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Real-time Decision Making in IoT Applications

- Smart buildings
- Network switches
- Autonomous medical devices
- Smart highways...

Diagram showing data flowing to a Controller, which makes decisions.
Variable Tolling

Adjust toll rate at each toll booth dynamically based on time of day and congestion conditions in road segments.

Reference: Linear road benchmark for stream management systems.
Dynamic network management for traffic engineering
Real-time response to emerging attacks / security threats

Software Defined Networking (SDN)
Opportunity for increased programmability/functionality
Safety-critical CPS

Medical device software:
Need and opportunity for applying formal verification
Recent success in case studies (pacemaker, infusion pump)

Verifying models much easier than verifying code

Higher-level programming abstractions ➔
Easier verifiability
Improved programmability
Example network policy:

if number of packets in current VoIP session exceeds the average over past VoIP sessions by a threshold $T$, then drop the packet

Stateful: Need to maintain state and update it with each item

Quantitative: Based on numerical aggregate metrics of past history
Design and Implementation of Policies

Which policies are effective?
Based on traffic models and domain specific insights

How to specify and evaluate policies?
Focus of these lectures!
Streaming Algorithm

state $s = \text{initialize}$;  
for each packet $p$ {
  $s = \text{update} \ (s, p)$;
  output $d = \text{decide} \ (s)$
}

data $\rightarrow$ decisions $\rightarrow$
High-level Abstractions over Data Streams ??

Example network policy:
if number of packets in current VoIP session exceeds the average over past VoIP sessions by a threshold $T$ then drop the packet

Low-level programming:
What state to maintain? How to update it?

Desired high-level abstraction: Beyond packet sequence
Modular Specification of VoIP Session Monitor

1. Focus on traffic between a specific source and destination
2. View data stream as a sequence of VoIP sessions
3. View a VoIP session as a sequence of three phases
4. Aggregate cost over call phase during a session, and aggregate cost across sessions

Session Initiation Protocol
Design Goals for Policy Language

Efficiency critical: Key parameters
1. Time to process each packet
2. State that needs to maintained
Ideally both should be constant or logarithmic in length of data stream

Programming abstractions for processing data stream ??

Theoretical foundations
Expressiveness
Optimization

Policy spec

Policy compiler

Policy code

decisions
### Do We Need A New Policy Language?

**State-based Languages**
- Regular expressions
- Temporal logics
- Dataflow/synchronous languages

**Application:** Runtime monitoring
**Quantitative extension:** Weighted automata

**Relational languages**
- SQL + Continuous queries
- Regular expressions + time windows to select events

**Industrial-strength implementations**
- IBM Streams Processing Language
- MSR StreamInsight / CEDR
Lectures Outline

✓ Motivation

Released

- Quantitative Regular Expressions (QRE)

☐ QRE Compilation

☐ Experimental Evaluation

☐ Theory of Regular Functions

☐ Conclusions and Research Opportunities
Illustrative Example: Patient Monitoring

Data items:
- Begin episode
- Measurement
- End episode
- End of day

Output every day, maximum over episodes during that day, average measurement during the episode
Regular expressions is a natural match
But need a quantitative extension!
Quantitative Iteration

Atomic function $M$ maps an item, if it is a measurement, to its value
Function $f$ maps a sequence of measurements to its average
Function $\text{Episode}$ maps an episode to average measurement within it
Function $h$ maps a sequence of episodes to the maximum episode value
Quantitative Regular Expressions

- Each QRE $f$ maps a sequence of data items to a cost value
  $f$ is a partial function from $D^*$ to $C$

- Sets $D$ and $C$ can be of arbitrary types with basic operations

- Example $D$: \{ $\uparrow$, $\downarrow$, $\star$, $v: \mathbb{N}$ \}

- Example $C$: Set of integers with constants, min, max, sum, average
QRE Rate

- A QRE $f$ is a partial function from $D^*$ to $C$
- $\text{Rate}(f) = \text{Subset of } D^* \text{ for which } f \text{ is defined}$
- QRE produces output whenever input stream so far matches its Rate

- Rate = Data streams that end with a well-formed episode
- $\text{Rate}(f)$ captured by “symbolic” regular expression
  
  $$D^*.( \uparrow. \square^* . \downarrow )$$
Atomic QRE

- Each data domain $D$ is equipped with a set of unary predicates
  1. Satisfiability is decidable (supported by SMT-solver)
  2. Set of predicates closed under Boolean operations
  Ref: Symbolic automata and symbolic transducers (Veanes et al)

- QRE $f : p(d) \rightarrow f(d)$ where $p$ is unary predicate, $f$ is data operation
  If input data stream consists of a single item $d$ satisfying $p$,
  then return $f(d)$

Rate($f$) = $p(d)$
Atomic QRE Examples

- Example D: \{ \uparrow, \downarrow, \star, \text{v: N} \} 

- Example basic predicates:
  - \( d \) equals \( \star \)
  - \( d \) equals \( v \) with \( v > 150 \)

- Example operations from D to C
  - \( f(\star) = 0 \)
  - \( f(v) = \min(80, v) \)
Quantitative Concatenation: split(f, g, op)

f and g are QREs and op is a binary operation over costs (e.g. +, max)

Divide input data stream s into two parts $s_1$ and $s_2$ such that

$s_1$ matches Rate(f) and $s_2$ matches Rate(g) and return $\text{op}(f(s_1), g(s_2))$

Rate(split(f,g,op)) = Rate(f) \cdot Rate(g)

Key requirement: split must be unique (unambiguous)

Type checking requirement:

split(f,g,op) allowed only when if a stream matches Rate(f).Rate(g) then there is exactly one way to split it
Rate(f) : Streams ending with a high-risk measurement (value > 150)
Rate(g) : Stream without high-risk measurements
Quantitative Iteration: \( \text{iter}(f, c, \text{op}) \)

\( f \) is a QRE with rate \( r \), \( c \) is a constant, and \( \text{op} \) is a binary operation.
Quantitative Iteration: \( \text{iter}(f, c, \text{op}) \)

- \( f \) is a QRE with rate \( r \), \( c \) is a constant, and \( \text{op} \) is a binary operation
- Divide input data stream \( s \) into multiple parts \( s_1, s_2, \ldots s_k \) such that each \( s_i \) matches \( r \), apply \( f \) to each part, and return
  \[
  \text{op}( \, \text{op}( \ldots \, \text{op}( c, f(s_1)), f(s_2)), \ldots \, f(s_k))
  \]
- \( \text{Rate}(\text{iter}(f,c,\text{op})) = \text{Rate}(f)* \)
- Allowed when the split is guaranteed to be unique
- Special case: \( \text{op} \) is set-aggregator (apply \( \text{op} \) to “set” of returned values)
  - max, min, sum, average, median, standard deviation ...
- Order dependent: Linear interpolation, Discounted sum
Choice: f else g

Given a stream $s$, if $f(s)$ is defined, return it, else return $g(s)$

Example: $f$ makes decisions for a stream that does not contain high-risk measurements (e.g. with value $> 150$), and $g$ makes decisions for streams that do contain such measurements.

Benefit: Test based on a global property of stream.

Strong typing restriction:

Allowed only when $\text{Rate}(f)$ and $\text{Rate}(g)$ are disjoint.

$\text{Rate}(f \text{ else } g) = \text{Rate}(f) \cup \text{Rate}(g)$
Key-based Partitioning

Suppose stream contains events for both Alice and Bob

Suppose we want to compute for each patient, whether the daily summary (max over episodes, average measurement during episode) exceeds a threshold value

QRE f maps stream of single-patient events to daily summary

Modular programming: Partition input stream into multiple streams, one for each patient identifier, and apply f to each

Challenges: How to synchronize outputs of different partitions? What is the type of combined outputs?
QRE \( f \) computes daily summary for single-patient input streams

Synchronization item: end-of-day 🌟

\( g = \text{map}-\text{collect} (f, \star *) \) i.e. produce joint output at end of each day

Output of \( g \): \{ \( v_1, u_1 \) \}, \{ \( v_2, u_2 \) \}, ...

Type of output: set of values produced by each thread tagged with key
Key-based Partitioning: map-collect

Type D of data items = $D_s \cup [D_k \times D_v ]$

Each item is a synchronization item or of the form (key, value)

QRE $f$ maps streams over $D_v$ to output values $C$

QRE $g = \text{map-collect} (f, r)$, $r$ is a symbolic reg-exp over $D_s$

QRE $g$ processes streams over $D$:
- if item is in $D_s$ then send it to all threads/partitions
- if item = (k,v), send it to the thread/partition for key k
- whenever $r$ holds, collect outputs of all threads

Output type = Relation (multi-set) over $D_k \times C$
Output Composition

Suppose $g$ outputs each day set of tuples (patient-id, daily summary)

Want to output set of patients for which daily summary $\geq 160$

Select : Relation (PID x V) $\rightarrow$ Relation (PID)

Select (I) = \{ p | there is v such that (p,v) is in I and v $\geq 160$ \}

Then desired QRE $h$ is Select($g$)

Count($h$) outputs number of high-risk patients each day

If $f_j : D^* \rightarrow C_j$ are QREs with equivalent rates $r$, and $\text{op}: C_1 \times ... \times C_n \rightarrow C$

Then op($f_1, ... f_n$) : $D^* \rightarrow C$ with rate $r$
Streaming Composition

Suppose $h$ outputs each day number of high-risk patients
Want to output the daily average number of high-risk patients so far

$h'$ maps sequence of numbers to average
    $h' = \text{iter (id, average)}$, where id is the identity function
Then desired QRE is $h >> h'$

If $f : D^* \to C$ and $g : C^* \to B$ are QREs, then $f >> g : D^* \to B$
Stream sequence of outputs of $f$ as input stream to $g$

Note: rate ($f >> g$) is a subset of $D^*$, and may not be regular
Current solution: allow $>>$ only at top-level
Quantitative Regular Expressions Summary

- Each QRE $f$ maps a sequence of data items to a cost value.
  - $\text{rate}(f)$ specifies when $f$ produces outputs given by symbolic regular expression.

- Core combinators:
  - Atomic QRE: $p(d) \rightarrow f(d)$
  - Quantitative concatenation: $\text{split}(f, g, \text{op})$
  - Quantitative iteration: $\text{iter}(f, c, \text{op})$
  - Choice: $f$ else $g$
  - Key-based partitioning: $\text{map-collect}(f, r)$
  - Output composition: $\text{op}(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$
  - Streaming composition: $f \gg g$

- Type checking rules check compatibility of rates (decidable!)
Type Checking and Compilation
Symbolic Regular Expressions

- Similar to traditional regular expressions.

\[ e ::= a \mid \text{[letter from alphabet]} \]
\[ e \cup e \mid \text{[choice]} \]
\[ e.e \mid \text{[concatenation]} \]
\[ e^* \mid \text{[iteration]} \]

- What if alphabet large or unbounded?

- “Symbolic” regular expressions:
  
  unary predicates instead of letters

- Examples of symbolic REs:

  \[ \text{even}(n)^* . \text{odd}(n) \quad (n = 0) . (n > 0)^* \]
Symbolic Regular Expressions

- Symbolic regular expressions:
  
  $$e ::= p \mid \text{[unary predicate]}$$
  
  $$e \cup e \mid \text{[choice]}$$
  
  $$e.e \mid \text{[concatenation]}$$
  
  $$e^* \mid \text{[iteration]}$$

- Predicates:
  
  Closed under Boolean operations
  
  Decidable satisfiability

- E.g., alphabet N (the set of natural numbers).

- Possible sets of predicates:
  
  Presburger arithmetic, linear integer arithmetic

- Can be decided with SMT solver.

- Cannot handle: full arithmetic with multiplication (UNDECIDABLE)
Symbolic Automata

- Traditional automata: transitions annotated with letters.
  
  ![Traditional Automaton]
  
  accepts the language $a^*b$

- Symbolic automata: transitions annotated with unary predicates.
  
  ![Symbolic Automaton]
  
  accepts even(n)$^*$.odd(n)

- Translation from expressions to automata is the same.
Product Construction

- Traditional automata $A = (Q, \Delta, I, F)$ and $A' = (Q', \Delta', I', F')$.
- The product $A \times A'$ has states $Q \times Q'$, initial states $I \times I'$, final states $F \times F'$, and transitions
  $$(p, p') \xrightarrow{a} (q, q'),$$
  when $p \xrightarrow{a} p'$ is transition of $A$ and $q \xrightarrow{a} q'$ is transition of $A'$.

- Suppose now that $A$ and $A'$ are symbolic.
- If $p \xrightarrow{\varphi} p'$ is transition of $A$ and $q \xrightarrow{\psi} q'$ is transition of $A'$, then
  $$(p, p') \xrightarrow{\varphi \& \psi} (q, q')$$
  is a transition of $A \times A'$.

- **BUT:** If $(\varphi \& \psi)$ unsatisfiable, the transition can be eliminated.
Symbolic Automata: Reachability

- Essentially the same as graph reachability.
- Satisfiability check to see if an edge can be traversed.
- Reachability solves non-emptiness.
Type Checking: Atomic QRE

- Input type D, output type C.
- \( p(d) \) is unary predicate on D.
- Operation op: D \( \rightarrow \) C.
- Atomic QRE:
  \[ p(d) \rightarrow \text{op}(d): D^* \rightarrow C. \]
- Type checking:
  “p(d) is satisfiable”
  **HOW**: one invocation of SMT solver
Type Checking: Quantitative Concatenation

- QREs $f: D^* \rightarrow A$ and $g: D^* \rightarrow B$.
- Operation $\text{op}: A \times B \rightarrow C$.
- Quantitative concatenation:
  
  $\text{split}(f, g, \text{op}): D^* \rightarrow C$.

- Type checking:
  
  “Rate($f$) and Rate($g$) are unambiguously concatenable”

  HOW: unambiguity check for Rate($f$).Rate($g$)
Type Checking: Quantitative Iteration

- QRE $f: D^* \rightarrow A$.
- Constant $c$ of type $C$.
- Binary operation $\text{op}: C \times A \rightarrow C$.
- Quantitative iteration:
  \[
  \text{iter}(f, c, \text{op}): D^* \rightarrow C.
  \]
- Type checking:
  
  "Rate(f) is unambiguously iterable"

  \[
  \text{HOW: unambiguity check for Rate(f)*}
  \]
Type Checking: Global Choice

- QREs \( f: D^* \rightarrow C \) and \( g: D^* \rightarrow C \).
- Global choice:

\[ f \text{ else } g : D^* \rightarrow C. \]

- Type checking:

  “Rate\((f)\) and Rate\((g)\) are disjoint”
  
  HOW: intersection of Rate\((f)\) and Rate\((g)\) empty
Type Checking: Output Composition

- QREs $f: D^* \rightarrow A$ and $g: D^* \rightarrow B$.
- Binary operation $\text{op}: A \times B \rightarrow C$.
- Output composition:
  \[
  \text{op}(f, g): D^* \rightarrow C.
  \]
- Type checking:
  "Rate(f) and Rate(g) are equivalent"
  HOW: equivalence algorithm of Stearns and Hunt (FOCS '81)

See also: Minimization of Symbolic Automata by D’Antoni & Veanes (POPL '14)
Type Checking: Map-Collect

- Input type $D = D_S \cup [D_K \times D_V]$
- $D_S = \text{Synchronization elements}$
- $D_K = \text{Keys, and } D_V = \text{values.}$
- QRE $f: D^* \rightarrow C$, symbolic RE $R$ over $D_S$.
- Map-collect QRE:
  \[
  \text{map-collect}(f, R): D^* \rightarrow \text{Rel}(D_K \times C).
  \]
- Type checking:
  "Rate($f$) is contained in expansion of $R$ to $D"$
  HOW: inclusion algorithm of Stearns and Hunt (FOCS '81)
Type Checking: Summary

- Atomic: $p(d)$ is satisfiable.
- Split: Rate($f$) and Rate($g$) are unambiguously concatenable.
- Iter: Rate($f$) is unambiguously iterable.
- Else: Rate($f$) and Rate($g$) are disjoint.
- Op(): Rate($f$) and Rate($g$) are equivalent.
- Map-collect: Rate($f$) is contained in $R$.

All problems can be decided in time that is polynomial in sizes of expressions and number of minterms over predicates.

(assuming satisfiability checks take unit time)

- Automaton for Rate($f$) is nondeterministic but unambiguous.
- No need for determinization (no exponential blowup).
- RE equivalence: PSPACE.
- Unambiguous RE equivalence: P.
Goals for Compiler

state \( s = \text{initialize} \);
for each packet \( p \) {
    \( s = \text{update} \ (s, p) \);
    output \( d = \text{decide} \ (s) \)
}

Optimize bits needed to store state and time for update
Ideally independent of length of data stream
Computing \( f(s) \), where \( f \) is a QRE and \( s \) is input stream, amounts to evaluating an expression tree of size linear in length of \( s \).
Stack-based Evaluation

- Incremental evaluation of expression:
  - Maintain state as a stack
  - Perform intermediate computations as soon as possible
  - Stack elements correspond to nodes of the expression tree
  - Evaluating + : sum of values seen so far
  - Evaluating average : sum and count of values seen so far

- Resources (total space / per-item processing time):
  - [Depth of expression tree (dependent only on QRE size)]
  - Times [resources needed at each node of expression tree]
Approximation

Suppose we want to compute average of numbers in a streaming fashion.
Need to remember total sum (73) and count of items (5) so far.

Suppose we want to compute median of numbers.
To ensure exact answer, must remember all numbers seen so far.

Exact algorithm for median:
Maintain the multiset of items seen so far.
Implementation 1: Extensible array of counts.
Implementation 2: Map as balanced binary search tree
(key: item, value: count)
Approximation

Approximation algorithm for median:

Map each number \( n \) to bucket \( k \) such that \((1+\varepsilon)^k \leq n < (1+\varepsilon)^{k+1}\)

Maintain for each bucket, count of numbers mapped to that bucket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number ( n )</th>
<th>Bucket ( k )</th>
<th>Number ((1+\varepsilon)^k)</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>49.923</td>
<td>0.154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>99.192</td>
<td>0.808%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>79,512.950</td>
<td>0.609%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1,190,834.857</td>
<td>0.764%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Space needed: \( \log_{1+\varepsilon}(U) \approx \varepsilon^{-1} \cdot \log(U) \),

where \( U \) is the range of numerical values
Approximation

Approximation algorithm for median:

Map each number \( n \) to bucket \( k \) such that \((1+\varepsilon)^k \leq n < (1+\varepsilon)^{k+1}\)

Maintain for each bucket, count of numbers mapped to that bucket

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number ( n )</th>
<th>Bucket ( k )</th>
<th>Number ((1+\varepsilon)^k)</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>49.923</td>
<td>0.154%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>99.192</td>
<td>0.808%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>79,512.950</td>
<td>0.609%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1,190,834.857</td>
<td>0.764%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximation error: Multiplicative factor of \( \varepsilon \).

\[ n' \leq n < (1+\varepsilon) n' \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \leq n - n' \leq \varepsilon n' \quad \Rightarrow \quad 0 \leq (n - n')/n < \varepsilon \]
Online Computation of Split Points

To process split(f, g, +), find the position where f ends and g starts.
Domain of f: Streams ending with high-risk measurements (val > 150)

Need to maintain multiple parallel computations of same subexpression initialized at different positions in input stream.

Insight: number of parallel copies is bounded (bound depends on query).
Map-collect Evaluation

- To evaluate map-collect\( (f, r) \), for each new key encountered, a new “thread” evaluating \( f \) must be initialized.

- Synchronization items must be input to all threads. Even to those whose keys have not appeared yet.

- IDEA: Maintain a special thread receiving only synchronization items. Fork that thread when a new key appears.
Map-collect Evaluation

- Collecting outputs of all threads when input matches rate $r$ requires careful implementation

- Resources needed: (Resource for $f$) x (Number of active copies)

- Amenable to high-performance distributed implementation (STORM)
QRE Compiler Summary

- Given a QRE, compiler first checks all typing rules are met (e.g. when split is applied, the splitting must be unambiguous)
- Then it compiles it into an executable streaming algorithm
- General case: Memory used is linear in length of stream

- If numerical operators are min, max, sum, average, and no map-collect, then constant memory and constant per item processing time

- If, in addition, median is also used, then
  - log U memory, where U is (dynamically updated) range of values
  - constant time to process each item
  - user specified multiplicative factor of approximation error
Implementation and Experimental Evaluation

- StreamQRE Java Library (PLDI 2017)
- NetQRE for network traffic engineering (SIGCOMM 2017)
Software Defined Networking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dst</th>
<th>NextHop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distributed Protocols

e.g. POX, NOX, Floodlight

Openflow

Control plane

Data plane

Programmability

APIs

Controller

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Match</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Src=A</td>
<td>drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NetQRE Language

Domain-specific extension/adaptation of core QRE

Basic types: ports, IP addresses, tests of packet fields
Actions on packets: drop, flood, forward, augmentation with fields...
Reference to time windows (e.g. stream of packets in last 5 sec)

Basic functions on packets (written in C) +
QRE combinators (else, split, iter, max, min, sum, average) +
Keys: IP addresses
Implementation and Evaluation

NetQRE Compiler
  + NetQRE Runtime system (to process packets and update state)

1. Can network policies be expressed in concise and intuitive manner?

2. Is compiled code efficient for throughput and memory footprint?

3. Can our system be used for real-time monitoring and alerting?

Flow-level traffic measurements
  e.g. detection of heavy hitters, super spreaders

TCP state monitoring
  e.g. aggregate statistics of TCP connections, detect SYN flood attack

Application level monitoring
  e.g. collect statistics about VoIP sessions
Monitoring of VoIP Sessions

Detect if current VoIP session is using excessive bandwidth compared of past average

Modular specification using
Map-collect on IP-addresses
Split and Iter constructs
Aggregation across users
Aggregation across sessions

18 lines of NetQRE code
(vs 100s of lines C++ code)
Throughput and Memory Footprint

How does NetQRE generated code compare with hand-crafted code?

Example: Detection of heavy hitters
(a source IP address has consumed > K bandwidth in past T sec)
Workload: CAIDA traffic trace of ~ 50 million packets

Throughput (million packets per second)
Manual: 18.5  vs  NetQRE: 18.3
Upto 10x faster than systems such as Bro and Opensketch

Memory: Manual: 14 MB vs NetQRE: 15.1 MB

Summary for other queries (measured for 20 queries)
Throughput within 4% overhead
SYN flood attack: NetQRE uses twice as much memory
Real-Time Response

- Experimental setup:
  - Network of two clients and one SDN switch
  - SDN Controller based on POX
  - Network emulated by Mininet with link bandwidth 100 Mbps

- How long does it take to detect an attack and block traffic?
  - Note: correction requires SDN controller to update rules on switch

- Incomplete TCP handshake:
  - SYN packet, followed by matching SYNACK, but no subsequent ACK

- SYN flood attack: Too many incomplete TCP handshakes
SYN Flood Attack

Attack starts

Attack detected and corrected by updating rules in switch
StreamQRE Java Library

- StreamQRE: Strong theoretical efficiency guarantees.
- Performance for practical workloads?
- Implementation of StreamQRE as a library in Java

**Yahoo Streaming Benchmark (2015)**
Interaction of web users with advertisements

```
Event(userId, pageId, adId, eventType, eventTime)
```

**NEXMark Benchmark (2002)**
Monitoring of an online auction system (e.g., eBay)

```
NewPerson(personId, name, timestamp)
Auction(itemId, sellerId, initPrice, timestamp, duration, category)
EndAuction(itemId, timestamp)
Bid(itemId, bidderId, bidIncrement, timestamp)
```
Experimental Evaluation

- StreamQRE: Strong theoretical efficiency guarantees.
- Performance for practical workloads?

**StreamQRE**
- Streaming extension of Quantitative Regular Expressions

**Esper for Java**
- SQL-like language with Complex Event Processing features

**RxJava**
- (ReactiveX for Java)
  - API for observable streams

**Flink**
- Distributed Stream Processing Framework

Popular and actively maintained engines with Java implementation. Rich high-level APIs for stream processing.
Time-based window with nested key-based partitioning: “Compute every second the number of views associated with each ad campaign”.

Yahoo Benchmark - Query 1
Experimental Evaluation

Slowdown compared to StreamQRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RxJava</th>
<th>Esper</th>
<th>Flink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo 1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahoo 2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXMark 1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXMark 2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXMark 3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXMark 4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEXMark 5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The StreamQRE engine has good performance.
- Consistently faster than RxJava (about 2-4 times).
- Much faster than Esper (6-70 times) and Flink (10-140 times).
Theory of Regular Functions
Language Classes in Complexity Theory

--- Recursive

--- NP

--- P

--- Linear-time

--- Regular

What if we consider functions?
From strings to natural numbers
From strings to strings

No essential change for Recursive, NP, P, linear-time...
Expressiveness of QREs

Do we have enough operators?
Is expressiveness of QREs robust?

Regular languages
- Regular expressions
- Deterministic finite automata
- Monadic second-order logic MSO

Beautiful well-understood theory

Regular functions parameterized by cost operations
- Quantitative regular expressions
- Cost register automata (CRA)
- MSO-definable string to term transformations

Emerging theory (open problems...)
Mapping Strings to Costs

- Each QRE $f$ maps $\Sigma^*$ to $D$

- Cost domain $D$ has a basic set of operations

- Combinators:
  - Atomic QRE: $a \rightarrow c$
  - Quantitative concatenation: $\text{split}(f, g, \text{op})$
  - Quantitative iteration: $\text{iter}(f, c, \text{op})$
  - Choice: $f$ else $g$
  - Key-based partitioning: $\text{map-collect}(f, r)$
  - Output composition: $\text{op}(f_1, \ldots, f_n)$
  - Streaming composition: $f \gg g$
Finite Automata with Cost Labels

C: Buy Coffee
S: Fill out a survey
M: End-of-month

Maps a string over \{C, S, M\} to a cost value:

Cost of a coffee is 2, but reduces to 1 after filling out a survey until the end of the month

Output is computed by implicitly adding up transition costs

How to define automata with richer set of operations?
Cost Register Automata:
- Finite control + Finite number of registers
- Registers updated explicitly on transitions
- Registers are write-only (no tests allowed)
- Each (final) state associated with output register
CRA Example

At any time, $x$ = cost of coffees during the current month

Cost register $x$ reset to 0 at each end-of-month
CRA Example

Filling out a survey gives discount for all coffees during that month
CRA Example

Output = minimum number of coffees consumed during a month
Updates use two operations: increment and min
String Transformation Example

Rev(w) = String w in reverse

String variables updated at each step as in a program

Key restriction: No tests! Write-only variables!
Regular Function

Definition parameterized by cost domain $D$ with a set of operations

Terms over $D$: Trees whose nodes are labeled with given operations

A (partial) function $f : \Sigma^* \rightarrow D$ is regular if there exists a function $g$ mapping strings to terms over $D$ such that

1. for all strings $w$, $f(w) = \text{Evaluation of } g(w)$
2. $g$ is a regular string-to-tree transformation
Example Regular Function

Cost Domain : Natural numbers with min and +
\( \Sigma=\{C,M\} \)
f\( (w) = \) Minimum number of \( C \) symbols between successive \( M \)'s

Input \( w = C C M C C C C M \)

Tree:

Value = 2
Regular String-to-tree Transformations

- Definition based on MSO (Monadic Second Order Logic) - definable graph-to-graph transformations (Courcelle)

- Studied in context of syntax-directed program transformations, attribute grammars, and XML transformations

- Operational models:
  - Macro Tree Transducers (Engelfriet et al)
  - Streaming tree transducers (ICALP 2012, JACM 2017)

Thm: QREs mapping $\Sigma^*$ to costs $D$ with given set of operations define exactly regular functions
MSO-definable String-to-tree Transformations

- **MSO over strings**
  \[ \Phi := a(x) \mid X(x) \mid x=y+1 \mid \sim \Phi \mid \Phi \land \Phi \mid \exists x. \Phi \mid \exists X. \Phi \]

- **MSO-transduction from strings to trees:**
  1. **Number k of copies**
     - For each position x in input, output-tree has nodes \( x_1, \ldots, x_k \)
  2. **For each symbol a and copy c, MSO-formula \( \Phi_{a,c}(x) \)**
     - Output-node \( x_c \) is labeled with a if \( \Phi_{a,c}(x) \) holds for unique a
  3. **For copies c and d, MSO-formula \( \Phi_{c,d}(x,y) \)**
     - Output-tree has edge from node \( x_c \) to node \( x_d \) if \( \Phi_{c,d}(x,y) \) holds
Properties of Regular Functions

Known properties of regular string-to-tree transformations imply:

- If $f$ and $g$ are regular w.r.t. a cost model $D$, and $L$ is a regular language, then "if $L$ then $f$ else $g$" is regular w.r.t. $D$.

- Reversal: define $\text{Rev}(f)(w) = f(\text{reverse}(w))$.
  
  If $f$ is regular w.r.t. a cost model $D$, then so is $\text{Rev}(f)$.

- Costs grow linearly with the size of the input string:
  
  Term corresponding to a string $w$ is $O(|w|)$.

- What about decision problems (e.g. are two QREs equivalent?)
  
  Need to focus on specific cost models.
Regular Functions over Commutative Monoid

Cost model: $D$ with binary function $+$
Interpretation for $+$ is commutative, associative, with identity 0

Cost model $D(\cdot\cdot)$: No restriction on use of $+$

Cost model $D(\cdot\cdot\cdot)$: Only addition by constant allowed

Thm: Regularity w.r.t. $D(\cdot\cdot)$ coincides with regularity w.r.t. $D(\cdot\cdot\cdot)$

Proof intuition: Show that rewriting terms such as $(2+3)+(1+5)$ to $(((2+3)+1)+5)$ is a regular tree-to-tree transformation, and use closure properties of tree transducers
Additive Cost Register Automata:

DFA + Finite number of registers
Each register is initially 0
Registers updated using assignments $x := y + c$
Each final state labeled with output term $x + c$

Given commutative monoid $(D, +, 0)$, an ACRA defines a partial function from $\Sigma^*$ to $D$
Regular Functions and ACRAs

- Thm: Given a commutative monoid \((D,+,0)\), a function \(f: \Sigma^* \rightarrow D\) is definable using an ACRA iff it is regular w.r.t. cost model \(D(+)\).

- Establishes ACRA as an intuitive, deterministic operational model to define this class of regular functions

- Proof relies on the model of SSTT (Streaming string-to-tree transducers) that can define all regular string-to-tree transformations
Decision Problems for ACRAs

- **Min-Cost:** Given an ACRA $M$, find $\min \{ M(w) \mid w \in \Sigma^* \}$
  - Solvable in Polynomial-time
  - Shortest path in a graph with vertices (state, register)

- **Equivalence:** Do two ACRAs define the same function
  - Solvable in Polynomial-time
  - Exercise: Design algorithm for equivalence checking!

- **Register Minimization:** Given an ACRA $M$ with $k$ registers, is there an equivalent ACRA with $< k$ registers?
  - Algorithm polynomial in states, and exponential in $k$
ACRA Equivalent QREs

Additive QREs:

- Base functions: $a \rightarrow c$ and $\varepsilon \rightarrow c$
- Concatenation: $\text{split (f, g, +)}$
- Iteration: $\text{iter (f, +)}$
- Choice: $f$ else $g$

Unambiguity requirements for all above constructors
Note: Output composition not included

Thm: Additive QREs are equivalent to ACRAs (i.e. regular functions over commutative monoid)
Emerging Theory of Regular Functions

- A few classes that have been (partially) studied
  - Finite strings to finite strings (DReX: specialized QREs)
  - Infinite strings to infinite strings
  - Finite strings to semiring \((N, +, \text{min})\)
  - Finite strings to discounted costs

- Many open problems
  - Decidability of equivalence of functions from \(\Sigma^*\) to \((N, +, \text{min})\)
  - Theory of congruences
  - Learning algorithms...

- Unexplored classes (e.g. mapping trees to numerical costs)
Back to QRE Evaluation Algorithm

- QREs and CRAs are expressively equivalent
- Can compiling a QRE into a CRA give an optimal streaming algorithm for evaluating QREs?  
  Recall connection between regular expressions and NFA/DFA
- No! Translation from QRE to CRA causes exponential blow-up
  - Deterministic simulation of unambiguous choice
  - Intersection (due to output composition)
- Research challenge: what’s a suitable model for “automata-based stream processing“?
  - ICALP’17: Unambiguous weighted automata + nesting + parallelism
  - Ongoing work: Data transducers
Conclusions and Research Directions
Real-time Decision Making in IoT Applications

- One research question: How to specify quantitative policies over data streams?

- One solution: Quantitative Regular Expressions (QRE)
  - Modular high-level specifications
  - Theoretically robust expressiveness
  - Guaranteed space/time requirements of generated code
  - Evaluation for network traffic engineering
Privacy ??

Query: Max over CarID  { Average speed of CarID in past month }

How much information about a specific car does answer to this query leak ?

Research opportunity:
Anonymity / privacy guarantees for queries over streaming data
What traffic constitutes an attack?

Known patterns can be captured by, say, QREs, but can the switch dynamically learn the attack pattern?

Research opportunity:
Learning high-level declarative patterns, say QREs, more plausible than learning low-level code
Distributed Processing ??

Logical query on a single stream of data
Physical implementation: distributed system

How to ensure consistency ? High performance ? Resilience to errors ?

Emerging architectures: Apache STORM
Safety-critical Applications ??

Clinical diagnosis → pacing stimulus

Specification: logical query over analog signal
- Implementation: discrete control software
Predictable response time critical
Key resource constraint: battery life, so need optimized code
Goal: design more effective diagnosis strategies