THE PATTERNS OF DISTRIBUTED LOGGING AND CONTAINERS

CloudNativeCon Europe 2017
March 30, 2017

Satoshi Tagomori (@tagomoris)
Treasure Data, Inc.

SATOSHI TAGOMORI

(@tagomoris)

Fluentd, MessagePack-Ruby, Norikra, ...

Treasure Data, Inc.

TREASURE
DATA


fluentd


CLOUD NATIVE
COMPUTING FOUNDATION

1. Microservices, Containers and Logging
2. Scaling Logging Platform
3. Patterns: Source/Destination -side Aggregation
4. Patterns: Scaling Up/Out Destination
5. Practices

MICROSERVICES, CONTAINERS AND LOGGING

Logging in Industries

- Service Logs
  - Web access logs
  - Ad logs
  - Commercial transaction logs for analytics (EC, Game, ...)
- System Logs
  - Syslog and other OS logs
  - Audit logs
  - Performance metrics

Logs for
Business Growth

Logs for
Service Stability

Microservices and Logging



Monolithic service

Microservices

Microservices and Containers

- Microservices
  - Isolated dependencies
  - Agile deployment
- Containers
  - Isolated environments & resources
  - Simple pull&restart deployment
  - Less overhead, high density

Logging Challenges with Microservices/Containers

- Containerization changes everything:
  - No permanent storages
  - No fixed physical/network addresses
  - No fixed mapping between servers and roles

Logging Challenges with Microservices/Containers

- Containerization changes everything:
  - No permanent storages
  - No fixed physical/network addresses
  - No fixed mapping between servers and roles

Transfer Logs to Anywhere ASAP

Logging Challenges with Microservices/Containers

- Containerization changes everything:
  - No permanent storages
  - No fixed physical/network addresses
  - No fixed mapping between servers and roles

Push Logs From Containers

Logging Challenges with Microservices/Containers

- Containerization changes everything:
  - No permanent storages
  - No fixed physical/network addresses
  - No fixed mapping between servers and roles

Label Logs With Service Names/Tags

Logging Challenges with Microservices/Containers

- Containerization changes everything:
  - No permanent storages
  - No fixed physical/network addresses
  - No fixed mapping between servers and roles

Label Logs With Service Names/Tags

Parse Logs & Label Values At Source

Structured Logs

Structured Logs: tag, time, key-value pairs

Original log:

```
the customer put an item to cart: item_id=101, items=10, client=web
```

Structured log:

```
ec_service.shopping_cart                    tag

2017-03-30 16:35:37 +0100                   timestamp

{
 "container_id":   "bfdd5b9....",
 "container_name": "/infallible_mayer",
 "source":         "stdout",
 "event":          "put an item to cart",
 "item_id":        101,
 "items":          10,
 "client":         "web"
}
```

record

How to Ship Logs from Docker Containers



read files,
parse plain texts

Using mounted volume

+ disk I/O penalty
+ mount points

read files,
parse json lines

Using container json logs

+ disk I/O penalty



just receive
transferred logs

Sending logs to agents directly

+ logger code
+ agent config



just receive
transferred logs

Using logging drivers

SCALING LOGGING PLATFORM

Core Architecture: Distributed Logging



Distributed Logging Workflow

Collector

- Retrieve raw logs: file system / network
- Parse log content

Aggregator

- Get data from multiple sources
- Split/merge incoming data into streams

Destination

- Retrieve structured logs from Aggregator
- Store formatted logs

Scaling Logging

- Network Traffic
  - Split heavy log traffic into traffics to nodes
- CPU Load
  - Distribute processing to nodes about parsing/formatting logs
- High Availability
  - Switch traffic from a node to another for failures
- Agility
  - Reconfigure whole logging layer to modify destinations

fluentd

PATTERNS:
SOURCE/DESTINATION -SIDE AGGREGATION


Source Side Aggregation
NO
YES
NO
Destination Side Aggregation
YES

Now I'm Talking About:



Source-side Aggregation Patterns



Aggregation Pattern without Source-side Aggregation

- **Pros**:
  - Simple configuration
- **Cons**:
  - Fixed aggregator (destination endpoint) address configured in containers
  - Many network connections
  - High load in aggregator / destination



Aggregation Pattern with Source-side Aggregation

- **Pros**:
  - Less connections
  - Lower load in aggregator / destination
  - Less configurations in containers
  - More agility

    (aggregate containers can be reconfigured)
- **Cons**:
  - Need more resources (+1 container per host)



Destination-side Aggregation Patterns



Aggregation Pattern without Destination-side Aggregation

- **Pros**:
  - Less nodes
  - Simpler configuration
- **Cons**:
  - Destination changes affects all source nodes
  - Worse performance:

    many small write requests on destination(storage)



Aggregation Pattern with Destination-side Aggregation

- **Pros**:
  - Destination changes does NOT affect source nodes
  - Better performance:

    destination aggregator can merge write operations
- **Cons**:
  - More nodes
  - More complex configuration



PATTERNS:
SCALING UP/OUT DESTINATION

Now I'm Talking About:



Scaling Destination Patterns

Scaling Up
Aggregator/Destination Endpoints



Using HTTP Load Balancer or Huge Queues

Scaling Out
Aggregator/Destination Endpoints



Using Round Robin Clients

Scaling Up Destination

- **Pros**:
  - Simple configuration:
    specifying load balancer only
    in collector nodes
- **Cons**:
  - Upper limits about scaling up
    on Load balancer (or queue)



Scaling Out Destination

- **Pros**:
  - Unlimited scaling by adding nodes
- **Cons**:
  - Complex configuration in collector nodes
  - Client feature required for round-robin
  - Unavailable for traffic over Internet



Destination-side Aggregation and Destination Scaling



PRACTICES

Practices: Docker + Fluentd

- **Docker Fluentd Logging Driver**
  - Docker containers can send these logs to Fluentd directly, with less overhead
- Fluentd's **Pluggable Architecture**
  - Various destination systems (storage/database/service) are available by changing configuration
- **Small Memory Footprint**
  - Source aggregation requires +1 container per hosts: less additional resource usage is fine!

Practice 1: Source-side Aggregation + Scaling Up

- Kubernetes: Fluentd + Elasticsearch
  - a.k.a EFK stack (inspired by ELK stack)
    - Elasticsearch - Fluentd - Kibana



https://kubernetes.io/docs/tasks/debug-application-cluster/logging-elasticsearch-kibana/

Practice 2: Source-side Aggregation + Scaling Up

- Containerized Applications
  - w/ Google Stackdriver for Monitoring
  - w/ Treasure Data for Analytics



Practice 3: Source/Destination-side Aggregation + Scaling Out

- Containerized Application
  - w/ Log processing on Hadoop
  - writing files on HDFS via WebHDFS
- Hadoop HDFS prefers large files on HDFS:
  - Destination-side aggregation works well



Practice 4: Source/Destination-side Aggregation + Scaling Out

- Containerized Application
  - w/ Log processing on Google BigQuery
  - putting logs via HTTPS
- BigQuery has quota about write requests:
  - Destination-side aggregation works well



Best practices?

- Source aggregation: do it
  - it makes app containers free from logging problems (buffering, HA, ...)
- Destination aggregation: it depends
  - no need for cloud logging services/storages
  - may need for self-hosted distributed filesystems/databases
  - may need for cloud services which charges per requests
- Destination scaling: it depends on destinations


Make Logging Scalable,
Service Stable & Business Growing.
Happy Logging!
@tagomoris