

Engineering and Experimentally Benchmarking a Container-based Edge Computing System

Francisco Carpio, Marta Delgado and Admela Jukan

Technische Universität Braunschweig, Germany, Email:{f.carpio, m.delgado, a.jukan}@tu-bs.de

Abstract—While edge computing is envisioned to superbly serve latency sensitive applications, the implementation-based studies benchmarking its performance are few and far between. To address this gap, we engineer a modular edge cloud computing system architecture that is built on latest advances in containerization techniques, including Kafka, for data streaming, Docker, as application platform, and Firebase Cloud, as realtime database system. We benchmark the performance of the system in terms of scalability, resource utilization and latency by comparing three scenarios: cloud-only, edge-only and combined edge-cloud. The measurements show that edge-only solution outperforms other scenarios only when deployed with data located at one edge only, i.e., without edge computing wide data synchronization. In case of applications requiring data synchronization through the cloud, edge-cloud scales around a factor 10 times better than cloud-only, until certain number of concurrent users in the system, and above this point, cloud-only scales better. In terms of resource utilization, we observe that whereas the mean utilization increases linearly with the number of user requests, the maximum values for the memory and the network I/O heavily increase when with an increasing amount of data.

Index Terms—edge computing, cloud, IoT, networking

I. INTRODUCTION

Edge computing systems are emerging today as the solution to bringing cloud capabilities closer to the users thus not only reducing the latency as perceived by users, but also the network traffic to remote cloud data centers. The latest advances on lightweight virtualization (LV) techniques in form of containers and serverless computing are especially gaining traction in edge computing. Unlike the Kernel-Based Virtual Machines (KVM) commonly used in the cloud, containers do not require manual server administration before launching the apps, and are used as standalone and self-contained software packages that include all the code and related dependencies necessary to run the app. In addition, container platform solutions, such as Docker, are platform independent, just like KVMs, allowing to execute apps independently from the operating system. As the name implies, lightweight virtualization techniques are also able to run on constrained devices, such as Raspberry Pis, making them a highly relevant IoT solution.

When engineering an edge computing system, the issue about how to interconnect distributed localities of computing nodes comes into play, and the performance of the resulting system needs to be benchmarked in terms of latency, resource utilization and scalability. While it is widely assumed that edge

computing outperforms the cloud in terms of latency, when engineering a real edge computing system, this performance advantage is not given, or obvious. In fact, many theoretical studies have pointed out that edge computing would show better latency as long as sufficient inter-edge bandwidth and computing edge capabilities are provisioned, which has not been tested real world systems yet. In regard to the basic performance metrics, including latency, resource utilization and scalability, there are still open questions regarding to the real advantages that edge computing solutions can bring.

We engineer to this end an edge and cloud system architecture with open source software using Kafka at the edge for data streaming, Docker as application platform and Firebase as realtime cloud database system. We then experimentally benchmark the performance in terms of scalability, latency and resource utilization, in scenarios where large number of amount of concurrent jobs in the system are sending data concurrently. We compare three scenarios: cloud-only, edge-only and combined edge-cloud. The results indicate that edge-only case performs the best in terms of latency, as long as the application does not require data synchronization between edge nodes. Otherwise, edge-cloud solution is a better option until certain number of concurrent users in the system and a certain amount of data; above that point, there is a clear disadvantage as compared to cloud-only. The resource utilization measurements show that the mean utilization is not affected by the amount of data and only the maximum values for the memory and network I/O increase with the number of users when sending larger amounts of data.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II presents related work. Section III describes the system architecture. The Section IV shows the performance evaluation of the proposed system and Section V concludes the paper.

II. RELATED WORK

Edge computing is envisioned to computing, processing and storing data as close as possible to the source of the data, which is critical to IoT systems [1], [2]. Especially in the resource constrained edge computing, traditional Kernel-Based Virtual Machines (KVM) have already been replaced by lightweight virtualization solutions [3]. Different lightweight virtualization technologies, most notably containers or unikernels, are used today as underlying tools to facilitating the fast adoption of edge computing [4]. Despite significant engineering challenges, including resource constraints, resilience and security [5], [6], the LV solutions have been shown to exhibit

This work has been partially performed in the framework of mF2C project funded by the European Union's H2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement 730929.

model currently used by major industries (including Netflix, Airbnb, Microsoft, LinkedIn). With Kafka, in comparison with traditional AMQP or MQTT, while the broker is not able to track the messages received that have been acknowledged by the consumers, it is possible to achieve high throughput by ingesting a large amount of data very quickly; for instance, Kafka is proven to manage more than 20 million of events per second in Netflix's system¹. This tool together with processing tools like Apache Spark becomes a powerful data processing solution.

B. The Aggregator

Since Kafka keeps track of all sent messages by persistent storage, and is also built to run as a cluster, that can expand or contract, where data is replicated internally to provide high availability and fault-tolerance, it is often considered a database system. On the other hand, Kafka is usually not used as a replacement of traditional database systems, but as support acting as commit log. In this context, an interface is required between Kafka and the database system, which we engineer herewith as Aggregator. The Aggregator is developed in Java a consist of a Kafka consumer that is subscribed to all topics which data need to be stored in the database. Since all data exchange in our system follows the JSON specification where every message contains one JSON object, the Aggregator only requires an identification field for every exchanged object. These objects are then stored into the database through the Firebase Admin SDK that the Aggregator also incorporates.

C. Data Storage and Synchronization

As previously mentioned, our system relies on a Firebase real-time database system specifically designed to maintain data synchronization among multiple clients. This database is NoSQL, and instead uses JSON trees structures to store data, which provides more scalability and full flexibility when defining data structures as compared to traditional SQL-based databases. The selection of Firebase database system rather than other NoSQL available ones is basically because of the ability of maintaining all clients synchronized automatically removing the effort of developing periodic queries to the database. There is also another feature that makes Firebase a suitable option for our architecture, which is the ability of working in offline mode. Since the Aggregator uses the Admin SDK, it first stores the data locally and later synchronizes in best effort mode to the cloud and to other clients. These features provide high flexibility to the Aggregator which is now able to work not only on devices with reliable connectivity, but also on mobile devices with intermittent connectivity.

IV. PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Let us now introduce the testbed and the parameters used to perform the tests and benchmark the performance. The testbed

consists of two local desktop computers (both with i5-7600 CPU, 16GB of RAM and SSD SanDisk X400 up to 540 and 520 MBps of reading and writing speeds, respectively), one desktop running as edge node and the other one as tester node. Each computer has two Gigabit Ethernet interfaces, where, in both cases, one is connected externally with 1 Gbps downlink and 500 Mbps uplink, and another one is used for the interconnection between the two machines. The computer running as edge node is running three Docker containers: the Aggregator, Kafka broker and Zookeeper. The computer used for the tests runs a Java application with a Firebase client and Kafka consumer to receive data either from the cloud or from the Kafka Broker depending on the scenario, and also stores the results of the measurements. In the same machine, a Python script sends data with JSON format to either the edge node using a Kafka producer or to the cloud using HTTP requests. In the Cloud, we have a Firebase realtime database (located in Western Europe) that will store the data sent by the Aggregator and will notify to the connected clients, in our case the Java app running on the tester node. With these two machines and the cloud, we evaluate three different scenarios shown in Fig. 2. In cloud-only scenario (see Fig. 2a), the tester node performs the tests by sending HTTP requests to the cloud endpoint and uses the firebase client to receive the updates asynchronously as soon as they are stored in the database. In edge-only scenario (see Fig. 2b), the tester node sends and receives data to and from the edge node using one Kafka producer and one Kafka consumer. In a combined edge-cloud scenario (see Fig. 2c), the tester node sends data to the edge node using the Kafka producer and receive the updated data from the cloud using the Firebase client.

To benchmark the system, we performed tests to measure the total latency of the system since the tester node sends data until the data is received in the same machine. The scalability is measured in terms of how many concurrent users (i.e., processes) the system support until the latency is too high that the system becomes unusable. We also benchmark the resource utilization, including CPU, memory and network utilization that are required by the containers running on the edge node when performing the tests. For the different tests, the tester node simulates different number of users (i.e., processes), from 100 to 1000, by opening threats and sending different payload sizes depending on each case. Every user individually sends 1000 requests with inter-arrival time following a normal distribution with mean value 1 second. For each test, the database is deleted and the containers at the edge node restarted in order to delete any data from previous tests.

A. Latency

To show the latency results, we use violin plots (which represents the probability density of the data as well as makers for median and interquartile range when possible) and cumulative distribution function (CDF). We then compare the results for all three scenarios previously described. Fig. 3 and Fig. 4 show the latency of the system for different number of users (i.e., processes) when performing requests with 1 KB and

¹S. Uttamchandani (2018, March 12). Lessons learnt from Netflix Keystone Pipeline handling trillions of daily messages. Retrieved from <https://quickbooks-engineering.intuit.com/lessons-learnt-from-netflix-keystone-pipeline-with-trillions-of-daily-messages-64cc91b3c8ea>




Fig. 2: Test scenarios

10 KB of payload data, respectively, in the scenarios described in Fig. 2.


Starting with the cloud-only scenario, Fig. 3a and Fig. 4a show the violin plots when the payload data size is 1KB and 10KB, respectively. From these measurements, we can observe that the increment in the number of users in the system increases exponentially the average latency. This trend is more evident above 500 concurrent users when sending 1KB and 300 users when sending 10KB. The latency distribution, with 400 users or less, when using 1KB, and with 200 users or less, when using 10KB, is similar in both cases. The main point to note here is the fact that above 500 and 300 users, respectively, the points are less concentrated around the median, but spread between the maximum and minimum values. This behavior can be explained by the fact that the cloud-only scenario starts getting overloaded at the values of around 300 concurrent users, and the response times may vary for every request, independently. Since this behavior is more or less similar by either sending 1KB or 10KB, the reason behind is the way that Firebase manages concurrent HTTP requests and less so because of the amount of data sent. The difference between the amount of data sent can be, however, appreciated by comparing the average values between both cases of data size, being 10KB size clearly higher than with 1KB. The final point to consider from these results is the fact that the results for 10KB are highly polarized as compared to the case with 1KB. This shows how sending more data concurrently with every request impacts on the variation of the response time of a request. This behavior can be better observed by comparing Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b where the CDF shows how the latency for 10KB case is clearly affected above 300 users, which is not for the case of 1KB of data.

Fig. 3b and Fig. 4b shows the latency results when considering the edge-only scenario described in Fig. 2b. In this case, the results for 1KB of payload data size do not exhibit large differences with varying number of users. For the case of data with 10 KB, there is clear increment of the median above 400 users. The latter case also affects the distribution of the latency measurements. Again, this behavior can be better observed by comparing Fig. 5c and Fig. 5d where for more


than 400 users, the CDF is more affected as compared to the case when only 1KB of data is sent. In Fig. 3c and Fig. 4c, we again show the latency, but in this case for the combined edge-cloud scenario described in Fig. 2c. Here, the behavior is quite different depending of the payload size and for different number of users. For 1KB size, the results between 100 and 600 users are similar, and above 600, the latency exponentially increases with the number of users (i.e., processes). For the case of sending 10KB, the same behavior can be observed but for over 200 users. The latter case is interesting since the results are not concentrated around the median, but spread out between the minimum and maximum values. Again, in Fig. 5e and Fig. 5f we can observe better the difference in the the number of users affected in both cases.

B. Scalability


By comparing all three scenarios, we can observe that edge-only case scales better than the other two cases for any number of users, with around 1 second of latency in the worst case scenario. This is because, while in this case the data is also synchronized to the cloud, the tests are being measured just between the tester node and the edge node. Therefore here, we see a clear advantage of using fast data stream tools such as Kafka, which can heavily reduce the latency as perceived by the end user, with data synchronized with the cloud. This, however, does not show, for instance, the latency that two users located in different locations would perceive when the data has to travel over the network. This case can be only measured by using either cloud-only or edge-cloud scenarios where the latency is measured after cloud synchronization. Then, by comparing these two cases, we see how edge-cloud outperforms cloud-only when the system has 600 users or less for 1KB of data, and 200 or less when for 10KB of data. This behavior is quite interesting since it would be more natural to expect that edge-cloud is always slower than cloud-only by the sheer fact the data is forwarded using Kafka and the Aggregator, which intuitively adds extra latency. The reasoning behind this interesting behavior is that the Aggregator and Kafka act as a buffer for the data and are more optimally synchronized with the cloud, at least until certain amount of




(a) cloud-only - 1KB payload size




(a) cloud-only - 10KB payload size




(b) edge-only - 1KB payload size



(b) edge-only - 10KB payload size



(c) edge-cloud - 1KB payload size



(c) edge-cloud - 10KB payload size

Fig. 3: Latency with 1KB versus num. of users and scenarios.

Fig. 4: Latency with 10KB versus num. of users and scenarios.

concurrent request and amount of data. Above that level (700 users sending 1KB or 300 sending 10KB), edge-cloud does not scale anymore, getting latency values between 10 and 100 seconds for 1KB, and between 10 seconds and 1000 seconds for 10KB. In the cloud-only case, the system scales well for 1KB case up to 600 users, and for 10KB case up to 300 users. Above these values, the latency can reach up to 10 seconds, which is the point where we can assume that the system does not scale anymore and becomes practically unusable.

C. Resource Utilization

Since the objective of our experimental study is also to show the feasibility of edge-cloud systems realized with common-purpose hardware, we now provide measurements on resources utilized by the edge node when running the tests. Because the edge node is running three different containers, we use Docker stats command to retrieve the the status of all three containers which are combined and stored in an output file every second. Fig. 6a shows the mean, maximum and mini-

mum CPU utilization for all number of users and both payload data sizes. It should be noted here that Docker considers 100% utilization when 1 core is fully utilized, so results above 100% mean that more cores have been used. Here, we can see how the mean value slightly increases with the number of users, with the case of 10KB being larger than 1KB in all cases. The maximum values are in both cases similar, and are progressively increasing from 100 to 400 users, and later stabilized at around 600 users. The memory utilization is shown in Fig. 6b. Here we can observe that the mean value slightly increases with the number of users, but the maximum value for the case of 10KB increases heavily with the number of users. This is due to the excessive memory usage that the Aggregator requires from the moment of the broker receiving the data until the data is stored into the database and removed from the memory. Since these intervals are short in time, they affects the maximum values but not to the mean values. Fig. 6c shows the results for the network input/output (I/O), whereby in this case both input and output are the same. This is due




Fig. 5: CDF for latency for different number of users, payload size and scenarios.

to all three containers combined, and for all data received are sent out again. In this case, we can observe the pattern similar to the memory measurements, whereby the maximum value for the 10KB case heavily increases with the number of users, from around 1GB of data transmitted to 6GB, which is in line to what we could also observe in memory measurements.

V. CONCLUSIONS

While edge computing is expected to be the solution for latency sensitive applications that require high intensive processing tasks, it is always an open question of whether a real-world edge computing system implementation can achieve the performance forseen. We engineered a modular edge cloud computing system architecture using the latest advances on containerization platforms and open source tools and show the challenges and importance of benchmarking latency, scalability and resource utilization in edge computing. We compared experimentally three scenarios: cloud-only, edge-only and edge-cloud. The measurements showed that while edge-only outperforms other cases in terms of latency and scalability, it also requires the app to work with data located at centralized edge nodes. Edge-cloud performs around 10




Fig. 6: Resource utilization at the edge node.

times better compared to only-cloud until certain number of concurrent processes where the system does not scale anymore, and only-cloud performs better. Finally, for resource utilization the maximum memory and network I/O increase heavily with increasing amounts of data and concurrent users.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Pan and J. McElhannon, "Future Edge Cloud and Edge Computing for Internet of Things Applications," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 439–449, 2018.
- [2] E. Zeydan, E. Bastug, M. Bennis, M. A. Kader, I. A. Karatepe, A. S. Er, and M. Debbah, "Big data caching for networking: Moving from cloud to edge," *IEEE Communications Magazine*, vol. 54, no. 9, pp. 36–42, 2016.
- [3] F. Ramalho and A. Neto, "Virtualization at the network edge: A performance comparison," *WoWMoM 2016 - 17th International Symposium on a World of Wireless, Mobile and Multimedia Networks*, pp. 1–6, 2016.
- [4] R. Morabito, V. Cozzolino, A. Y. Ding, N. Beijar, and J. Ott, "Consolidate IoT Edge Computing with Lightweight Virtualization," *IEEE Network*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 102–111, 2018.
- [5] R. Morabito, "Virtualization on internet of things edge devices with container technologies: A performance evaluation," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 8835–8850, 2017.
- [6] M. Caprolu, R. Di Pietro, F. Lombardi, and S. Raponi, "Edge Computing Perspectives: Architectures, Technologies, and Open Security Issues," *2019 IEEE International Conference on Edge Computing (EDGE)*, pp. 116–123, 2019.
- [7] B. I. Ismail, E. Mostajeran Goortani, M. B. Ab Karim, W. Ming Tat, S. Setapa, J. Y. Luke, and O. Hong Hoe, "Evaluation of Docker as Edge computing platform," *ICOS 2015 - 2015 IEEE Conference on Open Systems*, pp. 130–135, 2016.
- [8] P. Bellavista and A. Zanni, "Feasibility of fog computing deployment based on docker containerization over RaspberryPi," *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*, 2017.
- [9] A. Palade, A. Kazmi, and S. Clarke, "An Evaluation of Open Source Serverless Computing Frameworks Support at the Edge," *2019 IEEE World Congress on Services (SERVICES)*, vol. 2642-939X, pp. 206–211, 2019.
- [10] J. Dizdarević, F. Carpio, A. Jukan, and X. Masip-Bruin, "A Survey of Communication Protocols for Internet of Things and Related Challenges of Fog and Cloud Computing Integration," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1–29, 2019.