Diagnosis via monitoring & tracing

George Amvrosiadis, Greg Ganger, Majd Sakr
adapted from Raja Sambasivan

15-719/18-709: Advanced Cloud Computing
Spring 2019

Problem diagnosis is difficult

- For developers of clouds
- For cloud users (i.e., software developers)
  - Must debug own applications
  - Must debug interactions w/cloud
    - E.g., is a slowdown due to other VMs or my app?

Monitoring via perf. counters

- Yields counters of low-level data
  - E.g., CPU time, disk I/Os, etc.
- E.g., AWS CloudWatch, Ganglia

- Pros: Lightweight, commonly available
- Cons: Black-box; machine oriented

Logging events of interest

- Yields detailed text describing system's behavior (e.g., application, OS, VM, etc.)
- Available in most systems (in some form)

- Pros: White-box approach
- Cons: High overhead; machine-oriented

End-to-end activity tracing

- Similar to logging, but workflow-based
- E.g., Dapper, Stardust, X-Trace, etc.

- Pros: White box, shows workflow
- Cons: Requires system modifications

Monitoring

A key cloud-specific issue

- Cloud providers and users usually do not wish to share information
- As such:
  - Counters often normalized to VM capacity
    - e.g., percentage of AWS instance
  - Provider logs/traces often not visible to users

Example: Ganglia [Massie04]

- Designed for HPC environments
  - Paper assumes bare-metal hardware
- Collects and aggregates counters
  - Counters can be app or machine specific
  - Within cluster, counters visible everywhere
  - Counters from multiple clusters aggregated

Ganglia architecture



Source: The ganglia distributed monitoring system: design, implementation, and experience. Parallel Computing, Volume 30, Issue 7, July 2004.

AWS CloudWatch

- Provides monitoring for all AWS resources
  - EC2 counters show VM-normalized values
  - Also, can monitor app-specific metrics

End-to-end tracing

End-to-end tracing overview

- Focus of many research efforts for ~10 yrs
  - Currently used in Google, Bing, etc.
- Traces show causality-related activity
  - Trace: set of events from different threads/ machines merged & sorted by causality
  - E.g., flow of indiv. requests (request flows)

End-to-end tracing implementation

- Tracing infrastructure tracks trace points touched by individual requests
  - Some “start” traces (eg. user request rec’d)
  - Others propagate trace ID created at start
- Traces obtained by stitching together trace points accessed by individual requests
  - Hard to account for async and batched work

End-to-end tracing architecture



A DAG-based request flow



Nodes show trace points & edges show latencies

Throttling by Sampling

- Users trace too little or too much
- Limit user bytes added per trace span
- Request sampling to limit global overhead
  - Collects all trace points for a req. or none
  - Hash trace ID to [0,1] and keep if < threshold
  - Allows end-2-end tracing to be “always on”

A few key design questions

- How much representational power?
  - DAGs, trees, or paths?
- What causal relationships to preserve?
  - Read-after-write, contention, etc.
- How many request flows to sample?
- Where to make sampling decision?

Example: Dapper [Sigelman10]

- Google's impl. of end-2-end tracing
  - In use since at least 2008
- Similar in architecture to other examples
  - But, optimized for traces expected at Google
- Trace records gathered in external system
  - median lat. 15s, 25% of time 98%tile > hrs

Dapper design decisions

- Traces represented as trees of RPCs
  - Node contains all work done for an RPC
  - Edges indicate new RPC calls/replies
- Core tracing infrastruct. + developer adds
- Sampling decision made at request entry
  - Based on hash of root ID (keep x% traces)

Example Dapper trace tree



Dapper UI Example



Figure 6: A typical user workflow in the general-purpose Dapper user interface.

End-to-end tracing analysis tools

Example: Spectroscope [Sambasivan11]

- Localizes performance degradations
  - By ID'ing changed request flows
- Output:
  - Groups of before/after request flows
  - Some changes automatically ID'd

Spectroscope workflow



Automatically ID'd changes

- Same structure is same trace points
- Groups w/structural changes
  - Identified via heuristics (e.g. freq. of types)
- Groups w/response-time changes
  - Have identical flows in both periods
  - ID'd via statistical significance testing

Group w/structural changes



Developers localize root cause by ID'ing how differences before/after degradation

Group w/response time change

Before degradation avg. response time: 110µs

After degradation avg. response time: 1,090µs



Root cause localized by ID'ing responsible interaction

Summary

- Debugging distributed systems is hard
  - Performance debugging is harder still
- Monitoring is counting without causation
- But people want examples (traces)
  - Too much statistical analysis slows trust
  - Traces are logistically expensive, quick to rot