

Machine Learning For Optical Communication Systems



### Machine Learning Models for Optical Communication Systems & Networks

João Pedro, Rui Manuel Morais

### Machine Learning & Artificial Intelligence Take Center Stage

#### Making Headlines...

#### How Machine Learning Is Changing Cardiac Ultrasound

Artificial intelligence can speed workflow, take over time-consuming tasks, improve reproducibility and allow more time for patient care

> Google's DeepMind is training Waymo's self-driving cars like StarCraft II bots

#### AI 'EMOTION RECOGNITION' CAN'T BE TRUSTED

The belief that facial expressions reliably correspond to emotions is unfounded, says a new review of the field

#### The California State Bar Is Considering Allowing Non-Lawyers (And Skynet) To Practice Law

If non-lawyers are allowed to practice, it is very likely to affect solo and small firms the most as they tend to serve the low-income/middle-class market.

#### Artificial Intelligence Can Now Create Perfumes And Doesn't Even Require Any Sense Of Smell

Will artificial intelligence take your job?

How AI will change your career over the next 20 years.

#### Is Machine Learning <u>Needed</u>\* in Optical Communication Systems & Networks?

\* i.e. does it add enough value for what it will cost?



#### Outline

- Applying Machine Learning
  - When & How is it Useful?
  - When is it Cost-Effective?
- ML in Optical Communication Systems & Networks
  - Enabling Trends
  - Challenges
  - (Some) Use Cases
- Conclusions



# Applying Machine Learning



### Machine Learning: When & How is it Useful?

- ML algorithms can be seen as **universal function approximators** 
  - In theory, applicable to any problem
  - Probabilistic instead of deterministic
- Type of problems that should rely on a probabilistic approach
  - Conventional approaches not applicable or undesirable due to
    - » Model-deficit: e.g. no physics-based mathematical model exists for the problem due to insufficient domain knowledge
    - » Algorithm-deficit: e.g. mathematical model is available but algorithms to run it are too complex
  - Not relevant the details of how the task is solved (i.e. compatible with "black-box" approach)
    - » Task does not require application of logic, common sense or explicit reasoning based on background knowledge
    - » Task does not require explanations about how the decision was made
  - Phenomenon or function being learned is stationary for a sufficiently long period of time
  - Sufficiently large labelled training data set exists or can be created



### Machine Learning: When is it Cost-Effective?

#### • ML algorithms purely rely on data

- Differences in the solutions quality mostly arise from the data set quality, i.e., how representative of the full problem and how balanced is the data set
- "It's not who has the best algorithm that wins. It's who has the most data." Andrew Ng
- When is ML cost-effective against existing / alternative approaches?
  - If a representative data set can be generated with low cost the motivation to use ML is high
    - » Facebook and Google get labelled data almost for free (e.g. FB "10 Year Challenge")
  - If extended machinery and man power is required the motivation shrinks
    - Increasing the cost per example: as a result of deploying more / upgrade existing monitoring devices, creating dedicated set ups to generate data, etc.
    - » Demands showing higher benefits from adopting ML





# ML in Optical Communication Systems & Networks



### Evolution to 5G / Rise of IoT...



#### Network density will increase with 5G

10x density, into every neighborhood Much larger network footprint, elements and services Need to keep OpEx low and workforce constant





ARPU challenge will continue, unlimited consumption will translate into wireless Landline: Bandwidth x 10 over last years while ARPU ~ ½ Wireless: US changed from bandwidth by use to unlimited consumption 5G can be deployed as fixed-wireless substitution



#### **Operators seek to build 5G networks much faster than 4G**

Roll-out of 4G network took 3y for initial build and another 5y to get it everywhere Roll-out implies huge CapEx and increases OpEx associated to maintenance, upgrades, etc.

Critical To...





#### ...Core Networks under Pressure



#### More capacity...

Increase capacity per channel Maximize capacity of installed fiber infrastructure, postponing expensive fiber roll-outs / additional fiber lease



... while keeping expenditures low... Reduce cost per bit transported Reduce footprint and power consumption Simplify network operation Facilitate network expansion



#### ...and fostering innovation

Faster introduction of new features Shorter time-to-market of new services





### Setting The Vision

#### The Autonomous, Self-Learning & Self-Driving Network



Wouldn't it be nice if your network could ...

#### ... auto-configure

- Routing / spectrum / modulation format based on real-time physical layer data
- » Full automation of optical layer

#### ... self-heal

- » Root cause analysis & failure prediction
- » Automatic repair, preventive maintenance
- ... predict traffic and self-optimize
- » Automate network re-configuration
- » Suggest network augmentation
- » Avoid congested areas



### Enabling Trends: Programmable Optical Layer



#### NG Advanced Coherent Toolkit



#### Flexible coherent line interfaces

- High spectral efficiency
- Fine grained trade-off capacity and reach
- Rely on advanced digital signal processing to mitigate physical impairments

#### Performance data can be collected at the receiver end of a lightpath

#### 10G ODU2 10GbE MPLS-TP 10GbE CE Channelized ODU2

#### **Flexible network elements**

- Colorless, Directionless, Contentionless (CDC) ROADMs facilitate reuse of line interfaces, reduce need to send technician to the field, enable advanced restoration schemes
- Hybrid ODU/packet switches enable to mix and mux multiple types of client traffic over the same channel

Network can be remotely reconfigured and adapted to changing conditions



### **Enabling Trends: SDN Control**



#### **Centralized intelligence**

- Global view of network resources & centralized decisions
- Simplified operations via simpler protocols/functions
- Shorter time-to-market via central SW upgrade only
- Improved network resource utilization through optimized multi-layer and multi-domain routes
- Improved resilience via multi-layer LO-L3 coordination in multi-service and IP-Optical networks

Centralized computation facilitates using virtually limitless CPU and storage\*

\*when compared to distributed control plane relying on network element capabilities



### **Enabling Trends: Disaggregation**



Disaggregated Transponder

#### **Disaggregated transport platforms and line systems**

- Multi-vendor interoperability
- Open standards and protocols
- Simultaneously meet the requirements of ICPs, CSPs, enterprises

Estimating end-to-end performance requires agreeing on a common model and/or "learning" it from the devices, systems or lightpaths



#### **Disaggregated switches/routers**

- Open carrier classed disaggregated whitebox switch/router & open software supported by any industry standard whitebox switch/router
- Break vendor lock-in, reduce costs, improve scalability

Common control & orchestration across multiple layers, prone to adopt innovative solutions



### Enabling Trends: Low Margins Provisioning



#### Real time performance planning

- Rely on margin measurements during operation
- Avoid long term projections and worst case assumptions
- Accommodate short/mid term uncertainties, balancing bandwidth and reliability
- Avoid margin stacking / over-dimensioning
- Monitor performance evolution of lightpaths (i.e. service health check)

Data intensive approach facilitates estimating performance degradation and trend analysis



### Enabling Trends: An Example





© 2019 Infinera. All rights reserved.

### Challenges: A Mature Ecosystem

- Optical networks have been successfully deployed and operated for decades
- Significant investment done in (non-ML) models and processes to operate them
  - ML models need to show improvements in key metrics
  - Usage of ML models has to be cost-effective
- Established practices and labor force accustomed to deterministic approaches
  - Shift in mindset takes time (and money)
  - Practical questions need to be answered: e.g. if there is problem, who's fault is it? The algorithm, the data set? Who collected the data, who supplied the equipment?
- Existing network infrastructure may not be ready to exploit ML
  - Data collection, storage and processing need to be enhanced
  - Additional investment, when needed, has to pay off









#### Challenges: Data Sources & Access

• Not every community has privileges to directly access every source of data

User Community	Data Sources		
"Open Access" (e.g. broad research community)	<ul> <li>Analytical and simulation-based models and databases that are public</li> <li>Academic lab setups (usually limited in size and with limited access to device and sub-systems internal details)</li> </ul>		
System Vendors	<ul> <li>Same as "Open Access", plus</li> <li>Detailed characterization of (their) devices and sub-systems properties (but with limited visibility of phenomena arising in a complex, heterogeneous, live network)</li> </ul>		
Network Operators	<ul> <li>Same as "Open Access", plus</li> <li>Specific deployment instances (with visibility over multiple planes, layers, domains, vendors, enforced policies, with impact of time-varying effects)</li> </ul>		

- Partnerships within and between different communities (in various forms) can be key to create and exploit meaningful and rich data sets
  - What are the incentives for sharing data?
  - How to handle confidential data?



- Recall that ML applications are useful if
  - Phenomenon or function being learned is stationary for a sufficiently long period of time
  - Sufficiently large labelled training data set exists or can be created
- ML models cannot be seen as standalone applications immutable during their lifecycle
  - Monitoring tools need to be employed in order to control biases of the data as well as changes in the behavior of the problem
  - What does it take to trust a decision made by a machine (other than that it is 99% accurate)?
    - » Is it fair?
    - » Is it easy to understand?
    - » Can someone have tampered with it?
    - » Is it accountable?











#### **IBM ART – Adversarial Robustness Toolbox**

Evasion attacks	Evasion defenses	Poisoning detection	Robustness metrics
• FGSM	Feature squeezing	Detection based on	CLEVER
• JSMA	<ul> <li>Spatial smoothing</li> </ul>	clustering activations	Empirical robustness
• BIM	Label smoothing	Proof of attack strategy	<ul> <li>Loss sensitivity</li> </ul>
• PGD	Adversarial training		
• Carlini & Wagner	Virtual adversarial	Evasion detection	Unified model API
• DeepFool	training <ul> <li>Thermometer encoding</li> <li>Gaussian data augmentation</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Detector based on inputs</li> <li>Detector based on activations</li> </ul>	• Training
NewtonFool			Prediction
Universal perturbation			<ul> <li>Access to loss and prediction gradients</li> </ul>
			50



© 2019 Infinera. All rights reserved.





© 2019 Infinera. All rights reserved.

### (Some) Use Cases

- ML models for optical communication systems & networks are being investigated for a wide array of use cases
  - From modelling individual device (e.g. EDFA) to capturing network-wide behavior (e.g. lightpath QoT)
  - From modelling physical-layer impairments (e.g. BER, OSNR) to predicting traffic flows / patterns
- Use cases can also differ in their potential impact and complexity of use
  - "Low-hanging fruits" (data already available or easy to acquire, low effort to deploy ML model) vs.
     "starting from scratch" (data collection and ML model usage demand significant effort)
  - "Incremental benefit" vs. "Paradigm shift in network operation"
- Two use cases are illustrated
  - QoT estimation focusing on non-linear impairments
  - Advanced failure prediction



- Traditional methods to estimate optical performance
  - Simplified Heuristic / Analytical Models
    - ✓ Fast execution, enabling a trade-off accuracy vs complexity when they are designed
    - Limited accuracy (usually set to be conservative)
    - Valid only within a defined operation range and well-defined conditions

#### Complex Numerical Simulation

- ✓ High accuracy
- ...but requires detailed and accurate characterization of the lightpath
- Complex and very slow to execute
- Live Monitoring
  - ✓ Most reliable performance estimation for established lightpaths
  - Not self-sufficient to estimate performance of unestablished lightpaths
  - Only applicable when the network is operating

Dominant method for offline planning tools and online provisioning platforms



• Ideally, optical performance estimation would meet the following targets

#### - Fast execution

- ✓ Enabling applications with strict execution time requirements (e.g. optical restoration)
- ✓ Allowing network planners to explore more network configurations in tender planning

#### High accuracy

- ✓ Enabling CapEx optimized tender planning (i.e. "better planning tools and tender planning")
- ✓ Improving resource utilization in running networks (i.e. "better online provisioning platforms")
- Easily embed measurements from a monitoring system
  - ✓ Further improving accuracy and improving resource utilization in running networks
- Seamlessly support more than one mode of operation
  - Enabling to easily switch between, for example, a low precision industry standard optical model and a high precision proprietary optical model in the same engine



- Focus on a sub-set of physical impairments: Non-linear (NL) impairments
  - Difficult to compute, leading to cumbersome models
  - Relevant in high symbol rate, flexible-grid networks
- Exemplify potential of ML models to improve trade-off accuracy vs computational effort
  - Baseline: incoherent Gaussian Noise (iGN) model
    - Simple and fast, but usually conservative due to several assumptions, such as neglecting coherent interference, equal number of channels in the vicinity of the center channel, etc.
  - Detailed: Enhanced Gaussian Noise (EGN) model
    - » More accurate, but complex / slow to compute in order to account for self-channel, cross-channel and multi-channel effects, modulation format dependency, etc.









© 2019 Infinera. All rights reserved.

Proof of Concept: Hybrid iGN-ANN\*

\*final results also shown for Standalone ANN

- Data set characterization
  - 73,440 examples: 45 span lengths x 17 launch powers x 96 frequencies
  - Two sets for training
    - » Large set: 51,500 examples for training (70% of total set)
    - » <u>Small</u> set: 12,000 examples for training (optimized selection)
- ANN characterization
  - Hyperparameters are optimized using grid-search
    - » ANN with two hidden layers with 20 neurons each
    - » Output layer with one neuron (regression problem)
    - » Neurons activation function is the relu
    - » Learning method is the stochastic gradient descent
    - » Adaptive learning rate starting with 0.001 (decrease after two epochs w/o improving loss)
    - » Stop criteria is 2000 epochs or average error smaller than 0.0001





- NL OSNR Accuracy Results: <u>Large</u> training data set
  - ANN obtained a R<sup>2</sup> of 0.998394





- NL OSNR Accuracy Results: <u>Large</u> training data set
  - Example of <u>target</u> and <u>estimated</u> NL OSNR as function of frequency for three span lengths (60, 80 and 120 km) and two launch powers (0 and 3 dBm)





- NL OSNR Accuracy Results: <u>Small</u> training data set
  - ANN obtained a R<sup>2</sup> of 0.998479





- NL OSNR Accuracy Results: <u>Small</u> training data set
  - Example of <u>target</u> and <u>estimated</u> NL OSNR as function of frequency for three span lengths (60, 80 and 120 km) and two launch powers (0 and 3 dBm)





- Conclusions of Proof of Concept
  - Both Standalone ANN and Hybrid iGN-ANN show high accuracy

	Standalone ANN		Hybrid iGN-ANN	
	Large data set	Smal data set	Large data set	Smal data set
R <sup>2</sup>	0.999685	0.999195	0.998394	0.998479
Average	0.0225	0.0174	-0.0001	-0.0102
Stand. Dev.	0.1244	0.2013	0.1421	0.1379
Error  < 0.5 dB	98.93 %	95.96 %	97.14 %	98.48 %
Error  < 1 dB	99.95 %	99.66 %	99.93 %	99.95 %

- Both Standalone ANN and Hybrid iGN-ANN compute NL OSNR orders of magnitude faster than EGN

	EGN	Standalone ANN	Hybrid IGN-ANN
Normalized Execution Time	100	0.15	2.51

 ...but moving to a practical application requires training the ANN with more data (multi-span scenarios, different modulation formats, symbol rates, fiber types, different channel counts and spectrum profiles, etc.)



- Extending the concept of Hybrid iGN-ANN
  - Detailed performance model can comprise
    - » More accurate analytical models
    - » Numerical simulations and/or
    - » Measurements from a monitoring system
  - Externally defined boundary conditions can be applied to regulate the ANN contribution
    - » Increase/decrease the weight of the ANN contribution according to level of confidence for specific input conditions
    - » Selectively discard ANN contribution (e.g. if measurement data corrupted or not trustworthy)
- Physical impairments aware routing engine can be kept simple and fast



### (Some) Use Cases: Advanced Failure Prediction

- How to operate optical networks as to improve metrics such as scalability and reliability while decreasing OpEx?
  - <u>Automate</u>
    - » More decisions made and enforced by machines
    - » Abstract complexity to facilitate the remaining human decisions
  - Act instead of react
    - » Monitor the evolution of key parameters across the network
    - » Continuously analyze trends and trigger preventive measures (e.g. to avoid failures)
    - » Correlate data from different sources to further improve the process
  - <u>Adapt</u>
    - » Factor in the specifics of each network deployment
    - » Improve the overall process as more data is collected (i.e. learn from experience)





### (Some) Use Cases: Advanced Failure Prediction

- Avoiding failures or mitigating their impact
  - Failures can occur as a result of processes occurring in different timescales
    - » Slow degradation of devices and components (e.g. aging) should be possible to predict
    - » Preventive replacement of devices / components (predictive maintenance) and proactive measures to circumvent them (self-healing) during network operation can enhance network reliability, reduce OpEx and improve customer experience







## Conclusions



#### Is Machine Learning <u>Needed</u>\* in Optical Communication Systems & Networks?

\* i.e. does it add enough value for what it will cost?

- In short: "Yes..."
  - ... if use case fits the stated conditions to successfully employ ML models (*data, data, and more data!*)
  - ... if improvements are shown in key metrics and deployment cost is reasonable
  - — ... if moving to production environment can be done while meeting a range of requirements that can
     include fairness, robustness and assurance
- Looking ahead
  - ML applications expanded fast, time to consolidate and focus on fewer but high potential cases
  - We are just at the beginning: need to break barriers and work together to find ways to "standardize" data sets, securely share data and models, etc.







NIST - Boulder, Colorado on August 2, 2019

# Thank You!

JPedro@Infinera.com

