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“Ordinary mortals know what’s happening now, the gods know what the future holds because they alone are totally enlightened.

Wise men are aware of future things just about to happen”

C. P. Cavafy, (Greek poet, 1863-1933) “But the Wise Perceive Things about to Happen,” a poem based on lines by Philostratos
Motivation

• Ever-increasing systems complexity
• Ever-growing number of attacks and threats, novice users and third-party or open-source software, COTS
• Growing connectivity and interoperability
• Dynamicity (frequent configurations, reconfigurations, updates, upgrades and patches, ad hoc extensions), and
• Natural and man-made disasters
Facts, errors and failures are common events so let us treat them as part of the system behavior and learn how to cope with them.

Attractive panacea:

(self) Proactive Fault Management (PFM)
PFM is an umbrella term for techniques such as monitoring, diagnosis, prediction, recovery and preventive maintenance concerned with proactive handling of errors and failures: if the system knows about a critical situation in advance, it can try to apply countermeasures in order to prevent the occurrence of a failure, or it can prepare repair mechanisms for the upcoming failure in order to reduce time-to-repair.
Comparison to Classical Reliability Theory

- Classical reliability theory is typically useful for long term or average behavior predictions and comparative analysis.

- Classical reliability theory may help but is not very good for short term prediction due to dynamics, mobility, systems/networks complexity, changing execution environments, upgrades, online repair, etc.
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Variable Selection

- What are the right variables to use for modeling?
- There are up to 4200 variables \( (v) \) and up to hundreds of fault classes \( (f) \) per node
- For \( n \) nodes: \( m = v \times f \times n \) variables, the number of combinations \( c \) equals:

\[
c = \sum_{r=1}^{m} \binom{m}{r}
\]

- Combinatorial explosion!
Variable Selection Methods

- Selection by experts
- Filter (e.g., mutual information criterion)
- Wrapper (making use of modeling procedure specifics)
  - feed forward selection, finding independent variables
  - backward elimination
  - probabilistic (only variables showing correlation and certain distribution)
- Forward Addition - a method of selecting random variables for inclusion in the regression model by starting with no variables and then gradually adding those that contribute most to prediction
• Benchmarked four techniques
  – Forward selection
  – Backward elimination
  – Expert selected
  – PWA (Prob. Wrapper)

• Variables
  – alloc
  – sema/s

• PWA performs best on time series and class label data

[Hoffmann, Malek 2006; Hoffmann 2005]
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Faults, Errors, Failures again ...

- Testing
  - Fault
- Auditing
  - Undetected Error
  - Detection
  - Side-effects
- Reporting
  - Detected Error
- Tracking
  - Failure
  - Side-effects
- Monitoring
  - Symptom

Affects external state
Four Ways of Detecting Faults

(1) The system can be *audited* in order to actively search for *faults*, e.g., by testing on checksums of data structures, etc.

(2) System parameters such as memory usage, number of processes, workload, etc., can be *monitored* in order to identify side-effects of the faults. These side-effects are called *symptoms*. For example, the side-effect of a memory leak is that the amount of free memory decreases over time.

(3) If a fault is activated and *detected* (observed), it turns into an *error*.

(4) If the fault is not detected by fault detection mechanisms, it might directly turn into a *failure* which can be observed from outside the system or component.
Taxonomy

Online Failure Prediction

Failure Tracking
- Probability Distribution Estimation
- Co-occurrence

Symptom Monitoring
- Function Approximation
- Classifiers
- System Models
- Time Series Analysis

Detected Error Reporting
- Rule-based approaches
- Co-occurrence
- Pattern-recognition
- Statistical Tests
- Classifiers

Undetected Error Auditing

[Salfner, Lenk, Malek, CSUR]
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The goal of online failure prediction is to identify failure-prone situations, i.e. situations that will probably evolve into a failure. The evaluation is based on runtime monitoring data.

The output of online failure prediction can either be
- a decision that a failure is imminent or not, or
- some continuous measure evaluating how failure-prone the current situation is
Two Types of Input Data

- There are two types of system measurements
  - periodic, numerical
  - event-based, categorical

- Examples for periodic data
  - system- / CPU load
  - memory usage

- Examples for event-based data:
  - interrupts
  - threshold violations
  - error events
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1. *Universal Basis Functions (UBF)*

2. *Hidden Semi-Markov Model (HSMM)*

3. *Dispersion-Frame Technique (DFT)*

4. *Eventset method*
Universal Basis Functions (UBF)

- Tailored to periodic measurements
- Function approximation approach: Express target value as function of input variables
- Examples for target values:
  - Availability
  - Memory consumption
UBF Background

- Starting from radial basis functions
  Linear combination of kernel functions $G_i$

  $$f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i \ast G_{\lambda_i}(\|x - c_i\|)$$

  Replace fixed Gaussian by flexible domain specific kernel

  $$G_{\lambda_i}(d) = \omega \Phi_1(d) + (1 - \omega) \Phi_2(d)$$

- Determine parameters by minimizing, e.g., mean square error

  $$\min H[f] = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(f(x_i) - y_i\right)^2$$
Effect of $\omega$ (UBF slider)

- Linear combination of nonlinear kernel functions
- Examples:
  - Gaussian
  - Sigmoid functions, ...
- RBF is special case
- Improve efficacy by introducing data specific flexible kernels
- Universal approximator
- Large number of kernels to cover heavy tailed distributions
Dispersion Frame Technique

- Classic technique for error-log analysis
- Evaluates the time of error occurrence
- Applies a set of heuristic rules evaluating the number of errors within successive dispersion frames

EDI: Error Dispersion Index
DF: Dispersion Frame

[Lin, Siewiorek 1990]
Event-set Method

• Approach inspired by data-mining
• Focus on type of events
• Based on sets of events
  – Each set contains decisive events that occur prior to a target event
  – Events correspond to errors in our taxonomy
  – Target events correspond to failures
  – Event sets do not keep timing information
• Result: rule-based failure prediction system containing a database of indicative eventsets

[Vilalta, Ma 2002]
Event-set Method

![Diagram]

Failure window 1:
- B
- C
- A

Non-failure window:
- F
- D
- A
- A
- A

Failure window 2:
- B
- A
- B

Time:
- \( \Delta t_d \)
- \( \Delta t_l \)

Initial eventset database:
- B
- AB
- AC
- A
- ABC
- BC
- C

Keeping only frequent, accurate, validated, and specific eventsets:

Final eventset database:
- AB
Components of complex systems depend on each other

Dependencies lead to error patterns

Fault-tolerant systems:
- Failures occur only under certain conditions
- Failure-prone conditions can be identified by specific error patterns

Use pattern recognition to identify symptomatic situations

[Salfner, Malek 2007; Salfner 2008]
Approach

- Standard tool for pattern recognition: Hidden Markov Models
- Identify symptomatic patterns
  - Algorithmically
  - From recorded training data
  - **Machine learning**
- Additional assumption:
  - Time between events is decisive (temporal sequence analysis)
  - Standard Hidden Markov Models need to be extended
  - **Development of a Hidden Semi-Markov Model (HSMM)**
- The approach incorporates both type and time-of-occurrence of error events
• **Discrete Time Markov Chains (DTMC)** consist of states (1...N) and transition probabilities $p_{ij}$ between states.

• In **Hidden Markov Models (HMM)** each state can generate a symbol A,B,C according to probability distribution $b_i(o_k)$.

• **Hidden semi-Markov models (HSMMs)** replace transition probabilities $p_{ij}$ by time-continuous cumulative probability distributions $g_{ij}(t)$.
Machine Learning: Two Steps

1. Training: Fit model parameters to training data

   - Failure Sequence 1: B C A
   - Non-failure Sequence 1: A B C
   - Failure Sequence 2: B A B
   - Non-failure Sequence 2: C B A

   HSMM for Failure Sequences
   HSMM for Non-Failure Sequences

2. Prediction: Processing of runtime measurements

   - Sequence Likelihood
     - Failure Sequence: B C A
     - Non-Failure Sequence: B C A

   Classification
   Failure Prediction
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### Precision, Recall and other Metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>True failure</th>
<th>True success</th>
<th>Sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure alarm</strong></td>
<td>Correct alarm (TP)</td>
<td>False alarm (FP)</td>
<td># Alarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No warning</strong></td>
<td>Missing alarm (FN)</td>
<td>Correct no-alarm (TN)</td>
<td># No-Alarms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sum</strong></td>
<td># Failures</td>
<td># Successes</td>
<td># Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Precision:** fraction of correct alarms:  
  \[ \text{precision} = \frac{\text{correct alarms}}{\text{total \# of alarms}} \]

- **Recall:** fraction of predicted failures:  
  \[ \text{recall} = \frac{\text{correct alarms}}{\text{total \# of failures}} \]

- **False positive rate (fpr):**  
  \[ \text{false positive rate} = \frac{\text{false positives}}{\text{\# of successes}} \]

- True positive rate is equal to recall
Receiver Operating Characteristics (ROC)

- Plot true positive rate (recall) over false positive rate for various thresholds
- Threshold $\infty$ : tpr and fpr equal to zero
- Threshold $-\infty$ : tpr and fpr equal to one
Precision-Recall-Plots

- Plot precision over recall for various thresholds
- Threshold $\infty$: precision equal to one, recall equal to zero
- Threshold $-\infty$: precision equal to ratio of positive and negative examples, recall equal to one
Skalar Metrics

- ROC, Precision/Recall diagrams etc. are graphs
- Good for visual inspection, bad for algorithmic decisions
- Goal: obtain one real number to evaluate „quality“ of predictor
- Examples:
  - Precision-Recall-Breakeven: Value at which precision and recall cross
  - Area-under-curve (AUC): Area under the ROC curve
  - F-Measure: Harmonic mean of precision and recall:

\[
F\text{-Measure} = \frac{2 \times \text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}
\]
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• Failure prediction is only the first step in managing faults proactively
• After a potential failure has been predicted, an action must be taken in order to
  - Avoid the failure (prevent it from occurring)
  - Prepare the system such that TTR can be reduced
  - (See lecture seven)
• In general, the following steps have to be performed:
Taxonomy of Reaction Methods

Actions triggered by failure prediction

Downtime avoidance
- State clean-up
- Preventive failover
- Load lowering

Downtime minimization
- Prepared repair
- Preventive restart
**Effects of Proactive Methods**

- Downtime avoidance improves MTTF
- Downtime minimization reduces MTTR:

![Graph showing downtime without and with prediction](image)

(a) without failure prediction  
(b) with failure prediction

- However, In case of frequent false positive and false negative predictions, proactive fault management can also reduce availability!
Contents

• Introduction
• Variable Selection
• Online Failure Prediction Overview
• Four Online Failure Prediction Techniques
• Assessing Failure Predictors
• Taking Action
• Summary
Summary

- Dynamics and complexity of today’s systems require adaptive and proactive mechanisms to handle faults
- Proactive Fault Management (PFM) builds on
  - Continuously observing the system
  - Predict whether a failure is coming up
  - In case of an upcoming failure:
    - Analyze the fault that causes the upcoming failure
    - Decide what to do: Either try to avoid the failure or prepare repair mechanisms for the upcoming failure
- Since online failure predictors build on monitoring data: The best set of variables need to be identified: Variable selection
- Analyses of PFM suggest that PFM has the potential to enhance system availability by up to an order of magnitude.
Thanks!

Questions?