



## CODECO's Validation and Experimentation Challenges



Field	Details
1. Name of Challenge	CODECO Resilience strategies evaluation
2. Partners	FOR (Contact person is Rute C. Sofia at <a href="mailto:sofia@fortiss.org">sofia@fortiss.org</a> )
3. Submission Specifications	<p><b>Requirements:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>– Full CODECO framework OR</li><li>– <a href="#">CODAG</a>, <a href="#">PDLC-CA</a> and the CODECO scheduler, <a href="#">SWM</a></li><li>– CODECO <a href="#">NetMA</a>, in particular the monitoring aspects.</li></ul> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p>The main goal of this challenge is to assess the proposed CODECO strategies for resilience against i) CODECO without resilience; ii) vanilla K8s scheduler.</p> <p>SMART Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyze node selection consistency under varying conditions.</li><li>• Assess trade-offs between resilience and application QoS/impact in the overall infrastructure.</li><li>• Identify benefits of CODECO across different environments.</li></ul> <p><b>Main steps (Months: Mx)</b></p> <p><b>1 – Setup of the controlled experimental environment M1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Deploy CODECO on a real or emulated IoT–Edge–Cloud testbed (min of 10 worker nodes, single cluster) – CODEF is suggested as well.</li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If possible, Include heterogeneous hardware (ARM, x86) and varied network topologies.</li> <li>• Ensure Prometheus/Keppler is configured to expose metrics to CODECO's PDLC-CA.</li> <li>• Set adequate load generators (e.g., Apache JMeter, etc) and network load generators</li> </ul> <p><b>2 - Design Experimental Scenarios M1</b> Consider realistic datasets or realistic configurations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Measure baseline node resilience for different proposed metrics (and others).</li> <li>• Uniform load: Test equal pod distribution across nodes.</li> <li>• Heterogeneous load: Vary node preloads to test dynamic adaptability.</li> <li>• Varying request rates: Low, medium, high (e.g., 10, 50, 100 rps).</li> <li>• If possible, consider intermittent connectivity or mobile environments</li> </ul> <p><b>3 – Heuristics comparison M2-M3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Consider the proposed resilience aware metrics (node failure, link failure, etc) and assess the impact of the probing in this process</li> <li>– <b>Performance evaluation parameters should consider at least:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– <i>Baseline:</i> K8s, CODECO without resilience profile</li> <li>– Node selection stability</li> <li>– Migration frequency impact</li> <li>– Overall energy consumption</li> <li>– Response time (when re-scheduling)</li> <li>– Others: CPU, memory usage, etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>4 – Explain results – M3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Provide results</li> <li>– Upload raw results for multiple runs</li> <li>– Provide an adequate documentation</li> <li>– Validate if CODECO prevents deployment in „hot nodes“ as previously validated.</li> </ul> <p><b>5 – Propose improvements –M3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Explain where CODECO brings advantages, and where are gaps</li> <li>– Propose improvements</li> </ul>
--	--

	<b>Report will be provided by CODECO</b>
<b>4. Plataforms to be used</b>	<p>Local cluster with at least 10 nodes and/or <a href="#"><u>CODEF</u></a></p> <p>Applicants are expected to follow up with the listed contact persons in order to obtain the necessary material and then upload their submission via a Zip File.</p>