

Recovery Oriented Computing (ROC)

Dave Patterson and a cast of 1000s:

Aaron Brown, Pete Broadwell, George Candea[†], Mike Chen, James Cutler[†], Prof. Armando Fox[†], Emre Kıcıman[†], David Oppenheimer, and Jonathan Traupman U.C. Berkeley, † Stanford University April 2003

Outline

- · The past: where we have been
- The present: new realities and challenges
- · A future: Recovery-Oriented Computing (ROC)
- ROC techniques and principles

The past: research goals and assumptions of last 20 years

- · Goal #1: Improve performance
- · Goal #2: Improve performance
- · Goal #3: Improve cost-performance
- · Simplifying Assumptions
 - Humans are perfect (they don't make mistakes during installation, wiring, upgrade, maintenance or repair)
 - Software will eventually be bug free (Hire better programmers!)
 - Hardware MTBF is already very large (~100 years between failures), and will continue to increase
 - Maintenance costs irrelevant vs. Purchase price (maintenance a function of price, so cheaper helps)

ERROR

ES DEASCO

Learning from other fields: disasters

Common threads in accidents ~3 Mile Island

- 1. More multiple failures than you believe possible, because latent errors accumulate
- 2. Operators cannot fully understand system because errors in implementation, measurement system, warning systems. Also complex, hard to predict interactions



- 4. The systems are never all working fully properly: bad warning lights, sensors out, things in repair
- Emergency Systems are often flawed. At 3 Mile Island, 2 valves in wrong position; parts of a redundant system used only in an emergency. Facility running under normal operation masks errors in error handling

rce: Charles Perrow Normal Accidents: Living with High Risk Technols

Learning from other fields: human error

- · Two kinds of human error
 - 1) slips/lapses: errors in execution
 - 2) mistakes: errors in planning
 - errors can be **active** (operator error) or latent (design error, management error)
- · Human errors are inevitable
 - "humans are furious pattern-matchers" » sometimes the match is wrong
 - cognitive strain leads brain to think up least-effort solutions first, even if wrong
- · Humans can self-detect errors
- about 75% of errors are immediately detected Source: J. Reason, Human Error, Cambridge, 1990

Human error

· Human operator error is the leading cause of dependability problems in many domains



- · Operator error cannot be eliminated
 - humans inevitably make mistakes: "to err is human"
 - automation irony tells us we can't eliminate the human

The ironies of automation

- · Automation doesn't remove human influence
 - shifts the burden from operator to designer
 - » designers are human too, and make mistakes
 - » unless designer is perfect, human operator still needed
- · Automation can make operator's job harder
 - reduces operator's understanding of the system
 - » automation increases complexity, decreases visibility
 - » no opportunity to learn without day-to-day interaction
 - uninformed operator still has to solve exceptional
 - scenarios missed by (imperfect) designers'

 » exceptional situations are already the most error-prone
- Need tools to help, not replace, operator

Source: J. Reason, Human Error, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

0114-7

Learning from others: Bridges

- 1800s: 1/4 iron truss railroad bridges failed!
- Safety is now part of Civil Engineering DNA
- · Techniques invented since 1800s:
 - -Learn from failures vs. successes
 - Redundancy to survive some failures
 - Margin of safety 3X-6X vs. calculated load
 - -(CS&E version of safety margin?)
- What will people of future think our computers?

Slide 8

TO ENGINEER

IS HUMAN

HENRY PETROSK

Where we are today

MAD TV, "Antiques Roadshow, 3005 AD"
 VALTREX:

"Ah ha. You paid 7 million Rubex too much. My suggestion: beam it directly into the disposal cube. These pieces of crap crashed and froze so frequently that people became violent!

Hargh!"

"Worthless Piece of Crap: O Rubex"

Slide 9

Recovery-Oriented Computing Philosophy

"If a problem has no solution, it may not be a problem, but a fact, not to be solved, but to be coped with over time" — Shimon Peres ("Peres's Law")

- · People/HW/SW failures are facts, not problems
- · Recovery/repair is how we cope with them
- · Improving recovery/repair improves availability
 - UnAvailability = MTTR (assuming MTTR much less than MTTF)
 - 1/10th MTTR just as valuable as 10X MTBF
- · ROC also helps with maintenance/TCO
- since major Sys Admin job is recovery after failure
- Since TCO is 5-10X HW/SW \$, if necessary spend disk/DRAM/CPU resources for recovery

Slide 10

ROC Summary

- · 21st Century Research challenge is Synergy with Humanity, Dependability, Security/Privacy
- · 2002: Peres's Law greater than Moore's Law?
 - Must cope with fact that people, SW, HW fail
 - Industry may soon compete on recovery time v. $\ensuremath{\mathsf{SPEC}}$
- Recovery Oriented Computing is one path for operator synergy, dependability for servers
 - Failure data collection + Benchmarks to evaluate
 - Partitioning, Redundandy, Diagnosis, Partial Restart, Input/Fault Insertion, Undo, Margin of Safety
- Significantly reducing MTTR (people/SW/HW)
 => better Dependability & Cost of Ownership



Slide 11

Interested in ROCing?

- More research opportunities than 2 university projects can cover. Many could help with:
 - Failure data collection, analysis, and publication
 - Create/Run Recovery benchmarks: compare (by vendor) databases, files systems, routers, ...
 - Invent, evaluate techniques to reduce MTTR and $\ensuremath{\mathsf{TCO}}$ in computation, storage, and network systems
 - (Lots of low hanging fruit)

"If it's important, how can you say it's impossible if you don't try?" Jean Monnet, a founder of European Union

A

http://ROC.cs.berkeley.edu

Slide 12