



HAL
open science

An Efficient Approach for Multi-tenant Elastic Business Processes Management in Cloud Computing environment

Guillaume Rosinosky, Samir Youcef, François Charoy

► **To cite this version:**

Guillaume Rosinosky, Samir Youcef, François Charoy. An Efficient Approach for Multi-tenant Elastic Business Processes Management in Cloud Computing environment. IEEE Cloud 2016 - 9th IEEE International Conference on Cloud Computing, Jun 2016, San Francisco, United States. hal-01355125

HAL Id: hal-01355125

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01355125>

Submitted on 22 Aug 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

An Efficient Approach for Multi-tenant Elastic Business Processes Management in Cloud Computing environment

Guillaume Rosinosky
Bonitasoft
Grenoble, France

Email: guillaume.rosinosky@bonitasoft.com

Samir Youcef, François Charoy
Université de Lorraine, Inria, LORIA
Nancy, France

Email: samir.youcef@loria.fr, francois.charoy@loria.fr

Abstract—Even though the cloud computing paradigm has proven benefits, it faces a serious problem that can compromise its commercial success. It concerns the lack of efficient approach for using optimally the available resources. For this, several approaches have been proposed. However, they suffer from several shortcomings. Often only one objective is taken into account, expressing all operations in terms of cost. Furthermore, business processes should be insured with elasticity and multi-tenancy mechanism while adjusting the available resources to the dynamic load distribution. The proposed approach aims to optimize two conflicting objectives, namely the number of migrations of tenants and the cost incurred using a set of resources. It allows to take into account the multi-tenancy property and the Cloud computing elasticity, and is efficient as shown by an extensive experimentation based on real data from Bonita BPM customers.

Keywords-BPM; Cloud; Elasticity; Multi-tenancy; Bi-criteria optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

For years, software have been sold and installed in customers premises and operated by their IT teams. This business model requires the software to be deployed on the user's computer infrastructure. The customer will ensure its maintenance and transition between versions. Recently, several businesses adopted a new paradigm where the software is operated in a data center and accessed remotely. This new way to consume software, known as cloud computing, transfers the burden of IT management to the software provider. The latter must ensure the required quality of service (QoS) at the lowest possible operating cost for its customers. Achieving that goal efficiently remains an issue. Here, we consider the delivery of a business process execution as a service as part of a Business Process Management System (BPMS) [1]. The goal of a BPMS is, among others, to control the execution of business processes, according to their model. To provide elastic *business process management as a service* (BPMaaS) means to accommodate the service requirement of a set of customers and to support the execution of their processes with the required level of quality of service, for the best cost. More precisely, we want that at each point in time the available resources match the current demand as closely as possible. Thus,

we must set up an elastic infrastructure [2] adapted to the specific requirements of business process execution. Generic auto scaling techniques provided by cloud providers do not usually take into account software usage metrics, but rather system or OS level metrics such as CPU or memory. We argue that we can use business processes and their history of usage to anticipate the IT resource allocation need. It will be useful to achieve an efficient infrastructure elasticity for business process execution.

In this paper, we consider a service provider that wants to provide process execution as a service. The used BPMS must support multi-tenancy, i.e. it can accommodate several customers on the same installation. We assume that it is possible to migrate a tenant from a BPMS installation to another BPMS installation with a limited interruption of service. Considering these assumptions, our goal is to propose a way to ensure the required quality of service for each tenant at the minimal cost while minimizing tenant migrations. That requires to adjust the number of computers to the load required for each tenant while minimizing the number of migrations of tenant from one set of resources to another. We propose an efficient bi-criteria approach based on tenant migrations number and cost optimization, solving iteratively for each number of migrations a repacking step for the existing resources, followed by a variable cost and size bin packing, and by a step of consolidation. We compare this approach to the solving of the corresponding model, using data based on customer information.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we discuss the problem in more details and we describe our hypothesis and the limits of this study. Section III summaries the existing work. Section IV gives our problem formulation of resource allocation to execute business processes in cloud computing environment. This section also presents the optimization objectives, namely the cost incurred using a set of resources and the number of tenant migrations. Section V presents our proposition to provide an approximate solution to the problem that can be computed in polynomial time. In section VI, we describe the evaluation that we have conducted using Bonita BPM[3] as an example of BPMS and Amazon Web Services[4] as the

cloud provider. We show that it diverges very reasonably from an exact solution that could not scale. Section VII concludes the paper and describes its future extensions.

II. MOTIVATION AND HYPOTHESIS

Providing business process execution as a service requires support for an operator to manage execution of thousands of processes from hundreds of customers at the same time on its infrastructure. This requires an environment able to adjust itself to the load of the different customers automatically. We could rely on basic scalability techniques available in IaaS systems, and add more computing power in a BPMS installation when the load increases. This is not easy since a BPMS is database write intensive and we would reach a maximum number of customers on the same cluster. In the literature, many consider business process oriented optimization, at various level of elasticity completion, as we will see in the existing work part.

We consider a more lightweight approach based on a multi-tenant BPM solution where each tenant share the resources. More precisely, we consider a tenant-centric BP-MaaS elasticity, by looking at tenant usage data, namely the total number of BPM tasks per tenant and unit of time. We discuss about distribution of tenants and their activities on a cloud infrastructure. We want to support as many tenants as possible at the minimal cost, while ensuring a defined quality of service based on task execution time.

In order to distribute tenants on the best configurations, we will need to be able to migrate tenants. In our case, tenant migration is the action of moving customer software and data from a cloud configuration to another. When a tenant needs more computing power than the current configuration can provide, either we migrate it to a bigger configuration in accordance with the QoS of the customer, or we migrate other tenants from the same configuration to free computing power. On the other way, we should move a tenant which requires less resources. We assume that tenant awareness, automated migration, and tenant consolidation are totally supported by the BPM engine and its corresponding database systems. Migrations usually have negative effects on the origin and destination cloud configurations and the tenants they host. We consider that a tenant migration produces a service interruption that is acceptable for customers. It is realistic since solutions for live migration exist for databases [5]. We also assume that we can do migration operations in less than one unit of time (an hour in our case). However migrations could cause QoS breaks, and this is why we have chosen to minimize it aside of the cost.

As many other applications, a BPM stack requires many software elements (see figure 1). It needs one or several instances of ACID compliant relational database systems which it uses to store process data, one or several web application servers who will contain the BPM Engine, load balancers in the case of clustered applications, and other




Figure 1. Simple BPMS architecture. Here we have a clustered version of a BPMS using a clustered database, behind a load balancer. The user can use its own application interfaced to the BPMS, or access directly to this last one via end-user interfaces. The BPMS may contact other applications via web services.

services used in distributed applications, such as supplement web servers, message brokers, etc. We propose to measure BPM task execution throughput to estimate the required performance for tenants and the capability of various cloud configurations. It is also our second QoS metric. Task execution throughput is strongly related to the transaction performances of the underlying database. In order to execute the tasks of a BPM process, the BPM engine may execute one or several transactions in its database, before, during and after the execution of the task. A transition in BPM process also triggers state changes in the database. Database transactions are often used as a performance metric in precedent works and in industry [6], [7], [8]. In order to distribute the tenants on the cloud configuration, we need to have a way to estimate its required load. We have some knowledge on the behavioral patterns of every tenant for a given period of time. This information will be used to organize resources and distribute the load between configurations. This could be determined manually (in the contract part between the customer and the service provider), or using some prediction system.

Regarding the cloud resources part, we assume that we have access to a public cloud provider with unlimited resources, and on demand billing. Compute resources are paid per hour and their price is constant. We consider that compute resources have stable performance. For instance a stack can be composed of a compute instance for the database, another one for the BPMS. We name a defined group of compute instances a cloud configuration. Each cloud configuration has a defined capability and price. We assume that each tenant can fit on at least one cloud configuration type, i.e the sum of its activities can be supported by the configuration type which can handle the most activity count per hour. Small tenants can share configurations. We neglect the effect of tenant execution on the other tenants executing on the same configuration : we will consider that

tenants' workload adds up. For instance, a tenant with 10000 tasks per hour is similar to two tenants with 5000 tasks per hour.

These hypothesis ensure that the framework remains realistic. It allows us to define a model that we can optimize to enforce the best operation conditions for BPM tenants. In the next section, we explore the current solutions for similar problems.

III. RELATED WORK

Schulte et al. [9] made a review on the current status on BPM elasticity, and the different important criteria. [10], [11], [12] proposed solutions for BPM elasticity. They aim to distribute processes without taking into account multi tenancy. They consider mainly CPU and RAM for resource consumption. In [13], Sellami et al. propose a multi tenant approach based on customizable thresholds. It does not take into account migration cost or the database tier.

A lot of papers study virtual machine assignment in data-centers such as [14], [15]. However these works consider only the scheduling part, as the resources in data-center are fixed.

Assignment algorithms usually do not take into account migrations. Another term for this is reassignment, and, to the best of our knowing, much less attempts have been made on this subject. However, a well known initiative is the Google Reassignment Problem [16] where the problem is mono objective and sums up load, balance, process, service, and program move cost. Several propositions to solve this problem have been made. The best ones use variable neighborhood search [17], [18], or constraint programming [19]. However these approaches aim data centers, who have a predefined set of machines, and assume a fixed cost for migrations.

Other attempts such as multi-tenant relational database management system [8] or generic SaaS elasticity have been made for this problem, but there is no known work who take into account BPMS cloud migrations and cost in a multi-objective way.

IV. OUR MODEL FOR ELASTIC MULTI-TENANT BPM IN THE CLOUD

The objective of our study is to minimize the cost of computing resources and the number of tenant migration that cause QoS degradation while maintaining enough computing power to execute all processes. Thus we face a multi-objective problem who can be tackled using three approaches: (i) the mono-criterion approach, (ii) the ϵ -constraints and (iii) the multi-criteria approach. The criteria that we consider are conflicting. If we consider only the cost objective part, the best solution could provoke the migration of all the tenants. But as migrations can lead to QoS degradation, we will not consider it alone. On the other side, minimizing the migration objective can lead to leave

tenants on expensive configurations. Therefore, the most appropriate approach is the multi-criteria one. We consider the two objective functions simultaneously. The most used optimality notion when we deal with multi-criteria problems is the Pareto optimality concept defined as follows.

Definition 1. We say that a solution $x \in X$ is a Pareto solution (or belong to the Pareto front) iff:

- $\nexists x' \in X, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, f_i(x') \leq f_i(x) \wedge \exists j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, f_j(x') < f_j(x)$.

We assume that an instance of the BPMS is deployed on a cloud configuration consisting in several cloud resources, for instance one for the database, on for the application server etc. We rely on several configuration types with different cloud instance types. We consider that a configuration type has a cost, and a throughput capability. This cost is the total of the cost of its cloud resources for a time slot of one hour, since it is the unit of cost for most public cloud providers.

Let the following variables :

- \mathcal{J} , the set of possible configurations with m its cardinality
- C_j , and W_j , respectively the cost and the capacity for the configuration j
- \mathcal{I} , the set of tenants with n its cardinality
- w_i , the needed capacity for the tenant i during time slot $k + 1$
- $x_j^i(k)$, the assignment of tenant i to configuration instance j during time slot k
- $y_j(k)$, the activation of configuration j during time slot $k + 1$

We define an indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{\{x_j^i(k) \neq x_j^i(k+1)\}}$. which corresponds to actual tenant migration which will be equal to :

$$\begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x_j^i(k) = x_j^i(k+1) \\ 1 & \text{if } x_j^i(k) \neq x_j^i(k+1) \end{cases}$$

We aim to minimize the total configurations cost and the number of migrations for the time slot $k + 1$ from the configurations distribution at time k where we apply the needed capacity at time $k + 1$. The problem can be defined as follows:

$$\min f1 = \sum_j^{j \in \mathcal{J}} C_j y_j(k+1) \quad (1)$$

$$\min f2 = \sum_j^{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_i^{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_j^i(k) \neq x_j^i(k+1)\}} x_j^i(k+1) \quad (2)$$

We have the following constraints :

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I} \sum_j^{j \in \mathcal{J}} x_j^i(k+1) = 1 \quad (3)$$

$$\forall j \in \mathcal{J} \sum_i^{i \in \mathcal{I}} w_i x_j^i(k+1) \leq W_j y_j(k+1) \quad (4)$$

$$\forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, x_i^j \in \{0, 1\}, y_j \in \{0, 1\} \quad (5)$$

Equation 1 presents the cost objective, and equation 2 the migration quantity objective. Equation 3 indicates that a tenant should be assigned to only one configuration. Equation 4 means that the sum of the required throughput of tenants on one resource should be less or equal than the capability of this resource.

For a defined number of resources, and without taking into account migrations, this is a classic assignment problem. However the resource allocation part and the migration part makes it more difficult to solve. Since, as we will precise in the next section, the problem is NP-hard, it is appropriate to propose heuristic algorithms rather than exact algorithms that would not scale.

V. AN EFFICIENT APPROACH FOR MULTI-TENANT ELASTIC BUSINESS PROCESS EXECUTION IN CLOUD CONTEXT

The approach we propose is composed of two parts: (i) the resource allocation part and (ii) the scheduling part. Resource allocation and task scheduling are NP-hard problems. Greedy heuristics, integer and mixed integer linear programming, meta-heuristics, or constraint programming [20] are often used to deal with such problem. Greedy algorithms are heuristics who make the assumption that by aiming at the best local solution, a good global solution is reachable. This type of algorithm is usually simple and fast, but could get stuck in a local optimum. Integer linear programming (ILP) and mixed integer linear programming (MILP) are usual operational research algorithms, seeking to minimize an objective function under constraints with discrete variables (ILP), or mixed discrete and continuous variables. Solving these problems usually include LP relaxation in order to find valid solutions with continuous methods. However, depending on the problem size the computing can be long, and a solver is needed in order to resolve the problem.

Here, we choose to observe the number of migrations first since it is discrete, and to calculate the best cost for each migration number with an heuristic. Reducing the cost requires to reduce the number and the cost of configurations. In our approach, apart of the throughput constraint, we decided not to consider swapping tenants and to focus on resource reduction. We show an example of configurations and their tenants in figure 2.

The minimum number of tenants we must move is the number of tenants that doesn't fit anymore in their current resources. We divide them among two classes :

- tenants that we must migrate because their future throughput is greater than the capability of their current resource. The migration of these tenants is mandatory. We name these type of tenants **unfit** tenants. These are the crossed line boxes in the figure 2 such as *T6*.




Figure 2. An example of distribution of tenants and configurations. Three configurations contain ten tenants in this situation. The outer boxes represent the configurations, and the inner ones the tenants. Crossed stripped boxes represent the unfit tenants, that can't stay anymore in their configuration. Single stripped boxes represent the overloading tenants. Blank boxes represent tenants that fit in their current resource.

- tenants which, put together, overload their current resource. We choose to "remove" from the resources and force the migration of the biggest tenants in each overloaded resource until none is overloaded anymore. We name these type of tenants the **overloading** tenants. In figure 2 they are the striped boxes such as tenants *T9* and *T10*.

The main loop is described in algorithm 1. At each count of migrations, we consider the combination of resources containing precisely the number of tenants we wish to migrate if we add to it the number of mandatory tenants. This is a subset sum problem, where we use a simple recursive approach. In figure 2, the minimum number of migrations is 3 (*T9*, *T10* and *T6*), and it is possible to also reassign 4 or 6 tenants - by removing respectively *conf1* or *m3_medium_1_0* configuration, but not 5 as there is no combination of resources hosting 5 tenants. The number of possibilities increases exponentially, which will lead to memory and CPU time problems. Moreover, there are cases where the algorithm could be slower than the exact method in particular when the resource quantity is high. Let's imagine we have 50 tenants, that are all hosted on their own configuration. In the case where we don't limit the number of subset sum combinations, for 25 migrations we will have C_{25}^{50} which means more than 10^{14} combinations to test. This number of migrations is very high and can't be computed in acceptable time. This is why it is important, even if it gives less interesting results, to limit the number of the subset sum combinations. In the experimentation part, we have considered 1000 resource combinations as a limit.

For each possible combination, we then virtually suppress the concerned resources, and consider the **mandatory** tenants and the **orphan** tenants resulting from the suppression of the resources. In our heuristic we chose to replace at best these tenants in the existing resources - that we cannot

Algorithm 1 Main loop

```
1: procedure MAIN LOOP(tenant distribution for previous hour, needed throughput)
2:    $resultNumberLimit = 1000$ 
3:    $unfit \leftarrow$  tenants whose throughput is bigger than their current resource
4:    $overloading \leftarrow$  biggest tenants to remove until there is no more overloaded resource
5:    $mandatoryTenants \leftarrow overloading \cup unfit$ 
6:    $minMigrations = size(mandatoryTenants)$ 
7:    $maxMigrations = size(tenants)$ 
8:    $distribution =$  remove mandatoryTenants from distribution
9:   for  $i = minMigrations \rightarrow maxMigrations$  do
10:     $costByMigration[i] \leftarrow +\infty$ 
11:     $possibleResourceCombinations \leftarrow$  FINDSUBSETSUM( $i, resources, result\_number\_limit$ )
12:    for all  $resourceCombination \in possibleResourceCombinations$  do
13:       $newDistribution \leftarrow distribution - resources \in resourceCombination$ 
14:       $tenantsToRepack \leftarrow mandatoryTenants \cap tenants \in resourceCombination$ 
15:      REPACKING( $newDistribution, tenantsToRepack$ )
16:      BINPACKING( $newDistribution, tenantsToRepack$ )
17:      CONSOLIDATION( $newDistribution, tenantsToRepack$ )
18:      if  $cost(newDistribution) \leq costByMigration[i]$  then
19:         $costByMigration[i] \leftarrow cost(newDistribution)$ 
20:         $distributionResult[i] \leftarrow newDistribution$ 
21:   return  $distributionResult$ 
```

delete without adding more migrations. For this part, we used a best fit decreasing approach, where we aim to load the tenants into the most appropriate resources.

After this step, we must create new resources for the remaining tenants. At this point, the existing resources can no longer be filled. We use a variable cost bin packing heuristic with the remaining tenants, more precisely a variation of Iterative Best Fit Decreasing algorithm [21].

Since we have two parts, one looking to existing resources and the other creating new resources, both generate unused space that should be used at best. In order to solve this problem, we have added a consolidation step which tries to delete resources one by one and replace if possible the resulting orphan tenants with the repacking procedure. This consolidation step is inspired by one of the operators of the local search used in [22]. We adapted it by taking into account only resources who contain only initially orphan tenants.

A configuration combination is kept only if is less expensive than the previous computed, in order to obtain the Pareto front (as we compute from the minimum to the maximum number of migrations). Figure 3 shows an example of cost migration. The best solutions are for 3, and 7 migrations. Other solutions such as 6, 9, 10 migrations are useless as they involve more migrations for the same price. There is no solution below 2 migrations, and for 5 or 8 migrations.

VI. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we present a summary of the results we obtained based on real data from Bonitasoft customers. In order to evaluate the quality of the results using our approach, given the fact that the migration criterion is




Figure 3. This represents the best results of our algorithm after we run it against the configuration in figure 2. The bigger dots represents the points in the Pareto frontier. Absence of dot means that there is no solution for the corresponding number of migrations.

discrete, we have compared for each migration number the cost between the heuristic and the results given by a solver.

We need to know first the size of each cloud configuration in term of throughput capability. We must also estimate the size of the tenants in term of BPM task throughput. For this, we use Bonita BPM [3] open-source business process management and workflow suite. Bonita BPM is a multi-tenant BPMS where several customer can have their applications on the same Bonita BPM instance and uses a shared-schema strategy [23] in order to manage tenants. We have launched tests on Bonita BPM 7.0.3 using PostgreSQL 9.3 database, each on a separated EC2 instance on Amazon Web Services public cloud. A business process definition

used by Bonitasoft for their internal performance tests has been used in order to compare the various configurations. The business process which we will name "standard process" contains twenty sequential automated tasks, each one launching one connector computing the 25 first Fibonacci numbers. We have launch each time 3000 processes with an injector tool on various cloud configurations and on different parallel process number injections. Our goal is to observe the correlation between the number of parallel processes and the average computing duration for each process considering each configuration, in order to find each configuration mean BPM task throughput.




Figure 4. Test architecture used for the cloud configuration capability determination. Here we show three different databases and application servers.

As we don't know the duration of a task, we have computed the number of tasks for a given process duration. As the performances stay globally linear when we inject more processes in the engine (apart from the first ones, when we can assume there is not a lot of usage of the parallelism of the processor), we consider that it is possible to do a simple linear regression in order to find the capability in parallel processing. We have computed the corresponding process throughput for a duration of 10 second, by linear regression between the two corresponding values. We use this process throughput to compute the corresponding task throughput, by looking at the corresponding total duration and dividing it by the total number of tasks (here 60000). This gives us the mean task throughput we can expect for a mean duration of 10 seconds of standard process. In order to use realistic performances and prices, we have used these configuration's task throughput (in table I), and prices in our experimentation.

For the size of the tenants, we have used anonymous customer information fragments where we have observed the minimum and the maximum task throughput. In our experimentation, for each tenant i , we used an uniform

DB inst. type	AS inst. type	price	task TP	task TP per \$
m1.small	m1.small	0.094	8.120	86.392
m3.medium	m3.medium	0.146	17.762	121.660
m3.medium	m3.large	0.219	24.669	112.644
m3.medium	m3.xlarge	0.366	25.293	69.107
m3.large	m3.xlarge	0.439	41.147	93.730
m3.large	m3.2xlarge	0.693	42.813	61.868
m3.xlarge	m3.2xlarge	0.839	45.274	53.962

Table I

PRICE, MEAN TASK THROUGHPUT, AND MEAN TASK THROUGHPUT BY DOLLAR FOR A MEAN STANDARD PROCESS DURATION OF 10 SECONDS

distribution in interval $[w_i^{min}, w_i^{max}]$ to adjust the customer throughput, where w_i^{min} and w_i^{max} represent respectively the minimum and the maximum observed throughput. We have capped at the maximum configuration throughput the task throughput for each tenant in order to be able to fit them in cloud configurations. We show a summary of the data we collected in in table II.

customer	observed interval (in days)	minimum	maximum
A	4	2	45
B	1	14	16
C	45	0	45
D	7	1	3
E	45	5	45
F	550	0	4

Table II

SYNTHESIS OF THE USED CUSTOMER DATA. FOR EACH CUSTOMER, THE OBSERVED INTERVAL, THE MINIMUM AND THE MAXIMUM TASK THROUGHPUT PER SECOND FOR EACH HOUR.

In order to test our approach we have implemented the exact model with a linear optimization solver. As the multi-objective characteristic of the problem complicates the computing, we used the same migration number approach. For this we have transformed the objective function described in equation 2 in a constraint, as seen in equation 6, where M is the number of migrations for which we want to have the solution. Furthermore, \mathcal{J} is initialized with all the possible tenants and configuration combinations.

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mathbb{1}_{\{x_j^i(k) \neq x_j^i(k+1)\}} x_j^i(k+1) = M \quad (6)$$

This model can be resolved with linear programming solvers. We have used PuLP linear programming toolkit [24] coupled with Gurobi [25] linear solver on a AWS c4.xlarge EC2 instance. A first step is to determine the minimum number of migrations, and compute the optimal cost without considering the migrations (by removing the constraint described in equation 6). We then compute the optimal cost for each number of migrations between the minimum number and stop computing once we reach the optimal cost. We have configured the solver with a time limit of 3 hours for a migration number computation.

For the heuristic test, we have launched 30 times the uniform distribution we discussed before for various number

of tenants. We began with a distribution where all the tenants are on a minimum configuration, without considering the required load. We have then launched two times the heuristic. Indeed, this algorithm will be launched sequentially with an previously computed distribution. The results described in table III shows the second launch efficiency and duration. In order to compare the two methods, we launched the exact algorithm on the same tenant distributions. In some cases, the solver was not able to find a solution in the time limit.

Tenant quantity	Exact method results	Heuristic duration	Exact algorithm duration	Pareto front percent	Heuristic efficiency percent
5	30	0.003	0.128	85.55	1.41
10	30	0.047	0.864	85.38	0.97
20	30	5.243	13.625	81.55	1.97
30	29	78.56	579.31	78.56	2.26
40	29	1013.85	1850.66	66.22	4.10

Table III
HEURISTIC QUALITY VS. EXACT ALGORITHM (DURATION IN SECONDS, PARETO FRONT PERCENT AND EFFICIENCY)

The heuristic Pareto frontier percent corresponds to the ratio of migration optimum found in the heuristic which are optimum in the exact method. We have computed the heuristic efficiency for all the heuristic Pareto frontier, with the distance to the corresponding price in the exact method. In addition, based on the results, we can see that the relative error does not exceed 4.1%. Furthermore, in the worst case that we studied, the Pareto front percentage is 66.22% and the heuristic stay faster than the exact algorithm duration.

The results we obtained show that this heuristic takes a fraction of the time used in an optimization linear solver, gives good results with small errors, and most optimal migrations number that we obtain with the exact method. The exact algorithm does not scale with the number of tenants. It gives less and less results in a acceptable running time. Even if the Pareto front percent decreases with time, the heuristic’s cost efficiency stays at a very low level. The last point shows that the two Pareto front are very close.

We have seen that even if we consider only resources combinations and ignore tenants swaps between active configuration, the heuristic gives good results for most of the exact Pareto frontier, as the cost stay very close to the optimal cost.

Despite the use of an intuitive algorithm for the subset sum part by limiting the number of returned combinations, the results are very encouraging. This algorithm should be able to give a limited number of random solutions without computing all the results. In our case, using an approximate version of the subset sum method could greatly speed up our heuristic, as it consists in most of the running time from 40 tenants.

Another enhancement to speed up the heuristic is to elaborate a multi-threaded version of this algorithm in order to benefit from the architecture of multi-core processors

while computing the different resources combinations. For instance, several resource combinations could be computed simultaneously.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we described an effective approach for business process execution as a service on the Cloud. This approach considers tenants as a whole and proposes to minimize two conflicting objectives, the execution cost and the total number of tenants migration. We have validated this approach with an experimentation that shows the efficiency of our algorithm, on data based on Bonitasoft customer usage. We have considered configuration cost based on AWS cost profiles, and tested. We compared the results with an exact method. As [7] notes, distribution techniques are not totally orthogonal to consolidation methods. Our method could be used with other criteria than BPM tenants and task throughput. For instance, we could use the algorithm with other RDBMS dependent applications on cloud instances, using QoS constraints on the number of HTTP requests. With this heuristic architecture, it is conceivable to use multiple different algorithms for the bin packing part, the overloading tenants choice, or even the subset sum algorithm. For instance, testing multiple overloading tenants alternatives or using other variable size and cost bin packing algorithms such as [26] could be interesting and produce even better results. The next step for this work is to consider optimization for several consecutive time slots in order to optimize the cost not per hour but for a whole day, in order to take into account customer QoS requirements. We will also study the possibility to use other distributions that better adjust the throughput and customer distribution.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to thank Gurobi for the usage of their optimizer, and Amazon Web Services for the EC2 instances credits (this paper is supported by an AWS in Education Research Grant Award).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Weske, *Business process management: concepts, languages, architectures*, 2nd ed. Heidelberg ; New York: Springer, 2012, 01764.
- [2] S. Lehrig, H. Eikerling, and S. Becker, “Scalability, Elasticity, and Efficiency in Cloud Computing: a Systematic Literature Review of Definitions and Metrics.” ACM Press, 2015, pp. 83–92, 00006. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doid=2737182.2737185>
- [3] “Bonitasoft,” 00000. [Online]. Available: <http://www.bonitasoft.com/>
- [4] “Amazon EC2 Instance Comparison.” [Online]. Available: <http://www.ec2instances.info/?region=eu-west-1>

- [5] S. Das, D. Agrawal, and A. El Abbadi, "Elastic, scalable, and self-managing transactional database for the cloud," *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 1–45, Apr. 2013, 00095. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doi=2445583.2445588>
- [6] J. Gao, P. Pattabhiraman, X. Bai, and W.-T. Tsai, "SaaS performance and scalability evaluation in clouds," in *Service Oriented System Engineering (SOSE), 2011 IEEE 6th International Symposium on*. IEEE, 2011, pp. 61–71, 00046. [Online]. Available: http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpls/abs_all.jsp?arnumber=6139093
- [7] C. Curino, E. P. Jones, S. Madden, and H. Balakrishnan, "Workload-aware database monitoring and consolidation," in *Proceedings of the 2011 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*. ACM, 2011, pp. 313–324, 00115. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1989357>
- [8] A. J. Elmore, S. Das, A. Pucher, D. Agrawal, A. El Abbadi, and X. Yan, "Characterizing tenant behavior for placement and crisis mitigation in multitenant dbms," in *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. ACM, 2013, pp. 517–528, 00018. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2465308>
- [9] S. Schulte, C. Janiesch, S. Venugopal, I. Weber, and P. Hoenisch, "Elastic Business Process Management: State of the art and open challenges for BPM in the cloud," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 2014, 00011. [Online]. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0167739X1400168X>
- [10] P. Hoenisch, S. Schulte, S. Dustdar, and S. Venugopal, "Self-Adaptive Resource Allocation for Elastic Process Execution." IEEE, Jun. 2013, pp. 220–227, 00014. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/lpdocs/epic03/wrapper.htm?arnumber=6676698>
- [11] C. Janiesch, I. Weber, J. Kuhlenkamp, and M. Menzel, "Optimizing the Performance of Automated Business Processes Executed on Virtualized Infrastructure." IEEE, Jan. 2014, pp. 3818–3826, 00007. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/lpdocs/epic03/wrapper.htm?arnumber=6759076>
- [12] S. Euting, C. Janiesch, R. Fischer, S. Tai, and I. Weber, "Scalable Business Process Execution in the Cloud," in *2014 IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E)*, Mar. 2014, pp. 175–184, 00006.
- [13] W. Sellami, H. H. Kacem, and A. H. Kacem, "Elastic Multi-tenant Business Process Based Service Pattern in Cloud Computing." IEEE, Dec. 2014, pp. 154–161, 00002. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/lpdocs/epic03/wrapper.htm?arnumber=7037661>
- [14] A. Wolke, B. Tsend-Ayush, C. Pfeiffer, and M. Bichler, "More than bin packing: Dynamic resource allocation strategies in cloud data centers," *Information Systems*, vol. 52, pp. 83–95, Aug. 2015, 00003. [Online]. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0306437915000472>
- [15] Y. Li, X. Tang, and W. Cai, "On dynamic bin packing for resource allocation in the cloud." ACM Press, 2014, pp. 2–11, 00011. [Online]. Available: <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?doi=2612669.2612675>
- [16] "Challenge ROADEF/EURO 2012 : Machine Reassignment," 00000. [Online]. Available: <http://challenge.roadef.org/2012/en/sujet.php>
- [17] H. Gavranović, M. Buljubašić, and E. Demirović, "Variable Neighborhood Search for Google Machine Reassignment problem," *Electronic Notes in Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 39, pp. 209–216, Dec. 2012, 00011. [Online]. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1571065312000297>
- [18] W. Jaśkowski, M. Szubert, and P. Gawron, "A hybrid MIP-based large neighborhood search heuristic for solving the machine reassignment problem," *Annals of Operations Research*, Jan. 2015, 00002. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10479-014-1780-6>
- [19] F. Brandt, J. Speck, and M. Völker, "Constraint-based large neighborhood search for machine reassignment: A solution approach to the ROADEF/EURO challenge 2012," *Annals of Operations Research*, Dec. 2014, 00000. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10479-014-1772-6>
- [20] M. Lombardi and M. Milano, "Optimal methods for resource allocation and scheduling: a cross-disciplinary survey," *Constraints*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 51–85, Jan. 2012, 00032. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10601-011-9115-6>
- [21] J. Kang and S. Park, "Algorithms for the variable sized bin packing problem," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 147, no. 2, pp. 365–372, 2003, 00116. [Online]. Available: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0377221702002473>
- [22] V. Hemmelmayr, V. Schmid, and C. Blum, "Variable neighbourhood search for the variable sized bin packing problem," *Computers & Operations Research*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1097–1108, May 2012, 00009. [Online]. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0305054811001961>
- [23] Frederick Chong, Gianpaolo Carraro, and Roger Wolter, "Multi-Tenant Data Architecture," Jun. 2006, 00199. [Online]. Available: <https://msdn.microsoft.com/en-us/library/aa479086.aspx>
- [24] S. Mitchell, M. OSullivan, and I. Dunning, "PuLP: a linear programming toolkit for python," *The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*, http://www.optimization-online.org/DB_FILE/2011/09/3178.pdf, 2011, 00013. [Online]. Available: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.416.4985&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- [25] I. Gurobi Optimization, "Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual," 2015, 00000. [Online]. Available: <http://www.gurobi.com>
- [26] M. Haouari and M. Serairi, "Relaxations and exact solution of the variable sized bin packing problem," *Computational Optimization and Applications*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 345–368, Mar. 2011, 00015. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s10589-009-9276-z>