Rational Impatience Strategy of 5G Network Tenants in Queue-Based Slice Admission Control: Shall I Wait Further for My Network Slice?
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Abstract—The fifth generation (5G) technologies enable an emergent type of public cloud environment: Slice as a Service (SlaaS). Under the constraints of Quality of Service (QoS) and resource feasibility, mobile network operators (MNOs) may have to delay the admission to some slices requested by network tenants. When the service demand is dense, congestions of slice requests can occur, leading to long waiting time. Tenants can therefore behave impatiently to mitigate potential loss caused by congestions. This paper studies the rational strategies of impatient tenants waiting in queue-based slice admission control system, and discusses the benefits of allowing MNO to share its information with the tenants.

I. INTRODUCTION

The emerging technology of network slicing in Fifth Generation (5G) enables mobile network operators (MNOs) to manage their (radio, infrastructural and virtual) resources in the form of logically independent “network slices”, which can be customized for various service types with highly specific requirements. It also allows the MNOs to lease its network slices to external tenants for utilization, so that the tenants can deliver services to end users without possessing their own network infrastructure. This emerging business case is known as “Slice as a Service” (SlaaS) [1].

Differing from conventional cloud environments such as Software as a Service (SaaS) or Infrastructure as a Service (IaaS), the entities for rent in SlaaS, i.e. the network slices, can be highly heterogeneous in resource requirements and dynamic behavior. For instance, massive Machine-Type-Communications (mMTC) applications require dense wireless accesses but only limited throughput, and are usually created/released at low frequency. In contrast, enhanced Mobile Broadband (eMBB) slices for high-speed transmission need high throughput for medium amount of accesses, and can be created/released very dynamically to match the traffic load. This challenges the network management and orchestration system, calling for intelligent slice brokers [2] and efficient slice admission control (SAC) [3], in order to optimize the network resource utilization.

A SAC module conditionally declines some tenant requests for network slices to mitigate resource overload, and the declined requests shall be reconsidered for admission after a delay. A straight-forward solution for delivering such delayed service is queuing system with the “First-Come First-Serve” policy. However, when the service demand is dense, slice congestions can occur and most requests will suffer from an overlength waiting time in queue. The tenants may behave impatiently in this case, in order to avoid potential business deficits. In this paper, we study the business model of tenants in SlaaS environment, to find out: 1) how they shall behave in case of slice congestions, and 2) which knowledge do they need to make rational decisions.

The residential of the paper is organized as follows: Sec. II sets up the SlaaS model with multi-queued SAC and the business model of tenants. Sec. III investigates on the rational strategies of impatient 5G network slice tenants in congested queues. The analytical results are then demonstrated and evaluated in Sec. IV through numerical simulations. At the end we close the paper with our conclusion and outlook in Sec. V.

II. SYSTEM MODEL

A. Feasibility and Admissibility

A MNO with limited resource pool \( r = [r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_M]^T \) offers a number of tenants with slices of \( N \) different predefined types to rent. Every active slice under maintenance occupies the feasible region \( S \):

\[
S = \{ s | r_s - a_s \geq 0, \quad \forall 1 \leq m \leq M \},
\]

where the assigned resources \( a_m \) is defined by

\[
a = [a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_M]^T = U \times s;
\]

\[
U = [u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_N].
\]
Clearly, some slice sets \( s \in S \) can sufficiently utilize the resource pool so that no admission of new slice is possible, regardless of the slice type. In other cases, the MNO is able to admit at least one new slice with its idle resources, which introduces the admissibility region \( A \):

\[
A = \{ s | s \in S, \exists n : s + \Delta s_n \in S \},
\]

where \( \Delta s_n \) is the unit slice incremental vector of type \( n \):

\[
\Delta s_n = [0, \ldots, 0, 1, \ldots, 0], \quad n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}.
\]

Fig. 1 briefly illustrates the concepts of \( S \) and \( A \) with an example where \( M = 2, N = 2 \).

**B. Slice Admission Control with Heterogeneous Multi-Queue**

Generally, a variety of tenants independently and randomly issue service requests to the MNO. As indicated by many existing works [1], [4], [5], the MNO may decline some request instead of admitting them immediately, taking account of both the resource feasibility and prediction of the future load. In this case, a mechanism is needed to allow the MNO to reevaluate the declined requests and deliver a delayed slice admission. In this paper we consider a slice admission control mechanism with \( N \) queues, where every issued request for slice type \( n \in \{1,2,\ldots,N\} \) will enter and wait in the \( n^{th} \) queue. Only the first awaiting request in every queue can be considered by the MNO for potential admission. Upon admission, the request will be removed from the queue.

When there is more than one queue non-empty, multiple requests of different slice types are simultaneously available for the MNO’s decision. In this case, we consider that the MNO has a certain preference among different slice types, which can be described by a vector \( \varphi \):

\[
\Phi \rightarrow \varphi \subset \Phi
\]

where \( \Phi \) is the set of all permutations of \( \{1,2,\ldots,N\} \). The order of elements in \( \varphi \) presents the MNO’s preference. More specifically, every change in either the status of queues or \( s \) triggers the MNO to attempt admitting the first request in its most preferred queue. If this attempt fails due to resource constraint or an empty queue, the MNO continues with its next preferred queue. Once a request is admitted, both \( s \) and the queues status, and therefore the MNO’s preference as well, are updated, which triggers the aforementioned procedure again. This process continues recursively until no more awaiting request can be accepted by the MNO, thereafter the MNO waits for the next incoming request (that updates the queues status) or slice termination (that updates \( s \)).

It is also worth to note that sometimes the MNO may want to reserve its resource for future utilization, despite that it is able to admit another slice. This can be enabled by adding an option 0 for “standby” to the preference vector. In this case, \( \Phi \) should be extended to the set of all permutations of \( \{0,1,2,\ldots,N\} \). A graphical summary of the aforementioned mechanism is illustrated in Fig. 2. We refer to the specific mapping \( \varphi(s) \) as the admission strategy of the MNO.

As service requests are issued by a number of independent tenants, it is reasonable to consider the request arrival of every certain slice type as an independent Poisson process.

**C. Tenant Business Model**

Having introduced the SAC mechanism from the MNO’s perspective, now we take the tenant’s point of view and consider the business model of every tenant service instance through its life cycle.

Generally, the motivation of tenants to request network slices is to fulfill the end-user service demands from their own customers. For simplification, here we consider w.l.o.g. that for every certain tenant, every service demand can be supported by one slice of the same type. Once a tenant is granted with the requested network slice, it launches its business session.
to deliver service to the end-users. The duration of a business session, i.e., the lifetime of the corresponding network slice, is a random variable, that is known by the tenant before issuing the request and established in the Service-Level-Agreement (SLA) upon slice admission.

It can take the tenant a one-time cost $c_0$ to issue the service request to the MNO, which is used to issue the request and prepare the end-user service. Besides, this cost may also covers part (or even the whole lump) of the rent for requested network slice, which the MNO may also requires the tenants to prepay as deposit in advance. Additionally, when a request waits in queue, it can consistently generate a periodical waiting cost $c$ for the tenant, which is used to keep the tenant standby for launching the business service.

Once a request is accepted, a new network slice will be created and granted to the corresponding tenant to support the desired end-user service. This service is supposed to deliver service to the end-users. The duration of a business session, i.e., the lifetime of the corresponding network slice, is a random variable, that is known by the tenant before issuing the request and established in the Service-Level-Agreement (SLA) upon slice admission.

III. RATIONAL BALKING & RENEGING STRATEGIES

An arbitrary request can be characterized by a feature vector $[n, c_0, c, p, \tau]$, where $n$ is the slice type, $\tau$ is the expected life time of slice upon acceptance, $c_0$, $c$ and $p$ are the business model parameters discussed in Sec. II-C. Meanwhile, the queue of slice type $n$ can be characterized by $[l, \lambda, \mu]$ where $l = 1$ is its current queue length, $\lambda$ and $\mu$ are the arrival rate and serving rate of type-$n$ requests, respectively.

When the business demand arises, i.e. request is generated (not issued yet) by the tenant, the expected total profit that this business session can generate is

$$E\{P\} = pt.$$  

(7)

Meanwhile, the expected cost of issuing the request and waiting in the queue till acceptance is

$$E\{C\} = c_0 + cE\{w_1\},$$  

(8)

where $w_k$ is the time a request must wait in queue until being accepted with $k = 1$ other requests ahead of it.

Assume that the tenants can obtain the a priori knowledge about $w_1$, self-evidently, a rational tenant will propose the request if and only if $E\{P - C\} \geq 0$, which can be described as a binary decision model:

$$D_b = \begin{cases} 1 & p \tau - c_0 - cE\{w_1\} \geq 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$  

(9)

where $D_b = 1$ stands for issuing and $D_b = 0$ for balking.

A. Rational Balkening without Reneging

For simplification, we first ignore reneging, so that

$$E\{w_1\} = \frac{\lambda}{\mu},$$  

(10)

$$D_b = \begin{cases} 1 & \tau \geq \frac{c\mu + cl}{\mu p}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$  

(11)

Hence, given certain $p$, $c_0$ and $c$, it yields that $D_b = D_b(l, \tau)$ if the tenant is able to observe $l$ before pushing its request into the queue. The balkening chance of such a tenant is therefore a function of $l$ under any certain distribution of $\tau$:

$$b(l) = \int_0^{+\infty} D_b(l, \tau) f_r(\tau)d\tau = \int_0^{+\infty} f_r(\tau)d\tau - F_{\tau} \left(\frac{c_0\mu + cl}{\mu p}\right)$$  

(12)

Particularly, when $c_0 = 0$ and $\tau \sim U(0, \tau_{\text{max}})$:

$$b_{\text{lin}}(l) = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{cl}{\mu p \tau_{\text{max}}} & 0 \leq l \leq \frac{\mu p \tau_{\text{max}}}{c}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$  

(13)

which is the linear balkening model in [8]. Note that there is an implicit limit for the queue length $l_{\text{max}} = \frac{\mu p \tau_{\text{max}}}{c}$, even if no such limit is explicitly set by the MNO.

When $c_0 = 0$ and $f_r(\tau) = \frac{1}{(\tau + 1)^2}$:

$$b_{\text{exp}}(l) = 1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{l + 1}\right) e^{-\frac{\mu p}{l + \mu p}} = \frac{\mu p}{l + \mu p}.$$  

(14)
When $c_0 = 0$ and $\tau \sim \text{Par}(1, 1)$:

$$b_{\text{par}}(l) = \begin{cases} 1 & l = 0; \\ 1 - \left( -\frac{1}{\tau} \right)^{\frac{l}{\tau}} e^{\frac{c_1}{\tau}} & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(15)

which is the inversely proportional balkinig model in [9] with the factor of patience $\beta = \frac{c_1}{\tau}$. Note that this model assumes every slice remains active for at least an unit time period.

When $c_0 = 0$ and $\tau \sim \text{Exp}(\eta)$:

$$b_{\text{exp}}(l) = 1 - \left( -e^{-\eta t} \right)^{\frac{l}{\tau}} e^{\frac{c_1}{\tau}},$$

(16)

which is the exponential balkinig model in [7] with the exponent of impatience $\beta = \frac{c_1}{\tau}$.

B. Rational Reneging

Now we consider the reneging behavior. As we will derive below, the decision of reneging highly relies on the tenant’s knowledge of the queue. So we discuss this problem separately in different cases.

1) Full Knowledge: First, we assume that every tenant is not only able to observe the position $k$ of its request in the queue in real time, but also informed by the MNO about $E\{w_k\}$. In this case, at every step it will rationally choose whether to cancel the request (renge) after waiting in the queue for $t$, based on the observed queue information:

$$D_k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & pt - c_0 - cE\{w_{k(t)}\} \geq 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(17)

where $k(t)$ is the request’s position in the queue, $D_k(t) = 1$ indicates waiting and $D_k(t) = 0$ for reneging.

Clearly, $k(0) = l$ so that Eq. (17) becomes Eq. (9) $t = 0$. Hence, the maximal waiting time $t_{\text{max}}$ is determined by

$$pt - cE\{w_{k(\text{max})}\} = 0,$$

(18)

$$E\{w_k\} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\mu + \sum_{j=0}^{l} \omega_j},$$

(19)

where $\omega_i \geq 0$ is the reneging rate at the queue position $i$ for $i > 0$ and $\omega_0 = 0$. Therefore, this case has an equivalent form where the MNO informs the tenant that issues the $k$th request in queue about $\mu$ and $\omega_i$ for all $i < k$. The values of $\mu$ and $\omega_i$ converge to stable levels in long term when the business scenario remains consistent, therefore we consider them here as constants that are known by the MNO.

2) Knowledge of Current Position and Serving Rate: In this case, we assume that every tenant is informed by the MNO about $\mu$, and keeps observing the position $k$ of its request in the queue, but has no knowledge about $\omega_i$. As a tenant generally lacks knowledge of requests issued by other tenants, i.e. the statistics of their parameters $[c_0, c, p, \tau]$. So no tenant is able to estimate the values of $\omega_i$ in this case, which disables the estimation of $E\{w_k\}$ according to Eq. (19).

However, knowing that $\omega_i \geq 0$ for all $i$, the tenants can make conservative estimations based on

$$E\{w_k\} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\mu + \sum_{j=0}^{l} \omega_j} \geq \frac{k}{\mu},$$

(20)

and therefore Eq. (9) becomes

$$D_k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & k(t) \leq \frac{pt - c_0}{c}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(21)

3) Knowledge of Current Position: In this case, every tenant is able to track its request’s current position $k$ in queue, but has no a priori knowledge about $\mu$. Thus, the tenant has to estimate $\mu$ through an online learning process while waiting in queue:

$$\hat{\mu}(k) = \frac{l - k}{T_k},$$

(22)

where $T_k$ is the time that the request took to arrive the $k$th position since its entrance to the queue. Thus, Eqs. (20) and (21) become respectively

$$E\{\hat{w}_k\} = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}(k) + \sum_{j=0}^{l} \omega_j} \geq \frac{k}{\hat{\mu}(k)} \frac{T_k}{l - k};$$

(23)

$$D_k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & k(t) \leq \frac{(pt - c_0)}{cT_k}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

(24)

It has to be noted here that the estimation in Eq. (23) is only valid when $k < l$, and the estimation error $\epsilon_2$ decreases as $k$ increases. Therefore a threshold $\Delta K$ should be set whereas $\hat{\mu}(t)$ is estimated only when $l - k \geq \Delta K$. In summary:

$$D_k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & k(t) \leq l - \Delta K; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(25)

4) Knowledge of Mean Waiting Time: In this case, all tenants are only informed about the average waiting time $\bar{w}$ since joining the queue till being served, in which the waiting time requests that balk and renege do not count. Meanwhile, the current position in queue $k$ is unobservable for a request unless $k = 0$ (i.e. when the request gets served).

In this case, a request can only roughly consider the batch of all other requests ahead of it as an integrated entity in queue. As the service to every single request is a Poisson event, we approximately consider the complete service to this batch (of unknown length) as a Poisson event with arrival rate of $1/\bar{w}$. Thus, the reneging decision can be made as

$$D_k(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & pt - c\bar{w} \geq 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

(26)

Note that Eq. (26) is independent of $t$ or $k$ so that it always returns the same decision.

5) Blindness: If the tenant possesses neither the position $k$ of its waiting request in the queue, nor any knowledge about the dynamics of queue, it can only make a blind reneging, where its maximal waiting time is predetermined at the queue entrance. A straightforward solution is to set a maximal cost proportional to the total profit that can be generated by the requested slice upon admission:

$$c_{\text{max}} = c_0 + cl_{\text{max}} = \alpha pt,$$

(27)
where $\alpha \geq 0$ is the factor of risking that indicates the tenant’s intention of waiting in the queue. This yields that

$$D_t(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & t < \frac{\alpha PT-c_0}{c} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (28)$$

It is worth to note that when $c_0 = 0$ and $\tau \sim \text{Exp}(\eta)$, the blind reneging model becomes the classic reneging model $\text{Exp}(\eta)$ where the maximal waiting time is exponentially distributed. Furthermore, when $\alpha \to +\infty$ the tenants will never renege and therefore become patient.

C. Balking with Reneging

When requests are able to renege, the balking behavior can be considered as a special case of reneging at the queue entrance ($t = 0$, $k = 1$). Clearly, this implies to disable balking in the aforementioned cases III-B3 and III-B5 where no a priori estimation of $E(w)$ is available for tenants.

IV. NUMERICAL EVALUATION

A. Simulation Setup

For numerical simulation, we define a simplified scenario, where the MNO holds a normalized two-dimensional ($M = 2$) resource pool $r = [1, 1]$ and $N = 2$ different slice types are defined and specified with the parameters in Table I.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slice Type ($n$)</th>
<th>$u_n$</th>
<th>$\lambda_n$</th>
<th>$1/\eta_n$</th>
<th>$c_{0,n}$</th>
<th>$c_{1,n}$</th>
<th>$p_n$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>[0.01, 0.05]</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.01]</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under these specifications, the admissibility region $A$ is composed of 341 different values of $s$. For simplification we do not consider the option of “standby” in the MNO’s slicing strategy, so that for every state $s$ only two different preference vectors, i.e. $\varphi_1 = [1, 2]$ and $\varphi_2 = [2, 1]$, are available. Therefore, there are in total $2^{341}$ different slicing strategies applicable for the MNO. We randomly select 1000 from these valid slicing strategies, and with every MNO slicing strategy, we evaluate the rational balking/reneging strategies of impatient tenants with different information available. For every individual evaluation, we simulate the arrivals of tenant requests and the MNO’s operations for 400 periods.

B. Evaluation Results

During the simulation, we track the end-profit of every issued slice request

$$p_e = pt - c_0 - cw,$$

where $w$ is the total waiting time from queue entrance to admission/reneging. Then we evaluate the balking/reneging strategies of tenants with three different metrics:

- **Total profit**: the sum of end-profits obtained by all issued slice requests;
- **Mean profit**: the average end-profit obtained by all issued slice requests;
- **Profitting rate**: the ratio of slice requests that lead to positive end-profits in all issued requests.

The simulation results are listed in Tab. II.

It can be easily observed from the results, that when informed about its request’s current position in queue and the queue’s serving rate, a tenant is able to make the correct decision of balking and reneging, and thereby mitigate most losses caused by excessive waiting in case of request congestion. The information about reneging rates in addition provides only insignificant improvement – one reason could be that after a rational balking, the reneging rate generally remains on a low level and therefore has little impact. In contrast, when provided with only insufficient information, especially in the case of blindness, most tenants cannot benefit from their impatient behavior, but even likely lose more than they will do by simply waiting with patience.

C. Distribution of Reneging Time

In Sec. III-A we have theoretically proved the applicability of various classical models of balking statistics in the slice admission control scenario upon different distributions of the slice lifetime $\tau$. The distribution of reneging time in SAC, however, is relatively challenging to derive analytically.

To evaluate the applicability of existing reneging models, we execute two additional simulations, for each 1000 times Monte-Carlo test are carried out. For both simulations, the environment is configured to the same specifications listed in Tab. I and the tenants possess full knowledge of the queuing system. In the first simulation, each test simulates 400 operations periods, where the MNO is always fixed to a random admission strategy that $\varphi = [2, 1]$ for all $s \in A$. In the second simulation, the MNO is set to a random admission strategy in every Monte-Carlo test. We observe the waiting time of all reneged requests, the obtained results are illustrated in Fig. [3]. Generally, in both simulations and for both slice types, the maximal waiting time before reneging exhibits an exponential distribution, which supports applying the classical model proposed in [9] to simplify queue models from the MNO’s perspective.

D. Further Discussion

Certainly, when fed with knowledge of the queues, tenants may be more encouraged to balk or renege from densely congested queues of slice requests, which leads to a decrease in amount of awaiting slice requests. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the phenomena of balking and reneging are only significant when the queues are considerably long. In this case, the MNO’s resources are already sufficiently utilized, and the utilization rate is hardly impacted by the impatience of tenants. On the other hand, if lack of information about the queues, as we have demonstrated in Sec. IV-B, tenants can suffer from high probability of loss in business. This will, self-evidently, suppress the tenants’ interest for the MNO’s slice service in long term, which leads to a loss of customers from the MNO’s
TABLE II: Tenant profits in 400 operation periods under different balking/reneging strategies. “Patient” is the benchmark strategy where no balking or reneging takes place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Total Profit ($\times 10^3$)</th>
<th>Mean Profit</th>
<th>Profiting Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>-37.06</td>
<td>-67.97</td>
<td>11.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness</td>
<td>-111.231</td>
<td>-8586.10</td>
<td>-27.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = 0.05$</td>
<td>-1082.35</td>
<td>-5299.60</td>
<td>-29.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = 0.5$</td>
<td>-714.00</td>
<td>-3282.84</td>
<td>-38.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = 5$</td>
<td>-97.64</td>
<td>-772.49</td>
<td>-12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of current position ($\Delta K = 3$)</td>
<td>-55.59</td>
<td>-17.85</td>
<td>-11.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of mean waiting time</td>
<td>+4.21</td>
<td>+7.78</td>
<td>+9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of current position and serving rate</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td>9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full knowledge</td>
<td>+4.42</td>
<td>+8.13</td>
<td>+9.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3: The distribution of tenant requests’ maximal waiting time in the scenario of multi-queue slice admission control.

V. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this paper we have studied the impatient behavior of 5G network slice tenants in the multi-queue slice admission control scenario. We have derived the rational behavior models of tenants in different cases of knowledge, and demonstrated the applicability of some classical statistical balking/reneging models in the discussed scenario. Our result encourages the MNO to publish information of its queues to the awaiting tenants for the good of both MNO and tenants.

As an outlook, the statistical balking/reneging models that are proven applicable for SlaaS can be taken into account for the design and optimization of MNO’s admission strategy.
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