FaaSten Your Decisions: Classification Framework and Technology Review of Function-as-a-Service Platforms

Vladimir Yussupov[a], Jacopo Soldani[b], Uwe Breitenbücher[a], Antonio Brogi[b], Frank Leymann[a]

[a] *Institute of Architecture of Application Systems, University of Stuttgart, Germany*
[b] *Department of Computer Science, University of Pisa, Italy*

arXiv:2004.00969v1 [cs.SE] 1 Apr 2020

Abstract

Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) is a cloud service model enabling developers to offload event-driven executable snippets of code. The execution and management of such functions becomes a FaaS provider's responsibility, hereby included their on-demand provisioning and automatic scaling. Key enablers for this cloud service model are FaaS platforms, e.g., AWS Lambda, Microsoft Azure Functions or OpenFaaS. At the same time, the choice of the most appropriate FaaS platform for deploying and running a serverless application is not trivial, as various organizational and technical aspects have to be taken into account. In this work, we present (i) a FaaS platform classification framework derived using a mixed method study and (ii) a systematic technology review of the ten most prominent FaaS platforms, based on the proposed classification framework. Moreover, we present (iii) a FaaS platform selection support system, called FaaSten, which helps researchers and practitioners to choose the FaaS platform most suited for their requirements.

Keywords: Serverless, Function-as-a-Service, FaaS, Platform, Classification Framework, Technology Review

1. Introduction

In the context of cloud computing, the term *serverless* is typically used to describe a paradigm focusing on cloud architectures that comprise provider-managed components [1]. From the developer's perspective, the decreased control over the infrastructure gives the impression that servers are no longer needed, whereas in fact servers become a provider's burden. One exemplary serverless use case is when different non-managed component types, e.g., Database-as-a-Service and Software-as-a-Service, are combined to implement a Backend-as-a-Service [2].

Function-as-a-Service (FaaS) is a cloud service model enabling the hosting of business logic in a serverless fashion, which makes this model an essential instrument for developing serverless applications. By deploying event-driven, stateless and often short-lived functions to FaaS platforms, developers outsource the maintenance efforts to the corresponding platform provider. As a consequence, functions are automatically scaled without any imposed limits on the amount of new instances. Moreover, in case functions are no longer needed, they are scaled to zero instances, hence eliminating the need to pay for idle application components unlike in other service models that continuously run components, e.g., Platform-as-a-Service [3].

The FaaS service model started gaining a lot of attention after the release of AWS Lambda [4] in 2015, which started the overall serverless trend. Afterwards, all major cloud providers introduced their FaaS offerings including notable examples such as Microsoft Azure Functions [5], Google Cloud Functions [6], and IBM Cloud Functions [7], with the latter based on the open source FaaS platforms Apache OpenWhisk [8]. The landscape of open source FaaS platforms is also blooming: Various alternatives such as OpenFaaS [9], Apache OpenWhisk [8], Kubeless [10], or Knative [11] are being actively developed and maintained by the community.

However, in most cases the FaaS programming model is the only common denominator for all available offerings since the underlying technical platform characteristics and supported feature sets vary significantly. For example, one of the main strength of proprietary FaaS platforms lies in the out-of-the-box integration with provider-specific services, which is typically not the case for open source platform offerings. For instance, AWS Lambda can natively be combined with Amazon SQS to use message queues as sources triggering function execution. In contrast, open source platforms such as Kubeless or OpenFaaS provide a more portable way to develop serverless applications. They indeed reduce platform lock-in, favouring more portable serverless applications that are not locked into specific cloud offerings, e.g., by relying on based on Kubernetes [12], a portable application orchestrator, rather than on Amazon's or Microsoft's clouds.

As a result, choosing the most suitable platform becomes a decision problem involving multiple different di-

Email addresses: yussupov@iaas.uni-stuttgart.de (Vladimir Yussupov), soldani@di.unipi.it (Jacopo Soldani), breitenbuecher@iaas.uni-stuttgart.de (Uwe Breitenbücher), brogi@di.unipi.it (Antonio Brogi), leymann@iaas.uni-stuttgart.de (Frank Leymann)

mensions, which affect both the high-level business perspective of project managers and the low-level technical perspective of application developers and operators. For instance, high-level requirements include the license used by a FaaS platform, which heavily influence the choice of the platform when the latter is intended to be incorporated as an internal task-scheduling component for a company's product. Various low-level technical details have to be analyzed too, which might become a serious obstacle for deciding which platform to choose. Examples of such technicalities are available event source integrations, platform-supported tooling, or restrictions on function execution times or on supported language runtimes.

Our objective here is precisely to provide a way to uniformly classify FaaS platforms with the goal of simplifying the decision-making process for specialists with different levels of responsibilities, i.e., managers and technical specialists. To come up with an efficient classification mechanism, we conducted a mixed method study which combines the results from a systematic literature review and the documentation analysis of existing platforms to derive a *FaaS Platform Classification Framework*, which we present as the first contribution of this paper.

Our classification framework clearly distinguishes between two views: (i) the *business* view of project managers and (ii) the *technical* view of developers and operators. These two different views can help organisations in choosing the FaaS platform best suited for their requirements, with the *business* view helping project managers to first select the subset of FaaS platforms complying with the project and business requirements with a high-level analysis, and without delving into all technicalities of the platforms themselves. Complementarily, the *technical* view can then be exploited by the technical specialists working on the development and operation of a FaaS-based project to analyze the technical features of FaaS platforms, while at the same time focusing *only* on those already complying with the project and business requirements.

Based on our classification framework, we conducted a *FaaS Platform Technology Review*, which constitues the second contribution of this paper. The technology review classifies and compares the ten most popular FaaS Platforms, i.e., the three most used proprietary platforms and the seven highest-ranked open source platforms. Notably, our review provides a first systematic knowledge base that managers and DevOps can exploit to choose the platform best suited for their requirements.

To further support the selection process, we also provide a *FaaS Platform Selection Support System*, called FaaStener, constituting the third contribution of this paper. FaaStener is an open source web-based application exploiting the results of our technology review and enabling to search for FaaS platforms through multi-attribute queries. This enables, for example, to look for platforms with a certain license and supporting given monitoring and logging solutions.

To summarise, the main contributions of this paper are threefold:

(i) A *FaaS Platform Classification Framework*, which enables characterising FaaS platforms under two different perspectives, i.e., the high-level business view of FaaS project managers, and the low-level technical view of application developers and operators.

(ii) A *FaaS Platform Technology Review* of the ten most popular FaaS platforms, i.e., the three most used commercial platforms and the seven highest-ranked open source platforms. The review exploits our classification framework to provide a characterisation of the investigated platforms under both the business and the technical perspectives.

(iii) A *FaaS Platform Selection Support System* in the form of a web-based application called FaaStener, which enables researchers and practitioners to look for the FaaS platforms most suited for the requirements of their serverless projects and to browse through the systematic knowledge base formed by our technology review.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides background on FaaS and related technologies. Section 3 illustrates the reseach approach for conducting our study. Section 4 introduces the *FaaS Platform Classification Framework*. Section 5 presents the *FaaS Platform Technology Review*, while Section 6 illustrates the *FaaS Platform Selection Support System* materialising the results of the review. Section 7 and Section 8 discuss potential threats to the validity of our study and related work, respectively. Section 9 finally draws concluding remarks.

2. Background

The popularity of serverless computing started to rise after Amazon introduced its FaaS platform offering called AWS Lambda [4]. While the term *serverless* was also used previously in other contexts, it gained most popularity in the context of cloud-native application development [13]. Essentially, serverless applications are composed of components that are managed by third-parties, which significantly reduces control over the infrastructure, thus, minimizing management efforts [2].

Function-as-a-Service is an integral part of the serverless world as it enables hosting business logic in the form of functions that are typically stateless and driven by events. This means that the deployed function code can be triggered by events originating from multiple heterogeneous event sources such as databases, message queues, or streaming platforms. Moreover, functions can be exposed as HTTP endpoints via API Gateways, or invoked on a scheduled basis, e.g., using cron jobs. The actual list of supported event sources and possible ways to integrate events from third party services depends on the employed

FaaS platform. Since the provider is responsible for managing functions, autoscaling comes out-of-the-box, also including scaling to zero instances when functions are not needed. This introduces a new, more flexible cost model, where users do not need to pay for idle components as for Platform-as-a-Service deployments. However, in some cases the costs might become less appealing than with classic cloud service models [14]. Moreover, aside from its benefits, FaaS also has some well-known limitations [15] such as the cold start issue, limited execution time which might also vary on different FaaS platforms, or tighter-coupling with provider's specifics due to outsourced management efforts [16]. However, the combination of the above mentioned properties and limitations is what essentially affects the ways how FaaS platforms need to be chosen.

The FaaS technology landscape comprises a variety of heterogeneous platforms, which are offered as-a-service, or can be installed on-premises. For example, Microsoft introduced Azure Functions [5] while IBM started offering its Cloud Functions [7] based on the open source FaaS platform Apache Openwhisk [8]. The landscape of open source FaaS platforms started to evolve rapidly too, also due to the popularity of container orchestration brought by Kubernetes [12]. Multiple open source products such as OpenFaaS [9], Kubeless [10], or Fission [17] that provide serverless, FaaS-based application development experience on top of Kubernetes. Typically, since functions are event-driven, FaaS platforms can be integrated with multiple possible event sources such as databases, messaging and streaming platforms, or provider-specific services such as AWS Alexa [18]. As a result of this heterogeneity, there is an ongoing work on maintaining the list of available technologies with high-level details such as web-site and documentation pointers curated by the Cloud Native Computing Foundation (CNCF) [19]. Moreover, CNCF is also curating the work on standardization of event specification format called CloudEvents [20].

3. Research Method

In this section, we first recap terminology for core concepts related to the world of serverless and FaaS, which we use throughout this paper. We then proceed by describing the research method's steps.

3.1. Terminology

In this section, we define the serverless- and FaaS-related terminology used in the subsequent sections.

Function-as-a-Service Platform / FaaS Platform. We use the term *FaaS Platform* to describe an environment that enables deploying, managing, and observing function instances, similar to the notion of a FaaS platform used in the CNCF Serverless Landscape [19]. This definition also covers FaaS platforms that require a specific underlying platform, e.g., when a platform must run on top of a container orchestration platform such as Kubernetes, since these kinds of restrictions do not influence the overall purpose of the given product, i.e., to enable the usage of user-provided functions in a serverless fashion.

Event. We base our the definition of an *event* on the CloudEvents specification by CNCF. More precisely, by using the term *event* we mean a data record capturing an occurrence of a particular fact in a software system during its operating time [20].

Event Source. As for events, we rely on the definition from CloudEvents specification [20], i.e., an *event source* is the context where events happen, e.g., a remote database.

Function. We base our definition of a *function* on the definition from the serverless whitepaper by CNCF [2]. We use the term function to describe an executable snippet of code which can be hosted on the FaaS platform and triggered by events originating from supported event sources, or invoked directly, e.g., via programmatic access provided by available client libraries.

Serverless Application. The term *serverless application* is used to describe a combination of one or more functions that interact with a set of resources managed by third parties such as cloud providers or other external as-a-service offerings. Essentially, a serverless application represents a logical grouping of resources and functions in particular, which facilitates, e.g., versioning for development and deployment of applications.

Function Orchestrator. To describe a specialized software that enables composing multiple functions by means of workflows, we use the term *function orchestrator*. This definition is related only to specialized products explicitly tailored for FaaS, e.g., AWS Step Functions [21] or Azure Durable Functions [22], and does not include general-purpose workflow engines such as Apache ODE.

Function Marketplace. We use the term *Function Marketplace* to describe dedicated marketplace platforms for offering functions and FaaS-based applications that are distributed by third parties under proprietary or open source licenses for commercial and non-commercial use, e.g., applications that represent a common serverless use case and can be purchased for educational or development purposes. A function marketplace is managed by a marketplace provider, who also defines packaging and description formats of marketplace's products, for instance. A notable example of function marketplace is the AWS Serverless Application Repository (AWS SAR) [23].

Code Samples Repository. A *Code Samples Repository* is a publicly-available and officially-maintained collection of function and application examples developed for a given FaaS platform, which can be used as a training material or reused for application development. Unlike function marketplaces, code samples are always distributed under




Figure 1: The sequence of steps to derive the FaaS Platforms Classification Framework

open source licenses and typically provided as-is. Technically, it might be a standalone repository or a part of the main platform's repository maintained by the community or the platform producer, e.g., function examples stored in a *examples* folder with the platform repository.

3.2. Research Method's Steps

Figure 1 shows the multi-step process we followed based on a combination of academic literature review and documentation analysis. As an initial step we analyzed existing academic publications that focus on criteria-based review of FaaS platforms and we derived an initial FaaS platform classification framework. Afterwards, we selected ten existing FaaS platfoms, we analyzed them, and we refined the initial classification framework based on the newly-discovered data, and used it for the review of these platforms. In the following, we elaborate on the research method's design.

3.2.1. Step 1: Academic Literature Review

To derive a classification framework that covers both academic and industrial views on FaaS platforms, as a first step, we analyzed the existing literature that focuses on reviewing Function-as-a-Service platforms by searching the initial set of publications using well-known electronic research databases, namely ACM Digital Library, arXiv.org, Google Scholar, IEEE Xplore, Springer Link, Science Direct and Wiley Online Library.

Selection criteria. To identify publications relevant to FaaS platforms analysis and comparison, we defined a set of selection criteria. The initial dataset was screened by the authors using adaptive reading depth [24] to identify publications' relevance. We defined the inclusion (✓) and exclusion (×) criteria as follows:

- ✓ Publications that evaluate and compare existing FaaS platforms and function orchestration technologies.
- ✓ Publications that are written in English.
- × Publications not accessible as full-text or not in the form of a full research paper, e.g. extended abstract, presentation, tutorial, PhD research proposal, demo paper, as they do not provide enough details.

As a result, we identified five [25, 26, 27, 28, 29] relevant publications after applying the selection criteria to the identified initial set of publications.

Snowballing and Combination. As additional means to identify relevant literature, we applied the snowballing technique [30]. More specifically, we used Google Scholar for forward snowballing, i.e., analyzed all research papers that cite each of the selected publication, and applied closed recursive backward snowballing, i.e., analyzed all research papers cited by each of the selected publication. Afterwards, we applied the selection criteria defined previously in Section 3.2.1, which lead to the identification of six additional publications [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. Due to the relatively small amount of relevant publications (11 in total), the combination step was not necessary.

3.2.2. Step 2: Derive Initial Classification Framework

To derive an initial classification framework, we used the keywording technique [37]. The overal process is as follows: (1) at least two researchers separately analyzed each publication from the selected set to identify common concepts and define keywords for them. (2) The resulting keywords were discussed and clustered to form the initial classification framework. At this stage we had a set of generic, high-level categories, e.g., *Licensing*, *Installation*, *Documentation*, *Development*, *Interfaces*, and *Observability*, each coming with a set of concrete criteria. For example, *Observability* included *Logging* and *Monitoring* categories, which listed supported tooling and available integration mechanisms for adding new tools.

3.2.3. Step 3: Search and Select Relevant FaaS Platforms

As a next step, we selected ten relevant general-purpose FaaS platforms for subsequent refinement of our initial classification framework. We defined the following requirements that had to be fulfilled by a FaaS platform to be included for the documentation analysis:

- ✓ A platform must be *general-purpose*, meaning that it should not tailored for a specific use case (e.g., training AI models).
- ✓ A platform has to be *actively-maintained*, i.e., there exist one or more parties consistently contributing towards new platform releases and the code repository is not stale or archived.

We structured the overall process of searching and selecting relevant FaaS platforms using approaches from existing work, e.g., search engine hits analysis [38].

Phase 1: Platforms Search. To select relevant FaaS platforms, we used white and gray literature sources, namely the list of platforms reviewed in the publications chosen during the literature review step described in Section 3.2.1,

Table 1: List of selected FaaS platforms (sorted alphabetically).

FaaS Platform	Documentation Sources
Apache Openwhisk	`https://openwhisk.apache.org`, `https://github.com/apache/openwhisk`
AWS Lambda	`https://docs.aws.amazon.com/lambda`
Fission	`https://docs.fission.io`, `https://github.com/fission/fission`
Fn	`https://fnproject.io/`, `https://github.com/fnproject`
Google Cloud Functions	`https://cloud.google.com/functions/docs`
Knative	`https://knative.dev/docs`, `https://github.com/knative`
Kubeless	`https://kubeless.io/docs`, `https://github.com/kubeless`
MS Azure Functions	`https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/azure-functions`, `https://github.com/Azure/Azure-Functions`
Nuclio	`https://nuclio.io/docs`, `https://github.com/nuclio/nuclio`
OpenFaaS	`https://docs.openfaas.com`, `https://github.com/openfaas/faas`

and the serverless landscape [19] maintained by CNCF that describes the platforms and tooling related to serverless computing. We aggregated the lists of platforms obtained from both sources while checking if the aforementioned inclusion criteria are fulfilled to ensure that we do not miss relevant platforms. For example, we excluded Snafu [39], a research prototype evaluated in one of the publications as it is not a general-purpose and actively-maintained FaaS platform (no commits in the last 2 years). Afterwards, we sorted the remaining platforms by popularity using separate criteria for hosted and installable platforms (described next), and apply the *effort bounded* stopping criteria [40] by selecting ten platforms in total.

Phase 2: Platforms Selection. A first crucial selection aspect is how to decide on proper ratio between commercial and open source platforms. It is important to mention that at the moment of writing CNCF serverless landscape lists 33 FaaS platforms, 19 of which are hosted (mostly closed-source) and 14 are installable and open source. With the aim of putting more emphasis on open source installable FaaS platforms, which source code is publicly available and which can be installed on premises, we decided to cover 50% of them, i.e., seven open source installable FaaS platforms. Taking into account our bounded effort stopping criteria [40], according to which we limited our analysis to ten FaaS platforms, we hence decided to analyse three commercial platforms and seven open source platforms.

To pick the most representative commercial and open source FaaS platforms, we then decided to select the most popular of them. We used different popularity quantifiers for commercial and open source platforms since (i) commercial platforms typically have popularity quantifiers, like quantity of search engine hits or Stackoverflow questions, which are higher with respect to those of open source platforms by orders of magnitude, (ii) such popularity quantifiers can also be misleading for open source platforms, as their name may not be branded and correspond to other projects, and (iii) the developers' interest in open source platforms can be estimated by analyzing publicly available source code-related metrics, while commercial platforms are typically proprietary closed-source products maintained by one party, e.g., AWS Lambda.

We searched for the three most popular commercial FaaS platforms by sorting commercial platforms by Google Search hits, and by using the full platform name as a search query (e.g., "aws lambda", "azure functions", "google cloud functions", and "ibm cloud functions"). As a result, we selected AWS Lambda, Microsoft Azure Functions, and Google Cloud Functions It is worth mentioning that for all three selected platforms the amount of Google Search hits is above 500.000 hits, whereas there is a significant drop in number of hits for the remaining commercial platforms, all of which have less than 150.000 hits.

In contrast, we approximated the overall interest in open source platforms by measuring the amount of GitHub stars given by GitHub users since all open source FaaS platforms are hosted on GitHub [19]. The amount of stars associated with the GitHub repositories of FaaS platforms were extracted using GitHub's API, which resulted in the following list: OpenFaaS, Apache Openwhisk, Nuclio, Fission, Fn, Kubeless, and Knative. This decision was driven by several factors, namely (i) to highlight the trends in open source FaaS platform development community, and (ii) to provide more data for identifying the gaps between open source and commercial platforms, since the latter generally focus less on supporting integration with third parties.

Table 1 shows the final list of FaaS platforms selected for the documentation analysis together with the respective documentation sources we considered.

3.2.4. Step 4: Analyze Platforms' Documentation

We analyzed only the documentation provided via official sources such as a dedicated website maintained by the official producer of the platform and its GitHub repository, in case the platform is open source. The documentation was analyzed separately by the authors using the initial classification framework as a baseline. After the analysis, the results were discussed to identify potential refinements for the classification framework.

3.2.5. Step 5: Refine Classification Framework

After the classification framework was modified using the refinements resulting from the analysis in Section 3.2.3, the final version of the classification framework was further analyzed and cross-checked among authors to reduce potential bias (Section 7). The resulting set of concepts was used to derive our *FaaS Platform Classification Framework* which we discuss in-detail in Section 4.

3.2.6. Step 6: Conduct FaaS Platforms Review

We exploited our classification framework derived in Section 3.2.5 to conduct a technology review of the ten FaaS platforms listed in Table 1. As a first step, each platform was reviewed separately by two authors. Afterwards, the results were verified by the other authors and merged. The conflicting results were discussed and resolved until a unanimous consensus was achieved. The results of the review are presented in Section 5.

4. FaaS Platform Classification Framework

When choosing the FaaS platform best suited for a software project, various different aspects have to be taken into account, and two different views can be identified. On the one hand, *project managers* focus on project- and business-oriented aspects when choosing the possible FaaS platforms for shipping the projects they manage, e.g., whether to select a proprietary or open source platform, and its actual licensing. On the other hand, aspects like whether a FaaS platform natively supports certain function triggers or whether it can be integrated with given monitoring and logging solutions are typically not analysed by project managers. Such aspects are rather considered by the *technical experts* actually developing and operating the project itself.

Following the above idea, we hereafter present our framework for classifying FaaS platforms (derived in Step 4 of Section 3), by clearly distinguishing the *business* view of project managers from the *technical* view of developers and operators[1]. Classification categories pertaining to the *business* view are presented in Section 4.1, while those pertaining to the *technical* view are presented in Section 4.2.

4.1. A Business View for Classifying FaaS Platforms

The *business* view of our *FaaS Platform Classification Framework* comprises categories and dimensions of interest for project managers aiming to identify the FaaS platforms complying with the high-level project requirements. These include, for instance, the license under which a FaaS platform is released and whether the platform can be installed on premise or not, as both dimensions can impact on the integration of the platform with the rest of the software developed in a project [3, 41].

All dimensions pertaining to the *business* view of our classification framework are listed and categorised in Figure 2, and explained hereafter.

Licensing. Each FaaS platform is released under some existing licensing, whether open or proprietary. The category *Licensing* enables classifying platforms under such dimension by allowing to indicate the actual *License* and the corresponding license *Type*. Figure 2 reports some possible values for classifying the name and type of the license under which a platform is released, which can anyhow be any existing open source license name and type (such as those recapped by Laurent in his book [41], for instance), or any proprietary licensing option under which a vendor releases its software.

Installation. FaaS platforms currently come in two different forms, as they can be hosted by vendors, installed on-premise, or both. The purpose of the *Installation* category is precisely to enable classifying FaaS platforms under this dimension by allowing to distinguish their installation *Type* (i.e., *as-a-service*, *installable*). The *Installation* category also enables to indicate the set of *Target Hosts* where a FaaS platform can be installed, which is given by a subset of the set formed by existing OSs and cluster orchestrators (some examples of which are in Figure 2). Of course, if a platform only comes *as-a-service*, then the set of *Target Hosts* will be empty.

Source Code. The *Source Code* category enables classifying the *Availability* of the sources of a FaaS platform, whether it is *open source* or *closed source*. In the former case, the *FaaS Platform Classification Framework* also enables classifying the *Open Source Repository* and main *Programming Language* used for the *Source Code*. Figure 2 lists some possible values for classifying the *Open Source Repository* and main *Programming Language*, which can anyhow be any existing open source repository and programming language.

Release. The *Release* category enables to classify the release *Status* of FaaS platforms. Possible values for *Release Status* are listed in Figure 2, following the possible release statuses discussed in the book on software delivery by Humble and Farley [42].

Interface. Existing FaaS platforms offer different ways for interacting with them, and the purpose of the *Interface* category is precisely to enable classifying platform under this dimension. The *Interface* category allows to list the supported interface *Type*s, i.e., whether they offer a command line interface (*CLI*), an application programming interface (*API*), and/or a graphical user interface (*gui*). It also enables to classify whether a FaaS platform supports *Application Management*, i.e., which subset of CRUD operations it offers to manage applications. Finally, the *Interface* category includes the *Platform Administration* dimension, which enables indicating whether a FaaS platform offers operations for its own *deployment*, *configuration*, *enactment*, *termination* and *undeployment*.

Community. The *Community* category enables to classify FaaS platforms based on the size, activity, and popularity of their development community. Given that the seven most popular open source FaaS platforms (which drove the development of our classification framework) are all

[1] As already explained in Section 3, the classification framework was derived by extracting self-declared information available in FaaS platforms' online documentation. As a result, information that is not self-declared (e.g., vendor lock-in) is not included in our framework.

Licensing	*License*	Apache 2.0, GNU GPL 1.0, GNU GPL 2.0, GNU GPL 3.0, MIT, ...	
	Type	public domain, permissive, copyleft, freeware, proprietary, ...	
Installation	*Type*	as-a-service, installable	
	Target Hosts	Docker, Kubernetes, Linux, MacOS, OSX, Windows, ...	
Source Code	*Availability*	open source, closed source	
	Open Source Repository	BitBucket, GitHub, SourceForge, ...	
	Programming Language	C, C#, F#, Go, Java, Javascript, Python, Ruby, Scala, ...	
Release	*Status*	pre-alpha, alpha, beta, release candidate, stable release, rtm, ga, production	
Interface	*Type*	CLI, API, GUI	
	Application Management	creation, retrieval, update, deletion	
	Platform Administration	deployment, configuration, enactment, termination, undeployment	
Community	*GitHub*	Stars	*number*
		Forks	*number*
		Issues	*number*
		Commits	*number*
		Contributors	*number*
	Stackoverflow	Questions	*number*
Documentation	*Functions*	development, deployment	
	Platform	usage, development, deployment, architecture	
Quotas	*Deployment*	Code Size	limited, unbounded
		Package Size	limited, unbounded
	Runtime	CPU	limited, unbounded
		Memory	limited, unbounded
		Storage	limited, unbounded
		Execution Time	limited, unbounded

Figure 2: The *business* view of our classification framework. White cells contain categories, lighter grey cells contain classification dimensions, while dark grey cells contain values that can possibly be associated with classification dimensions.

hosted on GitHub, the obtained *Community* category explicitly enables to classify platforms based on quantitative information taken from their *GitHub* repository, i.e., the amount of *Stars*, *Forks*, *Issues*, *Commits* and *Contributors*. All such numeric information gives an indication of the size, activity, and popularity of the corresponding repository [43]. Another dimension explicitly included in the *Community* category is the amount of high-scored platform-related *Questions* on *Stackoverflow*, which also indicates the usage and popularity of the platform.

Documentation. The available official documentation for currently existing FaaS platforms is various in comprehensibility and nature. This is the main reason why the *business* view of our classification framework includes the *Documentation* category. The latter enables to indicate whether a FaaS platform comes with an official documentation for function *development* and *deployment* (with the *Functions* dimension), i.e., whether it documents how to develop functions that can be executed by the platform, and the actual processes for suitably deploying them on the platform. The *Documentation* category also enables to indicate whether a FaaS platform officially documents its *usage*, *development*, *deployment* and *architecture* (with the *Platform* dimension), i.e., whether it documents the processes to use the platform for running function-based applications, to develop extension to the platform, to deploy the platform, and whether it provides information on the platform's architecture.

Quotas. Finally, some FaaS platforms comes with upperbounds on the size of applications that can be deployed, as well as on the computing resources and execution time that application can get at runtime. The purpose of the *Quotas* category is precisely to qualitatively indicate whether such upperbounds apply to a given FaaS platform. The *Quotas* category indeed includes the *Deployment* dimension, which enables indicating whether the source *Code Size* and the deployment *Package Size* are limited or unbounded. It also includes the *Runtime* dimension, which enables specifying whether *CPU*, *Memory*, *Storage* and *Execution Time* are *limited* or *unbounded*.

4.2. A Technical View for Classifying FaaS Platforms

The *technical* view in our classification framework comprises a set of categories and dimensions that have to be considered by software development and operations specialists willing to identify if a given FaaS platform suffices the low level, technical requirements. For example, a runtime for the programming language used in the company or project might not be supported by the platform which would complicate the development. Figure 3 presents a set of categories helping to classify a given FaaS platform from the *technical* perspective. In the following, we discuss all categories and their respective dimensions in-detail.

Development. Essentially, a FaaS platform might provide various mechanisms that facilitate the overall function and

Development	*Function Runtimes*	Go, Java, JavaScript, Python, Docker Image, ...	
	Runtime Customization	supported, not supported	
	IDEs and Text Editors	IntelliJ IDEA, Eclipse, Visual Studio Code, ...	
	Client Libraries	Go, Java, JavaScript, Python, Docker Image, ...	
Version Management	*Application versions*	dedicated mechanisms, implicit versioning, no support	
	Function versions	dedicated mechanisms, implicit versioning	
Event Sources	*Endpoint*	*Synchronous Call*	HTTP, gRPC, ...
		Asynchronous Call	HTTP, gRPC, ...
		Endpoint Customization	supported, not supported
		TLS Support	supported, not supported
	Data Store	*File Level*	AWS S3, Min.io ...
		Database Mode	Azure CosmosDB, MySQL ...
	Scheduler	supported, not supported	
	Message Queue	AWS SQS, RabbitMQ ...	
	Stream Processing Platform	AWS Kinesis, Apache Kafka ...	
	Special-purpose Service	AWS Alexa, GitHub, IBM Watson, ...	
	Event Source Integration	plugin development, messaging-based integration, ...	
Function Orchestration	*Workflow Definition*	standard language, custom DSL, orchestrating function, ...	
	Control Flow Constructs	documented, not documented	
	Quotas	*Execution Time*	present, not present
		Task Input and Output Size	present, not present
Testing and Debugging	*Testing*	*Functional*	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling
		Non-functional	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling
	Debugging	*Local*	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling
		Remote	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling
Observability	*Logging*	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling	
	Monitoring	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling	
	Tooling Integration	push-based, pull-based, plugin development, ...	
Application Delivery	*Deployment Automation*	platform-native tooling, 3rd party tooling	
	CI/CD Pipelining	supported, not supported	
Code Reuse	*Function Marketplace*	official marketplace, 3rd party marketplaces	
	Code Sample Repository	present, not present	
Access Management	*Authentication*	built-in, external, ...	
	Access Control	functions, resources, ...	

Figure 3: The *technical* view of our classification framework. White cells contain categories, lighter grey cells contain classification dimensions, while dark grey cells contain values that can possibly be associated with classification dimensions.

application development experience. Firstly, to start developing functions in a specific programming language, e.g., Python or Java, the platform must support the required *Function Runtimes*. Note that even in cases when the platform does not support a particular language, it still might be possible to develop function in such language if the platform supports *Runtime Customization*, e.g., by supplying custom container images as a function runtime. However, since a custom container image has to be created first following the specific set of requirements (e.g., implementing a required interface), instead of simply providing the source code, this option also introduces additional management efforts.

As FaaS platforms typically impose varying requirements on, for example, the way functions have to be implemented [16], the source code development can also be simplified via plugins for popular *IDEs and Text Editors* such as IntelliJ IDEA [44] or Visual Studio Code [45] that provide support, e.g., for platform-specific syntax highlighting or automated code packaging. Moreover, a platform can provide *Client Libraries* for a set of programming languages that wrap the platform's APIs as a part of platform's Software Development Kit (SDK) to facilitate the development process, e.g., usage of platform-specific libraries for working with typed events' data.

Version Management. An important aspect in FaaS platforms which can simplify several distinct phases of the application lifecycle is *Version Management* of serverless applications and functions. Apart from facilitating the development process, versioning is also helpful for application deployment, e.g., to support canary releases [46] or blue-green deployments [47]. It is hence advantageous if a FaaS platform provides mechanisms for managing versions on the level of single *Function versions*, or entire *Application versions*, i.e., a combination of functions and resources tracked together. It is worth mentioning that while it is always possible, for instance, to encode version identifiers as part of function or application names or namespaces, however such *implicit* versioning is less advantageous than

the presence of *dedicated mechanisms* for version management. Additionally, a platform might not support version management on the serverless application level in case no notion of an application is present.

Event Sources. Due to the event-driven nature of FaaS the event sources support plays an important role in deciding whether the platform is suitable for given development requirements. For instance, one of the common FaaS use cases is when a function needs to be exposed as an *Endpoint* via an API Gateway [3]. Subsequently, several endpoint-related aspects can be considered here, e.g., whether a *Synchronous Call* or an *Asynchronous Call* is supported and which protocols can be used for performing such calls, e.g., HTTP or gRPC. Moreover, it might be needed to use a custom endpoint's name instead of the default resource name assigned when exposing the function as an endpoint, i.e., *Endpoint Customization* must be supported. In addition, in case a secure communication via HTTPS is required, a platform must provide *TLS Support*.

The next dimension of event sources encapsulates different *Data Store* types. Since serverless applications comprise non-managed components, we consider only the higher-level storage types [48] such as *File Level* which includes object stores like AWS S3, and *Database Mode* that covers SQL and NoSQL databases like Azure CosmosDB.

Another relevant event source is the *Scheduler*, which allows invoking functions on a scheduled basis. Typically, internally these sources are implemented using cron jobs, hence developers might need to understand the subtle differences in the required format of cron expressions.

Such event source dimensions as *Message Queue* and *Stream Processing Platform* are the next important parts for FaaS platforms. Being one of the main integration mechanisms, messaging plays a crucial role in serverless component integration. Examples of messaging and streaming solutions include AWS SQS [49], Apache Kafka [50], and RabbitMQ [51].

Generally, multiple event sources such as AWS Alexa [18], IBM Watson [52], or GitHub [53] are not related to particularly-large dimensions and instead represent particular use cases, which is covered by the *Special-purpose Service* dimension. The list of supported specialized service offerings varies drastically from platform to platform and might be a major factor influencing the choice of a suitable platform [16].

Finally, a platform might provide *Event Source Integration* options, which makes it possible to trigger functions using custom event sources. Examples of integration options might include plugin development or webhook-based integration. Essentially, the integration using proxy components such as event gateways or message queues is possible in the majority of the cases due to the loosely coupled nature of serverless applications. However, the crucial point here is that the platform's documentation describes official ways to integrate custom event sources, for example, company's proprietary applications emitting custom events, which hastens the overall development process.

Function Orchestration. The next significant aspect characterizing FaaS platforms is related to possible ways of orchestrating multiple functions. Apart from connecting functions by means of events and message queues, the specification of workflows [54] incorporating multiple functions is another way to orchestrate complex function interactions. Therefore, support for *Function Orchestration* brings additional benefits to platform users. In this category, we consider only FaaS-oriented orchestrators such as AWS Step Functions or Azure Durable Functions following the definition of a function orchestrator provided in Section 3.1. Essentially, the majority of function orchestrators are separate offerings that are tailored to work with FaaS platforms and require a separate classification framework. For instance, multiple criteria from the *business* view can also be used to classify function orchestrators, e.g., installation, licensing, or quotas. Moreover, other orchestration aspects, e.g., expressiveness and extensibility of the underlying workflow language, require a more detailed analysis.

For the sake of brevity, we present the baseline information relevant for developers willing to start defining function orchestrations. Firstly, the *Workflow Definition* process might vary significantly [26], e.g., a *custom Domain-Specific-Language (DSL)* can be used to define a function workflow, or even a *standard language* such as BPEL [55]. Another option is to implement an *orchestrating function* in a general-purpose programming language such as Java, which will be responsible for calling other involved functions and aggregating the results. Here, the execution of orchestrating functions is controlled by the function orchestrator that handles stateful operations or error handling, for instance, making this option not valid for programming languages that are not explicitly supported by the orchestrator. Another dimension to consider is the presence of documentation for *Control Flow Constructs*, e.g., to understand how parallel or sequential task execution can be modeled or whether it is possible to handle errors during the workflow execution. Additionally, function orchestrators can impose *Quotas* on certain aspects of function workflows execution. For example, the overall *Execution Time* might be restricted or the *Task Input and Output Size* can be limited to a particular value [16].

Testing and Debugging. Another crucial set of mechanisms is related to testing and debugging of standalone functions and entire serverless applications. While FaaS platforms are typically not responsible for the code development, additional ways to test *Functional* and *Non-functional* aspects of deployed functions can be provided, e.g., unit and integration testing, load testing, etc. For example, a platform might offer mechanisms for facilitating unit testing with platform-specific libraries, or verifying function invocation using dedicated CLI commands. Moreover, a combination of *Local and Remote* debugging mechanisms might be provided by the platform. In all

these cases, both platform-native and third-party tooling may provide the possible set of solutions.

Observability. The presence of mechanisms for observing serverless applications is a crucial factor for deciding on the FaaS platform. For instance, platforms might provide various *Logging* and *Monitoring* options including both *platform-native tooling* and *third-party tooling*. Additionally, platforms can provide documented ways to integrate existing tools, e.g., using a push-based or pull-based integration approaches.

Application Delivery. The next category groups together dimensions related to facilitating delivering developed applications. To hasten application deployment, various *Deployment Automation* tools can be supported by the platform. For example, a platform-native deployment automation tool such as AWS Cloud Formation [56], or a third-party tools such as the Serverless Framework [57] can be present. Moreover, presence of documented *CI/CD Pipelining* ways can facilitate the DevOps processes.

Code Reuse. The ability to use existing applications as a basis for implementation as well as having access to exemplary code and configuration snippets can facilitate reducing the time to market. Essentially, we distinguish two separate dimensions of *Code Reuse*, namely the availability of supported *Function Marketplaces*, and *Code Sample Repositories* which are actively-maintained by the platform's provider or open source community.

Access Management. Finally, FaaS platforms might provide various *Access Management* options related to using the platform from both, developer's and user's perspectives. For example, a platform can provide native or support external *Authentication* mechanisms. Additionally, there might be supported *Access Control* mechanisms for defining the access rules for functions and related resources that interact with them, e.g., forbidding a function to access a particular data store resources.

5. FaaS Platform Technology Review

In this section, we present the second contribution of this article, i.e., the results of the FaaS platforms review using the classification framework introduced in Section 4. As for the presentation of our classification framework, we first discuss the review results relevant for the *business* view, followed by the *technical* view.

5.1. A Business View on FaaS Platforms

The *business* view of our classification framework (Section 4.1) provides various categories for classifying and comparing existing FaaS platforms at a high-level. These high-level categories can be of help for researchers and practitioners willing to identify FaaS platforms suitable for hosting existing or new FaaS-based applications by focusing only on those platforms that adhere to high-level projects' requirements. Such top-down classification approach helps eliminating the need to delve into technical details of platforms that could be ignored beforehand.

In the following, we present and discuss the classification of the ten FaaS platforms selected in Section 3, based on the categories in the *business* view of our classification framework presented in Section 4.1.

Licensing. The different licensing options used by the considered FaaS platforms are listed in Table 2. As expected, all commercial solutions are licensed under provider's own proprietary license. Non-commercial solutions instead mainly use the permissive *Apache 2.0 License*, as easily observable in Figure 4. The only exception is OpenFaaS, which uses the permissive *MIT License*.

Table 2: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Licensing* category in the *business* view of our classification framework.

	License	*Type*
Apache Openwhisk	Apache 2.0	permissive
AWS Lambda	AWS Service Terms	proprietary
Fission	Apache 2.0	permissive
Fn	Apache 2.0	permissive
Google Cloud Functions	Google Cloud Platform Terms	proprietary
Knative	Apache 2.0	permissive
Kubeless	Apache 2.0	permissive
MS Azure Functions	Microsoft Fn SLA	proprietary
Nuclio	Apache 2.0	permissive
OpenFaaS	MIT	permissive




Figure 4: Distribution of *License*s among open source FaaS platforms, obtained by associating each *License* with the amount (*count*) of FaaS platforms using it.

Main Findings: Licensing

- ➔ All open source FaaS platforms use permissive licenses.
- ➔ Most of open source FaaS platforms (6/7) are licensed under Apache 2.0 license.
- ➔ All commercial FaaS platforms use proprietary licenses, with MS Azure Functions also releasing some of its components as open source projects.

Installation. Table 3 classifies the considered FaaS platforms by indicating whether they are available *as-a-service* or whether they can be installed on-premises. Not surprisingly, commercial FaaS platforms are all offered *as-a-service*. MS Azure Functions also supports installing the *Azure Functions Host*, which enables running serverless applications on Linux, Kubernetes, MacOS and Windows.

Table 3: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Installation* category in the *business* view of our classification framework. The abbreviation "n/a" stays for "not applicable".

	Type	*Target Hosts*
Apache Openwhisk	installable	Docker, Kubernetes, Linux, MacOS, Mesos
AWS Lambda	as-a-service	n/a
Fission	installable	Kubernetes
Fn	installable	Docker, Linux, MacOS, Unix
Google Cloud Functions	as-a-service	n/a
Knative	installable	Kubernetes
Kubeless	installable	Kubernetes, Linux, MacOS, Windows
MS Azure Functions	as-a-service, installable	Linux, Kubernetes, MacOS, Windows
Nuclio	as-a-service, installable	Kubernetes
OpenFaaS	installable	Docker,* faasd, Kubernetes, OpenShift

* *In swarm mode [58].*




Figure 5: Frequencies of values for the dimension *Target Hosts* of the category *Installation*, among the eight installable FaaS platforms.

All open source solutions are *installable* on different hosts, with Nuclio also coming *as-a-service*, i.e., allowing to run FaaS application on hosted instances of Nuclio and providing additional features, e.g., advanced monitoring and logging solutions, and a 24/7 support [59]. The target hosts actually supported by each installable platform are listed in Table 3. Figure 5 instead displays the frequencies of target hosts, i.e., it associates each target host with the amount of platforms that can be installed on it. Kubernetes turns out to be the most supported target host, as all platforms (but Fn) can be installed on Kubernetes hosts. A reason for this is that installable platforms are either developed by extending Kubernetes itself or to be natively integrated with it.

Main Findings: Installation

- ➔ Most of the open source platforms (6/7) are *only* available for on-premises installation.
- ➔ All commercial platforms are offered as-a-service, except some parts of MS Azure Functions that can also be installed on-premises.
- ➔ Most of installable platforms (5/8) support multiple target hosts, with Kubernetes being the most popular target host among them (7/8).


Source Code. The availability of the source code of the considered FaaS platforms (i.e., whether they are open or closed sourced) is classified in Table 4, which also lists the open source repository and main programming language in which an open source platform is implemented. AWS Lambda and Google Cloud Functions are closed source, while MS Azure Function is partly released open source. Microsoft is indeed maintaining a GitHub repository [60] where part of the C# sources of MS Azure Functions are publicly available. The GitHub repository provides sources of a simplified version MS Azure Functions runtime (i.e., *Azure Functions Host*), which can be installed and customised to run functions on-premises. The repository also provides open source tools for developing, debugging and testing functions running on MS Azure Functions. All other platforms in Table 4 are instead fully open source, and their source code can be found in corresponding GitHub repositories.

Table 4: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Source Code* category in the *business* view of our classification framework. The abbreviation "n/a" stays for "not applicable".

	Availability	*Open Source Repository*	*Programming Language*
Apache Openwhisk	open source	GitHub	Scala
AWS Lambda	closed source	n/a	n/a
Fission	open source	GitHub	Go
Fn	open source	GitHub	Go
Google Cloud Functions	closed source	n/a	n/a
Knative	open source	GitHub	Go
Kubeless	open source	GitHub	Go
MS Azure Functions	open source*	GitHub	C#
Nuclio	open source	GitHub	Go
OpenFaaS	open source	GitHub	Go

* *Partially open sourced.*

Notably, Go turns out to be the most employed programming languages for developing the FaaS platforms which code is publicly available on GitHub (including MS



Programming Language	*count*
Go	6
C#	1
Scala	1

Figure 6: Distribution of main *Programming Language*s for the classified FaaS platforms that release part of/all their sources on GitHub.

Azure Functions), as also clearly visible from Figure 6. All reviewed open source platforms (but Apache Openwhisk) are indeed mainly developed in Go, which emphasizes the relevance of Go for cloud-native development. Additionally, this language choice could indicate that platforms are developed by extending Kubernetes, which is also developed in Go, or with the installation and integration with Kubernetes in mind.

Main Findings: Source Code

- ➔ The source code of all open source FaaS platforms is hosted on GitHub.
- ➔ Most of the open source FaaS platforms (6/7) are mainly implemented in Go.
- ➔ MS Azure Functions is the only commercial FaaS platform partially open sourcing its components.

Release. The classification of the considered FaaS platforms based on their *Release Status* is shown in Table 5. Commercial platforms are obviously all in *production*. We can also observe that open source platforms show a kind of maturity. Nuclio indeed already comes as a ready-to-market (*rtm*) solution, while all other open source platforms (except for Knative) come as *stable release*s or *release candidate*s, which are the most mature statuses for in-development software.

Table 5: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Release* category in the *business* view of our classification framework.

	Status
Apache Openwhisk	release candidate
AWS Lambda	production
Fission	stable release
Fn	release candidate
Google Cloud Functions	production
Knative	beta
Kubeless	release candidate
MS Azure Functions	production
Nuclio	rtm
OpenFaaS	release candidate

Main Findings: Release

- ➔ All commercial platforms are production-ready.
- ➔ Open source platforms are also quite mature, with 4/7 release candidates, 1/7 stable releases and 1/7 ready-to-market (rtm).

Interface. Table 6 classifies considered FaaS platforms under the *Interface* category of our classification framework, i.e., by showing whether they offer a CLI, API or GUI, and which capabilities are featured through such interfaces. While we can observe that all platforms support all CRUD operations for serverless applications, they considerably vary in terms of interface type and of operations offered to manage the platform. A first distinction occurs between commercial platforms and open source platforms, with the former being the only providing all types of interfaces. In contrast, all open source solutions provide a command-line interface (*CLI*) to access and administer the platform, with only 4/7 also providing an HTTP-based *API* and only 2/7 featuring a *GUI*.

Figure 7 slightly elaborates on *Interface Type*s, by showing their overall frequencies, i.e., by associating each *Type* of *Interface* with the amount of FaaS platforms supporting it. It clearly emerges that CLI and API are the most important types to be supported, and this is clearly motivated by need for programming how to automate the management of serverless applications (and of installable platforms, as well). GUI is however also supported by more than a half of reviewed platforms (6/10), as it eases manually interacting with the platform wherever needed.




Figure 7: Frequencies of values for the dimension *Type* of the category *Interface*, among the ten classified FaaS platforms.

Finally, it is worth noting that a neat distinction between commercial platforms and open source platforms occurs as per what regards the administration of the platform itself. Commercial platforms do not provide any operation to administer the platform itself, which is a logical result

Table 6: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Interface* category in the *business* view of our classification framework.

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
Type	cli	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	api	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	✓
	gui	×	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓
App. Man.	create	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	retrieve	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	update	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	delete	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Plat. Adm.	deployment	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓
	configuration	×	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×	×
	enactment	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓
	termination	×*	×	×*	×*	×	×*	×*	×	×*	×*
	undeployment	×*	×	×*	×*	×	×*	×*	×	×*	×*

* *Termination/undeployment can be achieved by stopping/uninstalling the platform instance with host commands.*

Table 7: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Community* category in the *business* view of our classification framework. "n/a" stays for "not applicable".

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
GitHub	Stars	4.6k	n/a	5k	4.5k	n/a	2.7k*	5.5k	n/a	3.2k	17.1k
	Forks	890	n/a	451	328	n/a	563*	558	n/a	318	1.4k
	Issues	260	n/a	191	121	n/a	274*	158	n/a	56	63
	Commits	2.7k	n/a	1.1k	3.4k	n/a	3.8k*	1k	n/a	1.2k	1.8k
	Contributors	173	n/a	91	85	n/a	165*	82	n/a	51	138
SO	Questions	188	15.1k	6	20	8.5k	57	7	6.3k	3	28

* *Values for the function hosting component of Knative, i.e., Knative Serving.*

Table 8: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Documentation* category in the *business* view of our classification framework.

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
App.	development	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	×	×
	deployment	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Platform	usage	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	development	✓	×	×*	×*	×	×*	✓	×	×*	✓
	deployment	✓	×	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	architecture	✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓

* *Only providing guidelines/code of conduct for contributing to the project.*

Table 9: Classification of FaaS Platforms, based on the *Quotas* category in the *business* view of our classification framework. Letters L and U are used to denote the possible values *limited* and *unbounded*, respectively.

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
Depl.	*Pack. Size*	L	L	U	U	L	U	U	L	U	U
	Code Size	L	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U
Runtime	*CPU*	U	U	U*	U	L	U	U*	U	U	U*
	Memory	L	L	U*	U	L	U	U*	U	U	U*
	Storage	U	L	U	U	U	U	U	L	U	U
	Exec. Time	L	L	U*	U	L	U*	U*	L	U*	U*

* *Unbounded by default, but application deployments can be configured to set quotas.*

of being offered as-a-service (Table 3). Conversely, given that all open source platforms come as installable solutions (Table 3), they also provide operations for deploying and enacting the platform, with some also providing operations to configure the platform (e.g., to set quotas, as shown in Table 9). Finally, they all neither support nor provide means for terminating or undeploying the platform (e.g., in the form of runnable scripts or binaries). Installable FaaS platforms indeed rely on what available on the target host for being terminated or undeployed, e.g., if deployed with Docker or Kubernetes, they rely on the latters' functionalities to stop and delete the running Docker containers or Kubernetes deployments.

Main Findings: Interface

- ➔ All FaaS platforms provide a CLI, with most of them (7/10) being also accessible via an API. A GUI is also offered by more than a half of reviewed platforms (6/10).
- ➔ All platforms support CRUD operations for managing serverless applications.
- ➔ Open source platforms vary considerably in the way they can be administered.

Community. As an additional indicator of the platform's popularity, in Table 7 we present the details on community involved in the development of considered FaaS platforms[2]. Notably, the amount of questions on StackOverflow demonstrates that commercial FaaS platforms are considerably more popular and used in comparison with the reviewed open source platforms (Figure 8). This is influenced by the difference in the maturity of the platforms themselves, by the underlying infrastructure, and by natively supported services.

Among open source FaaS platforms, OpenFaaS is by far the most popular in terms of stars, and it shows also a quite active community (in terms of forks, commits and contributors). Kubeless, Fission, Apache OpenWhisk and Fn respectively follow in term of popularity, if measured in amount of stars. The Knative platform is instead that with the most active community of contributors, with its Serving component showing a total of 3.8k commits, by far higher if compared with all other open source platforms. Finally, Apache Openwhisk is actively maintained by 173 contributors, which constitute the biggest community of contributors among investigated open source platforms. Despite all such information just provides an indicator of popularity, it can still be important while choosing a platform for prioritising those with higher popularity or bigger community of contributors, as both indicate an active maintenance of the platform itself.

[2]In the table, we omit GitHub metrics for MS Azure Functions, as only some of its sub-components are released open source.




Figure 8: Values for the dimension *Stackoverflow* of the category *Community* (displayed on a logarithmic y-axis).

Main Findings: Community

- ➔ OpenFaaS, Apache Openwhisk, and Knative have the highest ratings on GitHub in terms of stars, contributors, and commits, respectively.
- ➔ Stackoverflow questions show a drastic difference in interest between commercial and open source platforms.

Documentation. Table 8 illustrates the classification of considered FaaS platforms based on the documentation they provide on development and deployment of supported applications, and on the platform itself. All considered platforms widely document how to use the platform itself and how to deploy serverless applications. Most of considered platforms (except for Knative, Nuclio and OpenFaaS) also concretely document how to develop serverless application that can run on the platform, hereby included the available runtime environments and how to exploit the support provided by the platform (see Section 4.2 for further details). In addition, each installable platform documents its deployment, by providing installation guidelines.

Notable differences can instead be observed when looking at how considered FaaS platforms document their development and architecture. Apart from the three commercial solutions, which obviously do not publicly document their development or architecture, one would expect all open source solutions to document the architecture of the platform and its development. However, the classification of open source FaaS platforms in Table 8 (for which a visual representation is displayed in Figure 9) clearly shows that this is not the case. Only Apache OpenWhisk, Kubeless and OpenFaaS fully document *both* their architecture and development. Also Nuclio documents its architecture, but it only provides guidelines to contribute to its development. Finally, Fission, Fn and Knative only provide guidelines or code of conduct for contributing to the platform, without giving information on their architecture.




Figure 9: Frequencies of values for the dimension *Platform* of the category *Documentation*, among the seven open source platforms.

Main Findings: Documentation

- ➔ All platforms provide application deployment and platform usage documentation.
- ➔ More than a half of open source platforms (4/7) do not document their development, with 3/7 also not documenting their architecture.

Quotas. The classification of considered FaaS platforms in Table 9 indicates whether such platforms establish quotas related to various aspect of application's lifecycle, e.g., runtime or deployment. Commercial solutions provide upperbounds to deployable packages' size, and they set timeouts for function executions. In addition, AWS Lambda sets quotas for the memory and storage space available for each function, Google Cloud Functions instead sets quotas for CPU usage and memory, while MS Azure Functions sets an upperbound to the available storage space. All such quotas vary based on the chosen service level, with each as-a-service FaaS platform setting different quotas for different service levels.

Open source, installable FaaS platforms instead mainly come without predefined quotas, with all of them (except for Apache OpenWhisk) being unbounded in all considered dimensions. Fission, Kubeless, Nuclio and OpenFaaS however allow to set quotas on computing resources, so as to configure and manage resource consumption on target hosts. The only open source FaaS Platform coming with pre-defined quotas is Apache OpenWhisk, which natively sets an upperbound to the deployable package and code sizes, and the memory consumption and execution time of running functions. Notably, for all installable FaaS platforms, additional quotas can be set by exploiting the support provided by the target host (e.g., if installing a FaaS platform on Kubernetes, the latter can be configured to set quotas to running deployments).

Main Findings: Quotas

- ➔ Most of the open source platforms (6/7) do not impose quotas, with 4/7 anyhow allowing to set customised quotas.
- ➔ Quotas in commercial platforms can be changed by switching to different subscription plans.

5.2. A Technical View on FaaS Platforms

As shown in Section 4, FaaS platforms can be classified using numerous categories that comprise heterogeneous sets of criteria related to their technicalities. In the following, we elaborate on the results of reviewing the ten selected FaaS platforms (Table 1) using the *technical* view in our classification framework.

Development. One of the main technical aspects related to development is whether a platform supports a required function runtime, which eventually allows developing functions in a chosen programming language such as NodeJS or Java. Table 10 shows the details of function runtime support for the list of reviewed platforms sorted alphabetically, and Figure 11 displays the frequencies of supported runtimes, i.e., it associates each programming language with the amount of FaaS platforms supporting the corresponding runtime.




Figure 10: Frequencies of values for the dimension *Function Runtimes* of the category *Development*, among the ten classified FaaS platforms.

The most popular languages are *NodeJS* and *Python* support for which is described by 9/10 platforms. Both NodeJS and Python are interpretable languages with a huge community and ecosystem of libraries, making these languages a perfect choice for fast-paced FaaS-based development. The next place is shared by *Go*, *Java*, and *.NET* support for which is stated by eight out of ten reviewed platforms. As shown previously, Go has become an inherent part of the cloud-native development world. Go is a compiled and fast language, which is also used

Table 10: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Function Runtimes* and *Runtime Customization* dimensions of the *Development* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework.

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
Function Runtimes	Ballerina	✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	×	×	×
	Custom Binary	✓	×	✓	×	×	×	×	×	✓	×
	Docker Image	✓	×	×	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Go	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	×	✓	✓
	Java	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
	MS .NET	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
	NodeJS	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Perl	×	×	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	PHP	✓	×	✓	×	×	×	✓	✓	×	✓
	Python	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Ruby	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	✓	×	×	✓
	Rust	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Shell	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	×	✓	✓	×
	Swift	✓	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
	Runtime Customization	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 11: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Development* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is in the documentation.

	IDEs and Text Editors	*Client Libraries*
Apache Openwhisk	Visual Studio Code*, Xcode*	Go, NodeJS, Python, Swift
AWS Lambda	AWS Cloud9, Eclipse, IntelliJ, PyCharm, Visual Studio, Visual Studio Code, Visual Studio Team Services	Go, Java, MS .NET, NodeJS, Python, Ruby
Fission	n/s	n/s
Fn	n/s	Go
Google Cloud Functions	n/s	Dart, Go, Java, MS .NET, NodeJS, Python, Ruby
Knative	n/s	n/s
Kubeless	Visual Studio Code	n/s
MS Azure Functions	Visual Studio, Visual Studio Code	Java, MS .NET
Nuclio	Jupyter Notebooks	Go, Java, MS .NET, Python
OpenFaaS	n/s	n/s

* *Deprecated / No longer maintained*

to implement multiple FaaS platforms, which is an additional reason why Go is supported by most of them. Moreover, both Java and .NET are mature, well-established languages with a large ecosystem of general-purpose libraries making them a good additions to the main list of supported languages. The third and fourth place among supported function runtimes are then occupied by *Docker Images* and *Ruby*, respectively. While Ruby is another good example of a popular programming language for web development, a large support for Docker Images worth a special highlight.

Essentially, supporting Docker Images as a function runtime allows developing and running functions in any programming language assuming that all required dependencies can be included together with the function's logic and the resulting container is compatible with the FaaS platform, i.e., a platform is able to invoke the function and pass the event data. However, implementing function as container images requires more effort, since the underlying container has typically to implement a specific interface allowing the platform to interact with the function within the container. Docker image can also encapsulate custom binaries, support for which is stated separately by several reviewed platforms, e.g., Nuclio and Kubeless. The main difference is in which kind of artifacts are used as an input for deploying the function, i.e., a Dockerfile or the binary with a specification of its invocation details.

Additionally, supporting Docker images is one of the possible way to enable the *Runtime Customization* since a function implemented in a non-supported programming language can be invoked by the platform. However, there are other ways to customize function runtimes. For example, in some platforms the runtime support is implemented via dedicated container images, e.g., for running Java8 applications. In such cases, extending the runtime might also mean building a modified runtime container image on top of an existing image, e.g., to add a particular library dependency. Most of the reviewed platforms provide a description of runtime customization options.

The classification of considered FaaS platforms based




Figure 11: Frequencies of values for the dimension *Client Libraries* of the category *Development*, among the six FaaS platforms providing some language-specific client library.

on the *Development* category is completed by checking whether each FaaS platform provides plugins for IDEs and rich text editors, as well as language-specific client libraries for programmatic access to the API of the platform. Table 11 shows the details about supported *IDEs and Text Editors* (e.g., in the form of plugins) and *Client Libraries*. One can readily observe that the presence of platform-specific IDEs or of plugins for existing IDEs is rarely the case, especially for open source FaaS platforms.

Most of the considered platforms (6/10) instead provide client libraries for existing programming languages, which wrap the platforms' APIs to facilitate the development of serverless applications (e.g., by easing the use of platform-specific libraries to work with typed data or events). Figure 11 displays the frequencies of programming languages for which a client library is provided, i.e., it associates a programming language with the amount of FaaS platforms providing a client library for it (among the six platforms that are known to provide a client library for a programming language - Table 11). The figure again highlights the importance of Go for serverless and cloud-native application development, and it confirm that Go, Java, MS .NET, NodeJS and Python are the most programming languages most supported by reviewed FaaS platforms.

Main Findings: Development

- ➔ No programming language is supported by *all* reviewed FaaS platforms.
- ➔ Go, Java, MS .NET, NodeJS and Python are the most supported programming languages. Docker images are also popular and help using custom programming languages.
- ➔ IDEs and text editor plugins are mainly offered by commercial platforms.
- ➔ Most platforms offer client libraries, with open source platforms supporting less languages.

Version Management. The results for versioning support with respect to single functions and application that represent a combination of multiple functions and resources are shown in Table 12.

Table 12: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Version Management* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. D and I are used to denote the possible values *dedicated mechanisms* and *implicit versioning*, respectively. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that a platform does not explicitly mention the versioning of serverless applications.

	Application versions	*Function versions*
Apache Openwhisk	I	I
AWS Lambda	D	D
Fission	I	I
Fn	I	I
Google Cloud Functions	I	I
Knative	n/s	D
Kubeless	n/s	I
MS Azure Functions	I	I
Nuclio	n/s	D
OpenFaaS	n/s	I

One interesting fact is that some reviewed platforms tend to omit the notion of a serverless application and rather focus on deploying single functions. For example, Knative does not differentiate between functions and serverless applications, since a Service in Knative represents a container. While in theory a service could also contain multiple functions, the documentation does not provide any details on such deployment strategy and how internal functions can be distinguished. As a result, application versioning in such platforms is not really possible even implicitly, e.g., by establishing certain naming conventions for applications. Secondly, most platforms do not offer dedicated versioning mechanisms, which makes only implicit versioning possible. In some cases, there are rudimentary versioning capabilities, which, however, cannot be considered dedicated versioning mechanisms. For example, in Apache Openwhisk there is an internal version property in metadata, which is assigned automatically af-

ter the deployment but cannot be managed. The only documentation describing both function- and application-level versioning is AWS Lambda, where applications can be defined and managed using AWS SAM templates.

Main Findings: Versioning

- ➔ Most open source platforms (6/7) employ implicit versioning of functions, while most commercial platforms (2/3) provide dedicated mechanisms for versioning functions.
- ➔ The versioning of serverless applications is not explicitly mentioned by 40% of the reviewed FaaS platforms.

Event Sources. The detailed results of the review for this category are shown in Table 13. There are several observations related to the *Endpoint* event sources category that can be highlighted. Firstly, all platforms provide capabilities to synchronously invoke functions exposed as endpoints using HTTP protocol, whereas the majority (7/10) of reviewed platforms do not document support for asynchronous invocation of endpoints. In addition, almost all platforms (9/10) provide mechanisms to customize endpoint names and the majority of platforms allow securing the endpoint communication using HTTPS.

Scheduled function invocation is also supported by the majority of platforms (9/10), as described by the *Scheduler* category. The scheduling is typically time-based, and it is implemented by exploiting cron jobs. The actual definition of time-based scheduling however slightly varies among considered FaaS platforms, mainly in terms of the required formatting.

Different considerations instead apply to triggers related to *Data Store*s and *Message Queue*s. Most open source FaaS platforms (4/7) indeed do not document any support for event sources in the *Data Store* category, neither for file level data stores nor for relational and NoSQL databases. There are some exceptions: Knative's documentation lists commercial and open source data stores as supported, Apache Openwhisk states support for IBM's NoSQL database called Cloudant, and OpenFaaS described how Min.io[3]. can be integrated. The main reason for this is that open source FaaS platforms come as distinct and standalone products, which typically do not come with a rich set of natively integrated services at a first place, unlike commercial FaaS platforms. Not surprisingly, all commercial FaaS platforms provide built-in support for multiple data stores originating from the same provider, e.g., AWS Lambda can be seamlessly integrated with the object storage service offering called AWS S3, and Amazon's NoSQL database called DynamoDB.

[3]Min.io (`https://min.io`) is an object storage solution, which is positioned as an open source alternative to AWS S3.

In the *Message Queue* category, similar as with data stores support, commercial FaaS platforms focus on provider-specific message queues such as AWS SQS and AWS SNS for AWS Lambda or Azure Queue Storage for Azure Functions. As can be seen in Table 13, the support for message queues is stated by the larger part (4/7) of the reviewed FaaS platforms. This list includes both open source messaging solutions such as RabbitMQ, and commercial solutions such as Google Cloud Pub/Sub [61]. Likewise, for the *Stream Processing Platform* category, commercial FaaS platforms provide support for provider-specific services such as Google Cloud Pub/Sub for Google Cloud Functions or Azure Event Hubs for Azure Functions. In case of open source platforms, Apache Kafka is the most supported (6/7) stream processing platform, whereas in some cases support for commercial stream processing offerings is provided as well.

For the *Special-purpose Service* category, there is no clear pattern on the choice of supported services. On the one hand, commercial providers focus on integrating their FaaS offerings with provider-specific services such as AWS Cognito or Microsoft Graph. On the other hand, open source platforms support a variety of external services, e.g., GitHub [53], Slack [62], or IFTTT [63]. To a large extent, the availability of certain services is driven by the needs of open source contributors, making platforms very heterogeneous under this dimension.

Finally, as shown in the *Event Source Integration* category the reviewed platforms mention multiple possible ways to integrate custom event sources, e.g., plugin development, webhooks, or polling. Essentially, one of the most common ways to integrate custom event sources that is not always listed explicitly is by means of messaging. However, since out-of-the-box integration typically requires less effort, it is more beneficial to have an explicitly-supported integration for a desired event source.

Main Findings: Event Sources

- ➔ All platforms support synchronous, HTTP-based function invocation, whereas asynchronous calls are supported by 3/10 platforms.
- ➔ More than a half of open source platforms (4/7) do not support data store event sources.
- ➔ Schedulers and stream processing platforms are supported by most platforms (9/10). Messaging is also widely supported (7/10).
- ➔ Support for special-purpose services varies significantly from platform to platform.
- ➔ More than a half of reviewed platforms (6/10) support the integration of custom event sources.

Function Orchestration. Table 14 presents the results of the platforms review with respect to the *Function Or-*

Table 13: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Event Sources* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. n/s stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is provided in the documentation.

		Apache Openwhisk	*AWS Lambda*	*Fission*	*Fn*	*Google Cloud Functions*	*Knative*	*Kubeless*	*MS Azure Functions*	*Nuclio*	*OpenFaaS*
Endpoint	Synchronous Call	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP, RPC[2]	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP	HTTP
	Asynchronou Call	HTTP	HTTP	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	n/s	HTTP
	Endpoint Customization	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/s
	TLS Support	✓	✓	n/s	n/s	✓	✓	✓	✓	n/s	✓
Data Store	File Level	n/s	AWS S3	n/s	n/s	Google Cloud Storage	Google Cloud Storage	n/s	Azure Blob Storage	n/s	Min.io
	Database Mode	IBM Cloudant	Amazon DynamoDB	n/s	n/s	Cloud Firestore,[3] Firebase Realtime Database[3]	Apache CouchDB, AWS DynamoDB	n/s	Azure Cosmos DB	n/s	n/s
Scheduler		✓	✓	✓	n/s	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Message Queue		n/s	AWS SQS, AWS SNS	NATS, Azure Storage Queue	n/s	Google Cloud Pub/Sub	AWS SQS, AWS SNS, Google Cloud PubSub	n/s	Azure Queue Storage, Azure Service Bus	RabbitMQ, MQTT, NATS	AWS SQS, AWS SNS
Stream Processing Platform		Apache Kafka, IBM Message Hub	Amazon Kinesis	Apache Kafka	n/s	Google Cloud Pub/Sub	Apache Kafka, AWS Kinesis, Google Cloud Pub/Sub	AWS Kinesis, NATS, Apache Kafka	Azure Event Hubs	Apache Kafka, AWS Kinesis, Iguazio Data Science Platform, Azure Event Hubs	Apache Kafka
Special-purpose Service		GitHub, Slack,[1] Weather Company Data,[1] IBM Push Notifications,[1] Websocket API[1]	Amazon Cognito, Lex, Alexa, Kinesis Data Firehose	Kubernetes Watch	n/s	Google Cloud Operations	Apache Camel, Kubernetes event, GitHub, BitBucket, GitLab, Google Cloud Scheduler, AWS CodeCommit, AWS Cognito, FTP/SFTP, Heartbeat events, Websocket	n/s	Microsoft Graph, Event Grid	n/s	IFTTT, VMware vCenter
Event Source Integration		hooks, polling, connection patterns	n/s	plugins	n/s	n/s	plugins	plugins	Custom I/O bindings	n/s	connector plugins

[1] *Only one-directional integration*
[2] *To be used for testing purposes*
[3] *Feature is in a pre-release state*

Table 14: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Function Orchestration* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. C denotes *custom DSL*, and O denotes *orchestrating function*, with the list of supported programming languages for developing orchestrating functions given in square braces. The abbreviations "n/s" and "n/a" stay for "not specified" and "not applicable", respectively.

	Orchestrator	Workflow Definition	Control Flow Described	Quotas
Apache Openwhisk	Openwhisk Composer	O [JavaScript]	✓	execution time
AWS Lambda	AWS Step Functions	C	✓	execution time, I/O size
Fission	Fission Workflows	C	✓	n/s
Fn	Fn Flow	O [Java]	✓	n/s
Google Cloud Functions	n/s	n/a	n/a	n/a
Knative	Knative Eventing	C	✓*	n/s
Kubeless	n/s	n/a	n/a	n/a
MS Azure Functions	Azure Durable Functions	O [C#, JavaScript]	✓	n/s
Nuclio	n/s	n/a	n/a	n/a
OpenFaaS	n/s	n/a	n/a	n/a

* *Only sequence and parallel execution are supported.*

chestration category. Orchestrating multiple functions is an important task, with a the majority of reviewed FaaS platforms (6/10) providing a dedicated function orchestrator aimed to facilitate this task. Furthermore, in most cases orchestrators are provided as standalone components or service offerings, e.g., Openwhisk Composer or Azure Durable Functions. While it is also possible to use general-purpose workflow engines, e.g., Google Composer is a general-purpose workflow engine based on Apache Airflow which can be used to compose functions via generic HTTP operators, in this review we focus on dedicated function orchestrators.

Half of the reviewed orchestrators allows defining workflows using so-called *orchestrating functions*, which define the required control flow involving multiple functions. With this approach, orchestrators typically provide a smaller set of supported programming languages for defining workflows, in comparison with supported function runtimes. Moreover, a set of supported control flow constructs such as sequences, exclusive and parallel gateways, is not always defined by the language itself. For example, Azure Durable Functions relies entirely on the constructs of the underlying language, i.e., JavaScript or C#, whereas Openwhisk Composer while also allows defining orchestrations using JavaScript-based functions, also introduces a set of so-called combinators, i.e., module-specific commands representing workflow constructs. For instance, a loop in Openwhisk Composer-based workflow is defined via a module-specific command `composer.repeat` instead of the regular `for` loop.

AWS Lambda, Fission and Knative instead allow orchestrating functions by relying on DSL-based workflow definitions, e.g.,, AWS Step Functions provides a custom DSL for composing functions on AWS Lambda. The list of supported control flow constructs is defined by the DSL itself, and it can vary significantly. For example, the Eventing component of Knative allows defining sequences and parallel executions, while the orchestrators provided by AWS Lambda and Fission feature more expressive power enabling the description of more complex workflows.

Finally, most platforms do not specify any quotas for limiting the execution of the workflows orchestrating functions. The only exceptions are Apache Openwhisk and AWS Step Functions, which allow to set timeouts for establishing maximum task execution time, with AWS Step Functions also allowing to limit I/O size.

Main Findings: Function Orchestration

- ➔ More than a half of reviewed FaaS platforms (6/10) support function orchestration by providing a dedicated function orchestrator.
- ➔ 50% of offered orchestrators rely on custom DSLs for workflow definitions, and the other 50% exploit orchestrating functions.
- ➔ All FaaS platforms supporting function orchestration document control flow constructs.

Testing and Debugging. Table 15 illustrates the review results regarding platform-specific testing mechanisms. The majority of reviewed FaaS platforms (6/10) documents some features related to functional testing. As testing of the function code is not a direct responsibility of a FaaS platform, most platforms just provide mechanisms for invoking deployed functions for testing purposes, e.g., using a dedicated CLI command or GUI. In particular, Apache Openwhisk provides a tool for testing the invocation of NodeJS functions, AWS Lambda provides a GUI to invoke deployed functions for testing purposes, and Fn offers a function development kit (FDK) for Java, which facilitates implementing unit tests. AWS Lambda, Google Cloud Functions and MS Azure also provide guidelines on how to exploit external tooling for for functional testing of serverless applications, typically referring to the platform-specific IDE plugins they provide (formerly reported in Table 11). AWS Lambda also illustrate some aspects of non-functional testing, and in particular related to load testing of serverless applications.

The review results related to provided debugging mechanisms are shown in Table 16. One observation is that all

reviewed FaaS platforms document mechanisms mainly related to local debugging. Not surprisingly, the commercial platforms provide advanced debugging solutions, as all of them provide dedicated tooling for step-through debugging of functions. Open source platforms instead mainly document log-based debugging, which can be done using either platform-specific tooling or tools supported by the underlying hosting platform, e.g., the `kubctl` tooling from Kubernetes. Only in few cases (2/10), platforms do not explicitly provide any information related to debugging, even if they may still support log-based debugging or debugging through available external tools. Overall, both testing and debugging mechanisms provided by open source FaaS platforms are rather rudimentary, whereas commercial platforms often offer more features.

Main Findings: Testing and Debugging

- ➔ The majority of reviewed FaaS platforms (6/10) documents possible options for functional testing. Commercial platforms also provide more advanced options.
- ➔ Most of reviewed FaaS platforms (8/10) support local debugging of functions.
- ➔ Open source FaaS platforms mainly support testing throughout function invocations, and log-based debugging.

Observability. This category covers logging and monitoring dimensions of FaaS platforms, and the corresponding classification of considered platforms is shown in Table 17. As with other tooling-related categories, commercial platforms provide standalone solutions for logging and monitoring. For example, Amazon offers AWS CloudWatch [64] and AWS CloudTrail [65] for monitoring and logging of functions hosted on AWS Lambda. Likewise, Microsoft provides Azure Application Insights [66] and Google offers its Operations suite (formerly Stackdriver) [67]. In contrast, open source platforms rely on external tooling, e.g., using a combination of Prometheus [68] and Grafana [69] for monitoring, or combining ElasticSearch [70] and Kibana [71] for logging. Nuclio and Knative also support the integration with commercial monitoring and logging services, i.e., Azure Application Insights and Google Cloud Operations, respectively.

Most reviewed open source platforms (5/7) document possible ways to integrate external logging and monitoring tools. Essentially, the integration can be achieved either by configuring the FaaS platform to send events and logs to an external endpoint (push-based) or vice versa, i.e., when an external component pulls events and logs from the platform (pull-based). Additionally, Fission allows enabling Istio, a service mesh, and installing add-ons, e.g., for monitoring and distributed tracing.

Main Findings: Observability

- ➔ All commercial platforms offer dedicated tooling for the monitoring and logging of functions.
- ➔ All open source platforms rely on integration of third-party tooling for supporting the monitoring and logging of functions.

Application Delivery. The results of the review related to the aspects of application delivery are shown in Table 18, with several observations that can be made on deployment automation. Firstly, most platforms rely on some form of

Table 15: Classification of testing mechanisms for considered FaaS Platforms. F and N denote *functional* and *non-functional* testing mechanisms, respectively. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is documented.

	Testing mechanisms	Documented features
Apache Openwhisk	F	function invocation testing
AWS Lambda	F, N*	function invocation testing, testing using external tools
Fission	F	function invocation testing
Fn	F	unit testing of Java functions
Google Cloud Functions	F*	testing using external tools
Knative	n/s	n/s
Kubeless	n/s	n/s
MS Azure Functions	F*	testing using external tools
Nuclio	n/s	n/s
OpenFaaS	n/s	n/s

* *Only guidelines provided.*

Table 16: Classification of debugging mechanisms for considered FaaS Platforms. L and R denote *local* and *remote* debugging, respectively. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is documented.

	Debugging mechanisms	Documented features
Apache Openwhisk	n/s *	n/s
AWS Lambda	L	Step-through debugging using IDE plugins and AWS SAM CLI
Fission	L	Log-based debugging using platform's CLI tool
Fn	L	Log-based debugging using platform's CLI tool
Google Cloud Functions	L	Step-through debugging using dedicated functions development framework
Knative	L**	Log-based debugging using Kubernetes
Kubeless	L**	Log-based debugging using Kubernetes
MS Azure Functions	L	Step-through debugging using dedicated functions development framework
Nuclio	n/s	n/s
OpenFaaS	L	Log-based debugging using platform's CLI tool

* *A debugging tool for NodeJS applications is available, but deprecated.*
** *Only through features of the underlying hosting environment.*

Table 17: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Observability* category in the *technical* view.

	Monitoring	Logging	Tooling Integr.
Apache Openwhisk	Kamon, Prometheus, Datadog	Logback (slf4j)	n/s
AWS Lambda	AWS CloudWatch	AWS CloudTrail, CloudWatch, CloudFormation	n/s
Fission	Istio + Prometheus	Istio + Jaeger	using a service mesh
Fn	Prometheus, Zipkin, Jaeger	Docker container logs	push-based
Google Cloud Functions	Google Cloud Operations	Google Cloud Operations	n/s
Knative	Prometheus + Grafana, Zipkin, Jaeger	ElasticSearch + Kibana, Google Cloud Operations	push-based
Kubeless	Prometheus + Grafana	n/s	n/s
MS Azure Functions	Azure Application Insights	Azure Application Insights	n/s
Nuclio	Prometheus, Azure Application Insights	stdout, Azure Application Insights	push-based, pull-based
OpenFaaS	OpenFaaS Gateway + Prometheus	Kubernetes cluster API, Swarm cluster API, Loki	pull-based

Table 18: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Application Delivery* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. P and T denote *Platform-native tooling* and *third party tooling*, respectively. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is documented.

	Deployment Automation	CI/CD
Apache Openwhisk	wskdeploy (P)	n/s
AWS Lambda	AWS Cloud Formation (P), AWS SAM (P)	AWS CodePipeline(P)
Fission	Kubernetes (P)*	n/s
Fn	Fn CLI (P)	n/s
Google Cloud Functions	n/s **	Cloud Build (P)
Knative	Kubernetes (P)*	n/s
Kubeless	Kubernetes (P)*, Serverless Framework (T)	n/s
MS Azure Functions	Azure Resource Manager (P)	Azure Pipelines (P), Azure App Service (P), Jenkins (T)
Nuclio	nuctl (P)*	n/s
OpenFaaS	faas-cli (P)	OpenFaaS Cloud (P), Jenkins (T)

* *Using Kubernetes specification with Custom Resource Definitions.*
** *Cloud Deployment Manager does not support function resources, and gcloud CLI only allows deploying functions manually.*

declarative deployment modeling [72], either by using proprietary tools and formats (e.g., Azure Resource Manager or AWS SAM) or by relying on the deployment automation featured by their underlying hosting environments (e.g., declarative deployments using custom resource definitions for Kubernetes-based platforms). In open source platforms, the deployment is automated typically by using a platform-native CLI tool that takes a declarative application specification as an input. Another thing worth mentioning is that the Serverless Framework, a popular solution for automating the deployment of FaaS-based applications, is explicitly mentioned only by Kubeless.

Most platforms (6/10) do not provide any information on CI/CD pipelines integration. Moreover, only OpenFaaS describes possible integration with Jenkins, by also providing a CI/CD-optimized version of the platform that already comes with out-of-the-box integration, i.e., OpenFaaS Cloud. Commercial platforms instead typically have a dedicated CI/CD service, i.e., AWS CodePipeline, Cloud Build, or Azure Pipelines.

Main Findings: Application Delivery

- ➔ 9/10 reviewed platforms follow a declarative approach to automate application deployment.
- ➔ Commercial platforms natively support CI/CD throughout dedicated tooling.
- ➔ From open source platforms only OpenFaaS documents integration with CI/CD pipelines.

Code Reuse. The classification of considered FaaS platforms concerning aspects of code reuse are shown in Table 18. Notably, only AWS Lambda and MS Azure Functions are equipped with a function marketplace where to pick already existing, runnable functions. Amazon indeed provides the Serverless Application Repository, which includes various serverless use case applications, whereas Microsoft provides a more general-purpose marketplace called Azure Marketplace, which also offers applications based on Azure Functions. At the time of writing, Google's marketplace instead does not offer applications based on Google Cloud Functions. Going beyond marketplaces all platforms instead provide one or more code sample repositories, which typically reside in the same or in a separate project under the same GitHub organization.

Table 19: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Code Reuse* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is documented.

	Function Marketplaces	Official Code Sample Repositories
Apache Openwhisk	n/s	✓
AWS Lambda	AWS Serverless Application Repository	✓
Fission	n/s	✓
Fn	n/s	✓
Google Cloud Functions	n/s	✓
Knative	n/s	✓
Kubeless	n/s	✓
MS Azure Functions	Azure Marketplace	✓
Nuclio	n/s	✓
OpenFaaS	n/s	✓

Main Findings: Code Reuse

➔ AWS Lambda and MS Azure Functions offer a marketplace where to pick ready-to-use functions and serverless applications.

➔ All platforms provide examples of functions in code sample repositories.

Access Management. Finally, the results of the review related to the aspects of access management covering support for authentication mechanisms and access control are shown in Table 20. With respect to available authentication mechanisms, commercial platforms offer dedicated services such AWS IAM or Google Cloud IAM that provide a powerful and highly-flexible way to control authentication. Azure Functions instead supports usage of a Microsoft account, or authentication via a trusted third party credentials such as Facebook, Google, or Twitter. On the contrary, most open source platforms do not cover such aspects, either by outsourcing this task to the underlying hosting environment (e.g., Kubernetes) or implementing basic authentication using shared secrets. In terms of access control capabilities, all commercial providers support defining access rules for who can invoke functions and how functions can access specific resources. The documentation of most open source platforms does not provide details on such advanced topics. The only exception is OpenFaaS, which allows configuring functions as read-only, hence preventing them to modify the underlying file system, and Kubeless which describes Kubernetes-based mechanisms. Notably, even if some Kubernetes-based platforms do not explicitly mention the support for access control mechanisms, it is still possible to reuse Kubernetes-native mechanisms to control the accesses to functions and/or resources.

Table 20: Classification of considered FaaS Platforms, based on the *Access Management* category in the *technical* view of our classification framework. The abbreviation "n/s" stays for "not specified", meaning that no related information is documented.

	Authentication Mechanisms	Access Control
Apache Openwhisk	function invocation using shared secrets	n/s
AWS Lambda	AWS IAM	resources, functions
Fission	n/s	n/s
Fn	n/s	n/s
Google Cloud Functions	Cloud IAM	resources, functions
Knative	n/s	n/s
Kubeless	✓**	✓**
MS Azure Functions	Azure Active Directory, Facebook, Google, Microsoft account, Twitter	resources, functions
Nuclio	n/s	n/s
OpenFaaS	function invocation using shared secrets, built-in basic authentication or proprietary OAuth2 API access plugins	resources*

* *Functions can be made read-only to forbid modifying the file system.*
** *Kubernetes-based mechanisms are described in the documentation.*

Main Findings: Access Management

➔ Commercial platforms natively support authentication and resource access control.

➔ Open source platforms typically rely on features offered by the hosting environment to enforce authentication and resource access control.

6. FaaStener: Platform Selection Support System

To facilitate the storage and usage of collected data for the FaaS selection process, we implemented an open source *FaaS Platform Selection Support System*, called FaaStener[4]. FaaStener is a web-based application developed in Angular and Angular Material components library[5] providing a graphical user interface for interacting with the platform's data (Figure 12).

FaaStener enables users to browse the information for a chosen reviewed platform, to perform a multi-attribute search for suitable FaaS platform based on the specified requirements (e.g., taken from the business, technical, or a combination of both views) and to visualize the corresponding results, which significantly improves the usability of our classification framework and technology review. Another advantage is the possibility to perform feature-wise comparison of multiple platforms by simultaneously looking at their classification in separate tabs of the browser.

[4]The sources of FaaStener are publicly available on GitHub at `https://github.com/faastener/faastener`, while running instance of FaaStener can be accessed at `https://faastener.github.io`.

[5]*Angular*: `https://angular.io`. *Angular Material*: `https://material.angular.io`.




Figure 12: FaaStener: A FaaS platforms selection support system

It is finally worth noting that FaaStener has been intentionally designed to ease the maintenance and extension of the systematic knowledge base it enables browsing, which is currently constituted by the results of our technology review. The technology review results are indeed encoded as JSON files, which structure represents the overall structure of our classification framework. Since FaaStener is open sourced, updating information on an already reviewed FaaS platform or adding a new platform just require to update or upload the corresponding JSON files, by exploiting the mechanism of pull requests in GitHub, which allows to accept contributions from all interested parties. To facilitate the contribution process, FaaStener provides the relevant documentation and resource links in a dedicated site section.

7. Threats to validity

Wohlin et al. [73] provide a standardised classification of threats of validity potentially affecting secondary studies. Four of such potential threats may apply to our study, namely threats to *external* validity, to *construct* and *internal* validities, and to *conclusions* validity. We hereafter discuss them and illustrates the countermeasure we adopted to mitigate them.

External validity concerns the applicability of a set of results in a more general context [73]. Since we focused on self-declared information available on the official websites and GitHub repositories of FaaS platforms, our results and observations may only be partly applicable to the broader practices and information available on FaaS platforms, hence threatening external validity. To reinforce the validity of our findings, we organised 3 feedback sessions during our analysis of the documentation available on the websites and GitHub repositories of considered FaaS platforms. We analyzed the discussion following-up from each feedback session, and we exploited this qualitative data to fine-tune our classification framework, the actual classification of considered platforms, and teh applicability of our findings. We also made our data easily accessible throughout the FaaStener, which is open source, and whose GitHub repository includes all artifacts we produced during our analysis. We believe that this can help in making our classification framework, technology review and observations more explicit and applicable in practice.

Construct and internal validity instead concern the generalizability of the constructs under studies and the validity of the methods actually exploited to study and analyze data, respectively [73]. These inherently includes the possible biases affecting our study. To mitigate both above threats, we adopted various inter-rater reliability assessment rounds, aimed at avoiding biases by triangulation (Section 3). We indeed performed various iterations among the authors both for (i) refining the initially obtained classification framework and obtaining that show in Section 4, and for (ii) cross-checking the actual classification of considered FaaS platforms until a full agreement among all authors was achieved.

Finally, threats to conclusions validity may apply depending on the degree to which the conclusions of a study are reasonably based on the available data [73]. To mitigate this threat, we exploited theme coding and inter-rater reliability assessment to limit observer and interpretation biases, both while developing the classification framework and while actually classifying the considered FaaS platforms. The ultimate goal in both cases was indeed to perform a sound analysis of the data we retrieved from official websites and GitHub repositories of considered FaaS platforms. In addition, the conclusions drawn in this paper were independently drawn by the authors, and they were then double-checked against the available information in joint discussion sessions.

8. Related Work

There already exist some research efforts qualitatively classifying and reviewing FaaS platforms. Such efforts were already listed in Section 3, as they were reviewed during Step 1 of our study and exploited in Step 2 to derive the initial version of our classification framework. Throughout the subsequent steps, we extended the set of criteria

considered while classifying FaaS platforms, as well as the set of considered platforms themselves.

A concrete example in this direction is the review by Kritikos and Skrzypek [25], who conducted an assessment of serverless frameworks using a set of criteria corresponding to various phases of a serverless application's lifecycle, e.g., design, development, deployment, or execution. In their work, Kritikos and Skrzypek distinguish between provisioning and abstraction frameworks. The former are responsible for provisioning serverless applications by enabling a "mini-serverless platform", whereas the latter abstract away the technical details of two or more serverless platforms. As a result, such Kubernetes-based FaaS platforms as Fission and Kubeless are classified as provisioning frameworks, and the framework Serverless is described as an abstraction framework. The Authors then evaluate and compare both provisioning and abstraction frameworks by considering 14 qualitative criteria. Our effort goes a step further in two directions by (i) considering a wider set of criteria to analyse and classify FaaS platforms, and by (ii) considering a wider set of FaaS platforms.

Other examples of criteria-based reviews of FaaS platforms are those by Lee et al. [28], Lynn et al. [29], and Mohanty et al. [27], Lee et al. [28] evaluate the performance characteristics of production FaaS platforms, and include a feature-wise comparison of the chosen products, i.e., FaaS platforms from Amazon, Microsoft, Google, and IBM. Lynn et al. [29] evaluate seven enterprise serverless platforms with the term serverless being used interchangeably with FaaS. The chosen products are reviewed based on the set of defined criteria and include, e.g., AWS Lambda, Microsoft Azure Functions, and Google Cloud Functions. Mohanty et al. [27] conduct a feature-wise comparison consisting of 15 features together with performance evaluation of four open source FaaS platforms, namely Kubeless, OpenWhisk, Fission, and OpenFaaS. In this work, the Authors put more focus on performance evaluation of open source platforms.

Some works focus on evaluating FaaS-related, complementary concepts such as function orchestrators and serverless application repositories. López et al. [26] evaluate and compare three commercial FaaS orchestrations systems, namely AWS Step Functions, IBM Composer, and Azure Durable Functions. The chosen function orchestrators are reviewed based on the set of defined criteria, and their runtime overhead is evaluated experimentally. Spillner [74] investigates how FaaS-based applications are specified, stored, and offered using the AWS Serverless Applications Repository. Various statistics are presented related to different aspects of functions' lifecycle.

All the aforementioned research efforts, together with other existing criteria-based reviews of FaaS platforms [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36], provide valuable contributions by taking various angles for reviewing FaaS platforms and related relevant concepts. At the same time, the features considered in all such efforts for classifying FaaS platforms, as well as the classified FaaS platforms themselves, do not overlap, hence scattering knowledge across different pieces of literature. We instead aim to provide a more comprehensive classification framework and technical review, by (i) extending the set features already considered in literature for classifying FaaS platforms, (ii) enabling to classify FaaS platforms at two different levels of detail, based on the involved stakeholders, and (iii) providing a more comprehensive technical review for the most popular FaaS platforms based on our classification framework. In addition, we also provide a first selection support system enabling researchers and practitioners to look for the FaaS platforms most suited to their needs.

Finally, it is worth relating our work to several research efforts tackling the problem of FaaS platforms benchmarking. For instance, Wang et al. [75] analyze the performance, resource management, and architectures of the FaaS platforms from Amazon, Microsoft, and Google. Authors implement measurement functions to discover hidden architecture details of these platforms and collect performance-related data. Our work differs from that by Wang et al. [75] since we focus on feature-wise classification and reviewing of FaaS platforms, rather than on their benchmarking. Similar considerations apply to other research efforts benchmarking FaaS platforms [76, 77, 78, 79].

9. Conclusions & Future Work

With the ultimate goal of supporting researchers and practitioners in classifying existing FaaS platforms and choosing those most suited to their needs, we presented a classification framework, technology review and selection support system for FaaS platforms. Our *FaaS Platform Classification Framework* enables the characterisation of FaaS platforms under two different perspectives. Such perspectives are clearly shown in the *FaaS Platform Technology Review* we presented based on such framework, which provides both a business and a technical view on ten existing FaaS Platforms. The *FaaS Platform Selection Support System* then materialises the results presented in our technology review in the form of a web-based application enabling researchers and practitioners to submit multi-attribute queries for searching for FaaS platforms satisfying their needs, and to compare different platforms based on their managerial or technical views.

Apart from enabling a thorough comparison of existing FaaS platforms, our contributions result in the stemming out of various novel research and innovation directions. For instance, we observed a lack of solutions for testing, debugging and versioning FaaS-based project, especially for separately testing, debugging and versioning of FaaS-based applications from the functions used to implement them. Portability is another example of research direction stemming out from our study, as FaaS platforms resulted to be quite heterogeneous in featured triggers, in supported orchestration, monitoring and logging solutions,

and in deployment automation technologies. This obviously hampers the migration of a FaaS-based application from a FaaS platform to another, hence requiring solutions for enhancing their portability.

In addition of the above listed directions for future work, we actually plan to extend the results and support provided by the proposed classification framework, technology review and selection support system. We intend to extend the classification framework defined in this work with other dimensions (e.g., security- or performance-related aspects), and to extend the technology review both by reviewing already considered platforms with the novel introduced dimensions and by considering other existing FaaS platforms and/or related tooling (e.g., function orchestrators). In addition, we plan to combine the categories and dimensions forming our classification framework into advanced metrics for evaluating and comparing FaaS platforms, and to exploit such advanced metrics to extend our selection support system into a full-fledged decision support system, which will be capable of providing smart informed recommendations to researchers and practitioners needing a FaaS platform for run their applications.

Acknowledgements. This work is partially funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation project *RADON* (825040), and by the projects *AMaCA* (POR-FSE) and *DECLware* (University of Pisa, PRA_2018_66). We also wish to thank Roman Bunz, Simon Hauser, and Leon Kiefer (listed alphabetically), who contributed to setting up this work during an initial exploratory study of existing FaaS platforms.

References

References

[1] I. Baldini, et al., Serverless computing: Current trends and open problems, in: Research Advances in Cloud Computing, Springer, 2017, pp. 1–20.

[2] Cloud Native Computing Foundation (CNCF), CNCF Serverless Whitepaper v1.0, https://github.com/cncf/wg-serverless/tree/master/whitepapers/serverless-overview (Sep. 2018).

[3] V. Yussupov, U. Breitenbücher, F. Leymann, M. Wurster, A Systematic Mapping Study on Engineering Function-as-a-Service Platforms and Tools, in: Proceedings of the 12th IEEE/ACM International Conference onUtility and Cloud Computing (UCC 2019), ACM, 2019, pp. 229–240. doi:10.1145/3344341.3368803.

[4] Amazon Web Services, Inc., AWS Lambda, https://aws.amazon.com/lambda.

[5] Microsoft, Microsoft Azure Functions, https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/services/functions.

[6] Google, Google Cloud Functions, https://cloud.google.com/functions.

[7] IBM, IBM Cloud Functions, https://cloud.ibm.com/functions.

[8] The Apache Software Foundation, Apache OpenWhisk, https://openwhisk.apache.org.

[9] OpenFaaS Project, OpenFaaS, https://www.openfaas.com.

[10] Bitnami, Kubeless, https://kubeless.io.

[11] The Knative Authors, Knative, https://knative.dev.

[12] The Kubernetes Authors, Kubernetes, https://kubernetes.io.

[13] G. C. Fox, et al., Status of serverless computing and others, arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.08028.

[14] A. Eivy, Be wary of the economics of" serverless" cloud computing, IEEE Cloud Computing 4 (2) (2017) 6–12.

[15] J. M. Hellerstein, et al., Serverless computing: One step forward, two steps back, arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.03651.

[16] V. Yussupov, U. Breitenbücher, F. Leymann, C. Müller, Facing the Unplanned Migration of Serverless Applications: A Study on Portability Problems, Solutions, and Dead Ends, in: Proceedings of the 12th IEEE/ACM International Conference onUtility and Cloud Computing (UCC 2019), ACM, 2019, pp. 273–283. doi:10.1145/3344341.3368813.

[17] The Fission Authors, Fission, https://fission.io.

[18] Amazon, Alexa, https://developer.amazon.com/en-US/alexa.

[19] Cloud Native Computing Foundation (CNCF), CNCF Serverless Landscape, https://landscape.cncf.io/format=serverless.

[20] Cloud Native Computing Foundation (CNCF), Cloud Events v1.0, https://github.com/cloudevents/spec/blob/v1.0/spec.md (2020).

[21] Amazon Web Services, AWS Step Functions, https://aws.amazon.com/step-functions.

[22] Microsoft, Azure Durable Functions, https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/azure-functions/durable.

[23] Amazon Web Services, Serverless Application Repository, https://aws.amazon.com/serverless/serverlessrepo.

[24] K. Petersen, S. Vakkalanka, L. Kuzniarz, Guidelines for conducting systematic mapping studies in software engineering: An update, Information and Software Technology 64 (2015) 1–18.

[25] K. Kritikos, P. Skrzypek, A review of serverless frameworks, in: 2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing Companion (UCC Companion), 2018, pp. 161–168.

[26] P. García López, M. Sánchez-Artigas, G. París, D. Barcelona Pons, Á. Ruiz Ollobarren, D. Arroyo Pinto, Comparison of faas orchestration systems, in: 2018 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing Companion (UCC Companion), 2018, pp. 148–153.

[27] S. K. Mohanty, G. Premsankar, M. di Francesco, An evaluation of open source serverless computing frameworks, in: 2018 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom), 2018, pp. 115–120.

[28] H. Lee, K. Satyam, G. Fox, Evaluation of production serverless computing environments, in: 2018 IEEE 11th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD), 2018, pp. 442–450.

[29] T. Lynn, P. Rosati, A. Lejeune, V. Emeakaroha, A preliminary review of enterprise serverless cloud computing (function-as-a-service) platforms, in: 2017 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Computing Technology and Science (CloudCom), 2017, pp. 162–169.

[30] C. Wohlin, Guidelines for snowballing in systematic literature studies and a replication in software engineering, in: Proceedings of the 18th international conference on evaluation and assessment in software engineering, 2014, pp. 1–10.

[31] R. A. P. Rajan, Serverless architecture-a revolution in cloud computing, in: 2018 Tenth International Conference on Advanced Computing (ICoAC), IEEE, 2018, pp. 88–93.

[32] A. Palade, A. Kazmi, S. Clarke, An evaluation of open source serverless computing frameworks support at the edge, in: 2019 IEEE World Congress on Services (SERVICES), Vol. 2642, IEEE, 2019, pp. 206–211.

[33] M. Kumar, Serverless architectures review, future trend and the solutions to open problems, American Journal of Software Engineering 6 (1) (2019) 1–10.

[34] D. Kalnauz, V. Speranskiy, Productivity estimation of serverless computing, Applied Aspects of Information Technology (1) (2019) 20–28.

[35] F. Gand, I. Fronza, N. El Ioini, H. R. Barzegar, C. Pahl, Serverless container cluster management for lightweight edge clouds, in: Intl Conference on Cloud Computing and Services Science CLOSER, 2020.

[36] D. Bortolini, R. R. Obelheiro, Investigating performance and

cost in function-as-a-service platforms, in: International Conference on P2P, Parallel, Grid, Cloud and Internet Computing, Springer, 2019, pp. 174–185.
[37] K. Petersen, R. Feldt, S. Mujtaba, M. Mattsson, Systematic mapping studies in software engineering, in: 12th International Conference on Evaluation and Assessment in Software Engineering (EASE) 12, 2008, pp. 1–10.
[38] M. Wurster, et al., The Essential Deployment Metamodel: A Systematic Review of Deployment Automation Technologies, SICS Software-Intensive Cyber-Physical Systemsdoi:10.1007/s00450-019-00412-x.
[39] J. Spillner, Snafu: Function-as-a-service (faas) runtime design and implementation, arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.07562.
[40] V. Garousi, M. Felderer, M. V. Mäntylä, Guidelines for including grey literature and conducting multivocal literature reviews in software engineering, Information and Software Technology 106 (2019) 101–121.
[41] A. M. S. Laurent, Understanding Open Source and Free Software Licensing, OReilly Media, Inc., 2004.
[42] J. Humble, D. Farley, Continuous Delivery: Reliable Software Releases through Build, Test, and Deployment Automation, 1st Edition, Addison-Wesley Professional, 2010.
[43] R. Guidotti, J. Soldani, D. Neri, A. Brogi, D. Pedreschi, Helping your docker images to spread based on explainable models, in: U. Brefeld, E. Curry, E. Daly, B. MacNamee, A. Marascu, F. Pinelli, M. Berlingerio, N. Hurley (Eds.), Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases, Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 205–221.
[44] JetBrains, IntelliJ IDEA, https://www.jetbrains.com/idea.
[45] Microsoft, VS Code, https://code.visualstudio.com.
[46] Danilo Sato, CanaryRelease, https://martinfowler.com/bliki/CanaryRelease.html (2014).
[47] Martin Fowler, BlueGreenDeployment, https://martinfowler.com/bliki/BlueGreenDeployment.html (2010).
[48] Y. Mansouri, A. N. Toosi, R. Buyya, Data storage management in cloud environments: Taxonomy, survey, and future directions, ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR) 50 (6) (2018) 91.
[49] Amazon Web Services, Amazon Simple Queue Service, https://aws.amazon.com/sqs.
[50] Apache Software Foundation, Apache Kafka, https://kafka.apache.org.
[51] Pivotal, RabbitMQ, https://www.rabbitmq.com.
[52] IBM, IBM Watson, https://www.ibm.com/watson.
[53] GitHub, Inc., GitHub, https://github.com.
[54] F. Leymann, D. Roller, Production workflow: concepts and techniques, Prentice Hall PTR, 1999.
[55] OASIS, Web Services Business Process Execution Language (WS-BPEL) Version 2.0, Organization for the Advancement of Structured Information Standards (OASIS) (2007).
[56] Amazon Web Services, AWS CloudFormation, https://aws.amazon.com/cloudformation.
[57] Serverless, Inc., Serverless Framework, https://serverless.com.
[58] Docker, Inc., Swarm mode overview, https://docs.docker.com/engine/swarm/.
[59] Iguazio, Nuclio, https://nuclio.io.
[60] Microsoft, Azure Functions, GitHub, https://github.com/Azure/Azure-Functions.
[61] Google, Google Cloud Pub/Sub, https://cloud.google.com/pubsub.
[62] Slack Technologies, Slack, https://slack.com.
[63] IFTTT, Inc., IFTTT, https://ifttt.com.
[64] Amazon Web Services, AWS CloudWatch, https://aws.amazon.com/cloudwatch.
[65] Amazon Web Services, AWS CloudTrail, https://aws.amazon.com/cloudtrail.
[66] Microsoft, Azure Application Insights, https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/azure-monitor/app/app-insights-overview.
[67] Google, Google Cloud's Operations, https://cloud.google.com/products/operations.
[68] Prometheus Authors, Prometheus, https://prometheus.io.
[69] Grafana Labs, Grafana, https://grafana.com.
[70] Elasticsearch B.V., Elasticsearch, https://www.elastic.co.
[71] Elasticsearch B.V., Kibana, https://www.elastic.co/kibana.
[72] C. Endres, U. Breitenbücher, M. Falkenthal, O. Kopp, F. Leymann, J. Wettinger, Declarative vs. imperative: Two modeling patterns for the automated deployment of applications, in: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Pervasive Patterns and Applications, Xpert Publishing Services (XPS), 2017, pp. 22–27.
[73] C. Wohlin, P. Runeson, M. Hst, M. C. Ohlsson, B. Regnell, A. Wessln, Experimentation in Software Engineering, Springer Publishing Company, Incorporated, 2012.
[74] J. Spillner, Quantitative analysis of cloud function evolution in the aws serverless application repository, arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04800.
[75] L. Wang, M. Li, Y. Zhang, T. Ristenpart, M. Swift, Peeking behind the curtains of serverless platforms, in: Proceedings of the 2018 USENIX Conference on Usenix Annual Technical Conference, USENIX ATC '18, USENIX Association, Berkeley, CA, USA, 2018, pp. 133–145.
[76] T. Back, V. Andrikopoulos, Using a microbenchmark to compare function as a service solutions, in: Service-Oriented and Cloud Computing, Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 146–160.
[77] M. Malawski, K. Figiela, A. Gajek, A. Zima, Benchmarking heterogeneous cloud functions, in: D. B. Heras, L. Bougé, G. Mencagli, E. Jeannot, R. Sakellariou, R. M. Badia, J. G. Barbosa, L. Ricci, S. L. Scott, S. Lankes, J. Weidendorfer (Eds.), Euro-Par 2017: Parallel Processing Workshops, Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 415–426.
[78] J. Kuhlenkamp, S. Werner, M. C. Borges, K. El Tal, S. Tai, An evaluation of faas platforms as a foundation for serverless big data processing, in: Proceedings of the 12th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing, Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, p. 19. doi:10.1145/3344341.3368796.
[79] K. Figiela, A. Gajek, A. Zima, B. Obrok, M. Malawski, Performance evaluation of heterogeneous cloud functions, Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience 30 (23).

All links were last followed on the 27th March 2020.