The number of virtual nodes of each virtual network varies from 2 to 10, and there is a virtual link between every two virtual nodes with a probability of 0.5. Parameters a and b in Eq. (3) are set to 5, which will be explained later. The number of time slots of each interval is $T = 7$, e.g., seven days a week. The monitoring period consists of 100 time slots. The arrival rate of virtual network requests follows the Poisson process with an average rate of 5 virtual networks per time slot, and the duration of each virtual network varies with no more than 50 intervals. The length of $K(G^v)$ in Algorithm 3 is set to 5.

Resource demands of virtual networks. For resource demands of virtual networks within an interval, we consider two patterns: one is the Weekday-weekend pattern, where a virtual network has demand peaks during either weekdays (five demand peaks) or weekends (two demand peaks); another is the Random pattern, where the number of time slots when a virtual network has peak demands is randomly generated. In both resource demand patterns, the amounts of peak computing and bandwidth demands are randomly generated from 2 to 10. The off-peak resource demands are no more than 80 percent of its peak resource demands.

Benchmarks. We evaluate the proposed algorithms for the VNE problem against two state-of-the-art algorithms. The first one is the algorithm in [44], referred to as algorithm MAX, in which the embedding ability of each substrate node n^s is the amount of its available computing




Fig. 3. The performance of different algorithms under Random resource demand patterns of virtual networks.

resource, i.e., $\Phi(n^s) = P(n^s, i, t)$, it embeds virtual networks to G^s according to their maximum resource demands. The second one, referred to as PAGERANK, is a PageRank-based embedding algorithm [8], which assigns each virtual node or each substrate node a rank by adopting the PageRank algorithm. It then embeds each virtual network by mapping its virtual nodes, followed by embedding its virtual links to the substrate network. For simplicity, we use algorithms ALG-PERIOD, and ALG-NO-PERIOD to denote Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 3 with and without the knowledge of periodic resource demands, respectively. Similarly, we use ALG-PERIOD-DIFF and ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF to denote Algorithm 2 and its version without the knowledge of periodic resource demands.

Evaluation metrics. In addition to the revenue achieved by embedding of virtual networks, we also consider the revenue-to-cost ratio $\eta(G^v)$ to quantify the efficiency of embedding of each virtual network G^v as follows:

$$\eta(G^v) = \frac{\mathbb{R}(G^v)}{\mathbb{C}(G^v)}. \quad (14)$$

Given a distributed cloud $G^s = (V^s, E^s)$ and a monitoring period I , the *accumulated revenue*, *service cost*, and

revenue-to-cost ratio within the monitoring period thus are the total revenues collected, the total service cost spent, and the ratio of the total revenue to the total service cost for the monitoring period. Each value in our figures is the mean of the results by applying the mentioned algorithm to either 15 synthetic network topologies or 15 resource capacity settings of the GÉANT topology. Also, 95 percent confidence intervals for these mean values are presented in all figures.

6.2 Performance Evaluation

We first evaluate two proposed algorithms ALG-PERIOD and ALG-NO-PERIOD against algorithms MAX and PAGERANK, based on the synthetic substrate networks generated by GT-ITM. Fig. 3 shows the results when virtual networks follow the Random resource demand pattern. Specifically, Fig. 3a indicates that, on average, algorithm ALG-PERIOD admits around 15 and 30 percent more requests than those of algorithms MAX and PAGERANK in a monitoring period consisting of 100 time slots. It can also be seen from Fig. 3b that algorithm ALG-PERIOD earns 10 and 31 percent more revenues than these of algorithms MAX and PAGERANK. The reason behind is that algorithm ALG-PERIOD performs




Fig. 4. The performance of different algorithms under Weekday-weekend resource demand patterns.

fine-grained resource allocations by exploring the periodic resource demands and adopting a novel embedding metric that takes into account both the dynamic workload on the substrate network and the user periodic resource demands.

It can be seen from Figs. 3a and 3b that algorithms MAX and PAGERANK have wider confidence intervals for the mean of acceptance ratios and revenues. The reason is that they allocate cloud resources according to the maximum demands of virtual networks. Their acceptance ratios or revenues will oscillate a lot since each virtual network request is likely to be rejected with high probability, and algorithm PAGERANK is the worst among them. Figs. 3c and 3d clearly demonstrate that algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD consistently delivers the highest acceptance ratio and the maximum number of admitted virtual network requests among the three mentioned algorithms. It can be seen from Fig. 3c that the virtual network acceptance ratios of algorithms MAX and PAGERANK oscillate a lot, since the number of admitted virtual networks is only affected by the amount of available resources in the substrate network. In addition, Fig. 3e implies that the revenue delivered by algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD is higher than that by algorithms MAX and PAGERANK, and it has also the higher

revenue-to-cost ratio than these of algorithms MAX and PAGERANK as shown in Fig. 3f.

Fig. 4 depicts the performance curves when the resource demands of virtual networks follow the Weekday-weekend resource demand pattern, from which it can be seen that algorithms ALG-PERIOD and ALG-NO-PERIOD outperform the others in terms of the acceptance ratios, revenues, and revenue-to-cost ratios. In addition, the acceptance ratio of algorithm ALG-PERIOD with pattern Weekday-weekend (Fig. 4a) is higher than that of it with pattern Random (Fig. 3a), so is its revenue that can be seen from Figs. 3b and 4b, respectively. This is because that there are more opportunities for virtual networks with complimentary resource demands to share resources with each other. For the sake of clarity, in the rest of evaluation, we will focus only on the Random resource demand pattern.

We now evaluate algorithms ALG-PERIOD-DIFF and ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF against algorithms MAX and PAGERANK, by assigning the resource demand period of each virtual network with one of the values in $\{7, 14, 15, 30\}$. It can be seen from Fig. 5 that algorithms ALG-PERIOD-DIFF and ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF outperform algorithms MAX and PAGERANK. Furthermore, by comparing the results in




Fig. 5. The performance of different algorithms with different resource demand periods and under Random resource demand patterns of virtual networks.




Fig. 6. The performance of different algorithms using GÉANT topology under Random resource demand patterns of virtual networks.




Fig. 7. The impact of a on the performance of different algorithms.

Figs. 3 and 5, it can be seen that algorithms ALG-PERIOD-DIFF and ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF are inferior to their counterparts, ALG-PERIOD and ALG-NO-PERIOD. For example, as shown in Fig. 5a, the acceptance ratio by algorithm ALG-PERIOD-DIFF is lower than that by algorithm ALG-PERIOD in Fig. 3a, since algorithm ALG-PERIOD-DIFF merges the type of virtual networks with a shorter resource demand period to the type with a longer resource demand period that is a multiple of the shorter one. This means that the resource availability check process (Step 5 in procedure EmbedOneVN-Periodic) will consider a longer interval, thereby increasing the rejection probability of virtual networks. Furthermore, it can be seen from Figs. 5b and 5c that the accumulated revenue of algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF is roughly the same as that of algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD, whereas the accumulated revenue-to-cost ratio of algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF is much lower than that of algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD. In other words, the cost by algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD-DIFF is much higher than that by algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD,

because more substrate links are needed in order to embed each virtual link, given that the rejection probability of a virtual link increases.

6.3 Performance Evaluation Using GÉANT Topology

To evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithms in real networks, we now evaluate algorithms ALG-PERIOD and ALG-NO-PERIOD against algorithms MAX and PAGERANK in the GÉANT network. It can be seen from Figs. 6a and 6b that algorithms ALG-PERIOD and ALG-NO-PERIOD outperform algorithms MAX and PAGERANK in terms of the acceptance ratio and revenue. Specifically, Fig. 6b shows that algorithm consistently achieves higher revenues than those of algorithms MAX and PAGERANK, and the overlapping on that by the confidence intervals by these algorithms are trivial. For example, the revenue by ALG-NO-PERIOD is around twice that of algorithm PAGERANK, and 30 percent more than that of algorithm MAX. Also, it must be mentioned that the acceptance ratios by all algorithms in GÉANT are

lower than that in random topologies generated by GT-ITM. This is because the network size of GÉANT is smaller and has less number of edges compared with the topologies generated by GT-ITM. Also, it can be seen from Fig. 6c that algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD outperforms algorithms MAX and PAGERANK. For example, within a monitoring period of 100 intervals, the accumulated revenue-to-cost ratio by algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD is around 30 and 35 percent higher than those by algorithms MAX and PAGERANK, respectively.

6.4 Impact of Parameters

We then study the impact of constant parameters a and b in embedding metrics in Eqs. (3) and (4) on the performance of the proposed algorithms ALG-NO-PERIOD and ALG-PERIOD, by varying their values from 5 to 5^7 . For the sake of simplicity, we only evaluate the algorithms for virtual networks with Random resource demand patterns. Figs. 7a and 7b demonstrate that the larger the value of a , the lower the acceptance ratio. This implies that when there is a larger a , each substrate node is reluctant to accommodate a virtual node when its utilization rate is nearly full, otherwise leading to SLA violations. Fig. 7c plots the resource demand violations by algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD for different values of a . It can be seen that algorithm ALG-NO-PERIOD has the highest and lowest resource demand violation ratios when $a = 5$ and $a = 5^7$, respectively. The algorithm delivers a resource demand violation ratio less than 0.5 percent when $a = 5$, but achieves a relatively high acceptance ratio. This is why we set $a = 5$ in the default setting.

7 CONCLUSION

In this paper we considered virtual network embedding problems with and without the knowledge of periodic resource demands in a substrate network. We devised efficient embedding algorithms, by incorporating novel embedding metrics and periodic resource demands of virtual network requests, provided that periodic resource demands of each virtual network are given and all virtual networks have identical resource demand periods; otherwise, we proposed a period prediction method to predict the periodic resource demands of each admitted virtual network. We finally evaluated the performance of the proposed algorithms through experimental simulations, based on both synthetic and real substrate networks. Experimental results demonstrate that the proposed algorithms are promising, and outperform existing heuristics.


ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to appreciate the three anonymous referees and the associate editor for their constructive comments and valuable suggestions, which help us significantly improve the quality and presentation of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Anderson, L. Peterson, S. Shenker, and J. Turner, "Overcoming the Internet impasse through virtualization," *Computer*, vol. 38, pp. 34–41, 2005.
- [2] H. Ballani, P. Costa, T. Karagiannis, and A. Rowstron, "Towards predictable datacenter networks," in *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM Conf.*, 2011, pp. 242–253.
- [3] M. Bari, R. Boutaba, R. Esteves, L. Granville, M. Podlesny, M. Rabbani, Q. Zhang, and M. Zhani, "Data center network virtualization: A survey," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 909–928, Second Quarter 2013.
- [4] T. Benson, A. Akella, A. Shaikh, and S. Sahu, "CloudNaaS: A cloud networking platform for enterprise applications," in *Proc. 2nd ACM Symp. Cloud Comput.*, Art. no. 8, 2011.
- [5] R. Bradford, E. Kotsovinos, A. Feldmann, and H. Schiöberg, "Live wide-area migration of virtual machines including local persistent state," in *Proc. 3rd Int. Conf. Virtual Execution Environ.*, 2007, pp. 169–179.
- [6] N. F. Butt, M. Chowdhury, and R. Boutaba, "Topology-awareness and reoptimization mechanism for virtual network embedding," in *Proc. 9th Int. Conf. IFIP Netw.*, 2010, pp. 27–39.
- [7] Z. Cai, F. Liu, N. Xiao, Q. Liu, and Z. Wang, "Virtual network embedding for evolving networks," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2010, pp. 1–5.
- [8] X. Cheng, S. Su, Z. Zhang, H. Wang, F. Yang, Y. Luo, and J. Wang, "Virtual network embedding through topology-aware node ranking," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 41, pp. 38–47, 2011.
- [9] N. M. M. K. Chowdhury and R. Boutaba, "A survey of network virtualization," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 54, pp. 862–876, 2010.
- [10] N. M. M. K. Chowdhury, M. R. Rahman, and R. Boutaba, "Virtual network embedding with coordinated node and link mapping," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2009, pp. 783–791.
- [11] R. Duan, R. Prodan, and X. Li, "Multi-objective game theoretic scheduling of bag-of-tasks workflows on hybrid clouds," *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 29–42, Jan.–Mar. 2014.
- [12] F. Esposito, D. Paola, and I. Matta, "On distributed virtual network embedding with guarantees," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 569–582, Dec. 2014.
- [13] I. Fajjari, N. Aitsaadi, G. Pujolle, and H. Zimmermann, "VNR algorithm: A greedy approach for virtual networks reconfiguration," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2011, pp. 1–6.
- [14] N. Feamster, L. Gao, and J. Rexford, "How to lease the internet in your spare time," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 37, pp. 61–64, 2007.
- [15] P. Ferguson and G. Huston, "What is a VPN—Part I" *The Inter. Protocol J.*, vol. 1, 1998.
- [16] A. Fischer, J. Botero, M. Beck, H. Meer, and X. Hesselbach, "Virtual network embedding: A survey," *IEEE Commun. Surveys Tuts.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 1888–1906, Fourth Quarter 2013.
- [17] GÉANT. (2000). [Online]. Available: <http://www.geant.net>.
- [18] D. Gmach, J. Rolia, L. Cherkasova, and A. Kemper, "Workload analysis and demand prediction of enterprise data center applications," in *Proc. IEEE 10th Int. Symp. Workload Characterization*, 2007, pp. 171–180.
- [19] GT-ITM. (2000). [Online]. Available: <http://www.cc.gatech.edu/projects/gtitm/>.
- [20] C. Guo, et al., "SecondNet: A data center network virtualization architecture with bandwidth guarantees," in *Proc. 6th Int. Conf. Emerging Netw. Experiments Technol.*, Art. no. 15, 2010.
- [21] J. Guo, F. Liu, D. Zeng, J. Lui, and H. Jin, "A cooperative game based allocation for sharing data center networks," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2013, pp. 2139–2147.
- [22] I. Houidi, W. Louati, W. B. Ameur, and D. Zeghlache, "Virtual network provisioning across multiple substrate networks," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 55, pp. 1011–1023, 2011.
- [23] I. Houidi, W. Louati, and D. Zeghlache, "A distributed and automatic virtual network mapping framework," in *Proc. 4th Int. Conf. Autonomic and Autonomous Syst.*, 2008, pp. 241–247.
- [24] I. Houidi, W. Louati, D. Zeghlache, P. Papadimitriou, and L. Mathy, "Adaptive virtual network provisioning," in *Proc. ACM 2nd ACM SIGCOMM Workshop Virtualized Infrastructure Syst. Archit.*, 2010, pp. 41–48.
- [25] A. Kansal, F. Zhao, N. Kothari, and A. A. Bhattacharya, "Virtual machine power metering and provisioning," in *Proc. ACM 1st ACM Symp. Cloud Comput.*, 2010, pp. 39–50.
- [26] J. Lischka and H. Karl, "A virtual network mapping algorithm based on subgraph isomorphism detection," in *Proc. ACM 1st ACM SIGCOMM Workshop Virtualized Infrastructure Syst. Archit.*, 2009, pp. 81–88.
- [27] C. Mastroianni, M. Meo, and G. Papuzzo, "Probabilistic consolidation of virtual machines in self-organizing cloud data centers," *IEEE Trans. Cloud Comput.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 215–228, Jul.–Dec. 2013.


- [28] P. Padala, K. G. Shin, X. Zhu, M. Uysal, Z. Wang, S. Singhal, A. Merchant, and K. Salem, "Adaptive control of virtualized resources in utility computing environments," in *Proc. ACM 2nd ACM SIGOPS/EuroSys Eur. Conf. Comput. Syst.*, 2007, pp. 289–302.
- [29] A. Shieh, S. Kandulaz, A. Greenberg, C. Kim, and B. Saha, "Sharing the data center network," in *Proc. 8th USENIX Conf. Netw. Syst. Design Implementation*, 2011, pp. 309–322.
- [30] S. Su, Z. Zhang, A. X. Liu, X. Cheng, Y. Wang, and X. Zhao, "Energy-aware virtual network embedding," *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1607–1620, Oct. 2014.
- [31] G. Sun, V. Anand, H. Yu, D. Liao, Y. Cai, and L. M. Li, "Adaptive provisioning for evolving virtual network request in cloud-based data centers," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2012, pp. 1617–1622.
- [32] U.S. Department of Energy, "Creating energy efficient data centers," 2007.
- [33] T. Wood, K. K. Ramakrishnan, P. Shenoy, and J. Merwe, "Enterprise-ready virtual cloud pools: Vision, opportunities and challenges," *Oxford Comput. J.*, vol. 55, pp. 995–1004, 2012.
- [34] D. Xie, N. Ding, Y. C. Hu, and R. Kompella, "The only constant is change: incorporating time-varying network reservations in data centers," in *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM Conf. Appl., Technol., Archit., Protocols Comput. Commun.*, 2012, pp. 199–210.
- [35] Z. Xu and W. Liang, "Operation cost minimization for distributed data centers through exploring electricity price diversity," *Comput. Netw.*, vol. 83, pp. 59–75, 2015.
- [36] Z. Xu and W. Liang, "Minimizing the operational cost of data centers via geographical electricity price diversity," in *Proc. 6th Int. Conf. IEEE Cloud Comput.*, 2013, pp. 99–106.
- [37] Z. Xu, W. Liang, and Q. Xia, "Electricity cost minimization in distributed clouds by exploring heterogeneities of cloud resources and user demands," in *Proc. IEEE 21st Int. Conf. Parallel Distrib. Syst.*, 2015, pp. 388–395.
- [38] Z. Xu, W. Liang, and Q. Xia, "Efficient virtual network embedding via exploring periodic resource demands," in *Proc. IEEE 39th Int. Conf. Local Comput. Netw.*, 2014, pp. 90–98.
- [39] M. Yu, Y. Yi, J. Rexford, and M. Chiang, "Rethinking virtual network embedding: Substrate support for path splitting and migration," *ACM SIGCOMM Comput. Commun. Rev.*, vol. 38, pp. 17–29, 2008.
- [40] S. Zhang, Z. Qian, J. Wu, and S. Lu, "An opportunistic resource sharing and topology-aware mapping framework for virtual networks," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2012, pp. 2408–2416.
- [41] S. Zhang and X. Qiu, "A novel virtual network mapping algorithm for cost minimizing," *J. Sel. Areas Telecommun.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2011.
- [42] S. Zhang, J. Wu, and S. Lu, "Virtual network embedding with substrate support for parallelization," in *Proc. IEEE GLOBECOM*, 2012, pp. 2615–2620.
- [43] Y. Zhou, X. Yang, Y. Li, D. Jin, L. Su, and L. Zeng, "Incremental re-embedding scheme for evolving virtual network requests," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 5, pp. 1016–1019, May 2013.
- [44] Y. Zhu and M. Ammar, "Algorithms for assigning substrate network resources to virtual network components," in *Proc. IEEE INFOCOM*, 2006, pp. 1–12.



Zichuan Xu received the BSc and ME degrees from the Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, China, in 2008 and 2011, both in computer science. He is currently working toward the PhD degree in the Research School of Computer Science, Australian National University. His research interests include distributed clouds, data center networks, cloud computing, algorithmic game theory, and optimization problems. He is a student member of the IEEE.



Weifa Liang received the BSc degree from Wuhan University, China, in 1984, the ME degree from the University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China, in 1989, and the PhD degree from the Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, in 1998, all in computer science. He is currently a full professor in the Research School of Computer Science, Australian National University. His research interests include design and analysis of routing protocols for wireless ad hoc and sensor networks, cloud computing, graph databases, design and analysis of parallel and distributed algorithms, combinatorial optimization, and graph theory. He is a senior member of the IEEE.



Qiufen Xia received the BSc and ME degrees from the Dalian University of Technology, Dalian, China, in 2009 and 2012, both in computer science. She is currently working toward the PhD degree in the Research School of Computer Science, Australian National University. Her research interests include mobile cloud computing, distributed clouds, cloud computing, and optimization problems. She is a student member of the IEEE.

► For more information on this or any other computing topic, please visit our Digital Library at www.computer.org/publications/dlib.