

# Predictive Pod Auto-scaling in the Kubernetes Container Cluster Manager

by

Matt McNaughton

Professor Jeannie Albrecht, Advisor

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the  
Degree of Bachelor of Arts with Honors  
in Computer Science

Williams College  
Williamstown, Massachusetts

May 21, 2016

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1	Goals . . . . .	10
1.2	Contributions . . . . .	10
1.3	Contents . . . . .	11
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1	Resource Intensive Computing Paradigms . . . . .	12
2.2	Cluster Management Paradigms . . . . .	13
2.2.1	Borg . . . . .	14
2.2.2	Omega . . . . .	15
2.2.3	Mesos . . . . .	15
2.2.4	YARN . . . . .	16
2.2.5	Kubernetes . . . . .	16
2.3	Auto-scaling Paradigms . . . . .	17
2.3.1	Threshold-based Rule Policies . . . . .	20
2.3.2	Time-series Analysis . . . . .	21
2.3.3	Control theory . . . . .	21
2.4	Summary . . . . .	23
<b>3</b>	<b>Architecture</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Overview of Kubernetes . . . . .	24
3.1.1	History . . . . .	24
3.1.2	Values . . . . .	25
3.1.3	Running Kubernetes . . . . .	25
3.2	Building Blocks of Kubernetes . . . . .	25
3.2.1	Containerization . . . . .	26
3.2.2	Microservices . . . . .	26
3.2.3	Summary . . . . .	27
3.3	Components of Kubernetes . . . . .	27
3.3.1	Pods . . . . .	28
3.3.2	Replication Controllers . . . . .	28
3.3.3	Services . . . . .	29
3.4	Autoscaling in Kubernetes . . . . .	29
3.4.1	Current Implementation . . . . .	29
3.4.2	Algorithm . . . . .	30
3.5	Predictive Autoscaling in relation to Kubernetes . . . . .	31
3.5.1	Overview . . . . .	31
3.5.2	Algorithm . . . . .	32
3.5.3	Benefits of Predictive Autoscaling . . . . .	33

3.6	Summary . . . . .	33
<b>4</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>35</b>
4.1	Technical Overview . . . . .	35
4.2	Enabling Additions . . . . .	36
4.2.1	Recording Pod Initialization Time . . . . .	36
4.2.2	Storing Previous CPU Utilizations . . . . .	37
4.2.3	Autoscaling Predictively . . . . .	38
4.2.4	Enabling Predictive Autoscaling . . . . .	40
4.3	Summary . . . . .	40
<b>5</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>42</b>
5.1	Goals of Evaluation . . . . .	42
5.1.1	Predictive Auto-scaling's Impact . . . . .	42
5.1.2	Scenario Analysis . . . . .	43
5.2	Evaluation Metrics . . . . .	43
5.2.1	Efficient Resource Utilization . . . . .	43
5.2.2	Quality of Service . . . . .	45
5.2.3	Summation of ERU and QoS . . . . .	45
5.3	Control Groups . . . . .	46
5.3.1	Static . . . . .	46
5.3.2	Reactive Auto-scaling . . . . .	47
5.4	Independent Variables . . . . .	47
5.4.1	Pod Initialization Time . . . . .	48
5.4.2	Traffic Request Pattern . . . . .	49
5.5	Methodology . . . . .	51
5.5.1	Tools . . . . .	51
5.5.2	Evaluation Process . . . . .	53
5.6	Results . . . . .	56
5.6.1	Impact of Predictive Auto-scaling . . . . .	56
5.6.2	Scenarios . . . . .	63
5.7	Summary . . . . .	64
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>65</b>
6.1	Future Work . . . . .	65
6.2	Summary of Contributions . . . . .	67
<b>7</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>68</b>
7.1	Accessing Code . . . . .	68

# List of Figures

2.1	An Over Provisioned Application showing poor ERU. . . . .	17
2.2	An Average Provisioned Application showing poor QoS. . . . .	18
2.3	A Auto-scaled Application showing good ERU and QoS. . . . .	18
3.1	A visualization of Kubernetes . . . . .	28
3.2	A visualization of Kubernetes with autoscaler . . . . .	30
5.1	The step-ladder Traffic Pattern . . . . .	49
5.2	The jagged-edge Traffic Pattern . . . . .	50
5.3	The increase-decrease Traffic Pattern . . . . .	50
5.4	The flash-crowd Traffic Pattern . . . . .	51
5.5	A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder . . . . .	57
5.6	A comparison of negated ERU for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder . . . . .	58
5.7	A comparison of negated QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder . . . . .	59
5.8	A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, jagged-edge . . . . .	60
5.9	A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, increase-decrease . . . . .	61
5.10	A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, flash-crowd . . . . .	62

# List of Tables

2.1	Overview of Cluster Management Paradigms. . . . .	15
2.2	Overview of Auto-scaling Paradigms. . . . .	20
5.1	Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder . . . . .	58
5.2	Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, jagged-edge . . . . .	61
5.3	Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, increase-decrease . . . .	62
5.4	Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, flash-crowd . . . . .	63

# Abstract

Recent increases in the volume and scope of computable tasks drive increases in the utilization of distributed systems, specifically cluster computing. Increases to efficient resource utilization (ERU) and quality of service (QoS) are essential to ensuring cluster computing can reliably and cost-effectively handle these new types of resource-intensive computing tasks. One predominant method for improving ERU and QoS is auto-scaling, which allocates applications running on a cluster exactly the resources they need. Kubernetes, a new open-source cluster manager from Google, successfully implements reactive horizontal auto-scaling, meaning Kubernetes uses the current resource utilization of the application to determine how to replicate applications across the cluster to ensure each application operates at a previously specified resource utilization. We implement predictive auto-scaling in Kubernetes, as we use predictions about the future state of the cluster to replicate applications. While we find the addition of predictive auto-scaling does not universally improve the summation of ERU and QoS in representative trials, we highlight certain scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling is particularly beneficial. In short, this thesis presents users of Kubernetes, and cluster managers in general, an additional option for efficiently and reliably running their application. In doing so, we expand the realm of issues addressable through computing with distributed systems.

# Acknowledgments

Most importantly, thank you to my advisor, Jeannie Albrecht, for her wisdom and enthusiasm both during this thesis and my entire time doing computer science Williams. Thank you to my second reader, Brendan Burns, for his advice and assistance. Without Professor Albrecht and Brendan, this thesis would not have been possible. Additionally, thank you to Andrew Udell for his assistance creating visualizations and for the entire Kubernetes community for their assistance answering questions. Without all these people, this thesis would not have been possible.

Thank you to my parents, David and Janice, my brother Christopher, and my twin sister Kathryn for their love and support. Finally, thank you to my girlfriend Sarah and my friends for their encouragement.

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Over the past few decades, an explosion in the need for computing resources, and the existence of inexpensive, interconnected computers, has driven a significant increase in the feasibility and benefits of distributed systems [45]. Before progressing to a discussion of this thesis’ specific contributions to the field of distributed systems, we present a broad overview of the field. We then conduct analysis of greater and greater focus, until finally discussing the benefits and impacts of predictive auto-scaling in Google’s Kuberentes container cluster manager.

First, we consider the origin of distributed systems as a field of computer science. Before the availability of cheap, powerful microprocessors and reliable, efficient local-area networks (LANs), computational tasks could only be performed on a singular computer [45]. If a task was too computationally expensive for a commodity PC, the only solution was to run it on a larger, more powerful supercomputer. However, as cheap microprocessors increased the availability of affordable computers, and LANs fostered quick inter-computer communication, a new model of performing resource intensive computation arose. In this distributed systems model, a collection of individual computers function as a single mass of computing resources to solve a given computational task [45].

Second, we consider the ever-growing interest in unlocking and implementing the benefits of distributed systems. A number of forces drove, and continue to drive, increased interest in distributed systems over the past decade. The first, and most obvious, factor is the Internet and its substantial impact on the role of computers in everyday life. As more people connected to the Internet, through computers, mobile phones, and tablets, an increasing number of interactions became computerized. Consumption, communication, research, and more all became possible on the Internet. Subsequently, large amounts of computing resources were needed to store the data, and perform the computational tasks, related to these interactions. Closely coupled with this trend is the rise of “Big Data”. In 2013, the digital universe contained 4.4 zettabytes of data [35].<sup>1</sup> Without multiple computers working together it would be impossible to store and process this incredible volume of data.

Today, it is nearly impossible to do anything in modern society without interacting with a distributed system and creating new digital data. Driving a car, trading a stock, visiting a doctor, checking an email, and even playing a simple video game, are all activities that distributed systems

---

<sup>1</sup>A zettabyte equals  $10^{21}$  bytes, which equals 1 billion terabytes.



facilitate and improve [36]. As life becomes more computerized, and as the volume of data humans generate and hope to process grows, distributed systems will only increase in importance. Furthermore, research into distributed systems makes it possible to continue to unlock, and make available to the general public, the incredible power of networked, cooperating computers. As the distributed systems supplying massive computational power become more accessible, because of decreased cost, increased ease of use and improved reliability, we can computationally address an ever-increasing number of challenging, important problems.

There are a number of different models for computing tasks requiring high levels of computing resources, including supercomputing, cluster computing, and grid computing. In this thesis, we focus on cluster computing. Cluster computing groups together similar commodity PCs on the same LAN to offer a singular mass of computing resources. Specifically, we focus on the cluster manager, an integral component of cluster computing. Cluster managers abstract all of the management details of the distinct nodes in the cluster, and instead present a single collection of computing resources on which the user can run jobs or applications. More succinctly, a cluster manager “admits, schedules, starts, restarts, and monitors the full range of applications” on the cluster [48]. Overall, a cluster manager can be thought of like an operating system for a cluster of networked computers. There are a variety of different cluster managers, the most important of which will be discussed in the next chapter, each pursuing different objectives. This thesis will ultimately focus on Kubernetes, an open-source cluster manager from Google [25].

Cluster managers seek to accomplish a number of different goals, and as a result, multiple metrics measure success. For example, Microsoft’s Autopilot is predominantly concerned with application up-time, and thus measures success with respect to reliability and downtime [39]. Alternatively, a number of cluster managers measure themselves based on efficient resource utilization (ERU) [48]. Essentially, efficient resource utilization relates to the percent of cluster resources which are actually being used by applications to perform computation/store data. One such measurement of this metric, cluster compaction, examines how many machines could be removed from the cluster, while still comfortably running the cluster’s current application load [47]. This metric is particularly important, because the more efficient the cluster manager is at utilizing resources, the less the cluster costs, and the more accessible cluster computing becomes to the general public. A final important cluster management metric is quality of service (QoS). Quality of service measures the ability of an application to function at a specified performance level, despite ever-changing external factors.<sup>2</sup> Again, this metric is particularly important because increasing the robustness of applications run on cluster managers means these applications can be trusted with increasingly important tasks. Attempts to maximize efficient resource utilization and quality of service often lead to the cluster manager implementing auto-scaling, a behavior we will examine in great depth throughout this thesis. Cluster managers predominantly differ with respect to which metrics they optimize for, and the process by which this optimization occurs.

---

<sup>2</sup>In many instances, the most prominent varying external factor is changes in the load on the application. For example, for an application serving a website, changes in the number of people requesting web pages from the website would vary the application load.

## 1.1 Goals

This thesis is most concerned with maximizing the efficient resource utilization (ERU) and quality of service (QoS) metrics with respect to the Kubernetes cluster manager. As such, this thesis pursues three goals:

1. Given an application running on a Kubernetes cluster, we seek to determine a method which ensures quality of service stays consistently high regardless of variation in certain external factors. While it is difficult to make guarantees regarding quality of service, because application performance is dependent on a number of uncontrollable external variables, it is possible to ensure each application has, and is utilizing, the resources it needs to function efficiently.
2. A simplistic solution to the first goal of ensuring a high application quality of service is to just give each application many more resources than it will ever request. Yet, this over-provisioning is inefficient and costly, since the application is preventing other applications from using resources, but is not actually using them itself. Thus, our methods for ensuring a high quality of service must also ensure the maintenance, or improvement, of the efficient resource utilization metric. As such, we add an additional goal: given a certain number of applications running on a Kubernetes cluster, we seek to determine a method which ensures Kubernetes allocates resources as efficiently as possible, while still comfortably supporting the applications' current and future resource needs and ensuring a high quality of service.
3. Given that Kubernetes is an open-source project, we seek to implement, test, and evaluate a proposed enactment of the previous two goals. The methods we pursue will in part be dictated by the current structure and implementation of Kubernetes. The eventual goal is for this thesis' improvements to be merged into the production version of Kubernetes, and present another resource allocation method to Kubernetes users which should be particularly beneficial in situations discussed later.

## 1.2 Contributions

This thesis presents our contributions to Kubernetes. Kubernetes seeks to ensure high application quality of service and efficient resource utilization, and our contributions look to further its ability to accomplish these goals. As such, we present not only new methodology, but also new, working implementations with an accompanying evaluation.<sup>3</sup> Through constructing and utilizing an evaluation framework, we comment on when predictive auto-scaling is the correct choice and when it is not. Finally, we discuss the experiences of making these modifications to Kubernetes, as well as avenues for future improvements with respect to Kubernetes and cluster managers in general.

---

<sup>3</sup>Like our modifications of Kubernetes, our evaluation infrastructure is entirely open-source. Instructions for accessing said code can be found in Chapter 7.

## 1.3 Contents

The remainder of this thesis begins with an exploration of this problem’s background, as we explore resource intensive computing paradigms, cluster managers, auto-scaling, and Kubernetes in Chapter 2. We progress to a general overview of the architecture underlying Kubernetes in Chapter 3, with a specific focus on the current implementation of reactive auto-scaling, and our proposed future addition of predictive auto-scaling. We then discuss our implementation of predictive auto-scaling in Kubernetes in Chapter 4. With our implementation established, we perform an evaluation of our changes in Chapter 5. Finally, we comment on future avenues of exploration and summarize the contributions of this thesis in Chapter 6.

## Chapter 2

# Background

### 2.1 Resource Intensive Computing Paradigms

As was briefly mentioned in the introduction, a number of different paradigms exist for undertaking computing tasks too resource intensive for a single commodity computer. An overview of these paradigms is given below:

1. Supercomputing: The supercomputing model responds to increased demands for computing resources by increasing the technical specifications of the computer far beyond the range of the traditional commodity PC. While supercomputers are able to avoid the majority of the complications resulting from the introduction of networks, most prominently reliability and security, there are naturally limits on the power of supercomputers. Importantly, supercomputers often use specialized hardware which is extremely expensive, and thus their computing power is not available to the general public. Furthermore, it is difficult to scale a supercomputer should the need arise. Finally, supercomputers offer a single point of failure, meaning they are not particularly robust to error [33]. These limitations have decreased the usage of supercomputers to provide the mass of computing power needed in the “Big Data” era.
2. Cluster Computing: Cluster computing is defined as utilizing “a collection of similar workstations of PCs, loosely connected by means of a high-speed local-area network [where] each node runs the same operating system.” [45] Cluster computing can provide a mass of computing power similar to that contained in a supercomputer. Cluster computing also offers many advantages over the single supercomputer. First, and perhaps most importantly, clusters of commodity computers are more cost-efficient, and thus considerably more accessible. Second, clusters are easily scaled by simply adding new commodity PCs. Finally, cluster computing has the potential to provide greater fault tolerance, as a single failing node will simply be removed from the cluster [37]. Cluster computing is used in the implementation of what is colloquially referred to as Cloud computing, in which large amounts of computing resources are offered for rent on a per-usage basis [36]. Cloud computing, as implemented by Amazon Web Services [2], Microsoft Azure [28], and Google Compute Engine [8], continues to revolu-

tionize the development and deployment of computing applications, as developers gain access to cheap, easily accessible, quickly scalable, fault-tolerant computing power.

3. Grid Computing: Grid computing is similar in concept to cluster computing, except it foregoes the requirement that all computers within the grid be relatively homogeneous. As such, the grid computing model accounts for a large degree of heterogeneity with respect to network membership, operating system, hardware, and more [45]. One popular example of a grid computing implementation is TeraGrid, a high-performance system containing multiple computers connected by an optical network, and used for specific scientific tasks [34]. While grid computing systems' lack of homogeneity increases flexibility, the resulting heterogeneity introduces significant complexity. Importantly, the distinction between grid and cluster computing is fuzzy and predominantly based on the uses of the system. Most grid implementations are used for very specific scientific computing tasks, as seen with TeraGrid, while clusters are traditionally more about offering general computational power.

Ultimately, because of simplicity, cost, and scalability, cluster computing is becoming the most prominent resource-intensive computing paradigm. Thus, cluster computing, and the accompanying cluster manager, is the focus of this thesis.

## 2.2 Cluster Management Paradigms

As was briefly mentioned in the introduction, cluster managers are responsible for admitting, scheduling, running, maintaining, and monitoring all applications and jobs a user wishes to run on the cluster.<sup>1</sup> Overall, cluster managers can be thought of as the operating system for the cluster. Naturally, cluster managers are extremely diverse, both in the types of applications and jobs they are best suited to running, and the method in which they seek to execute their duties. At the most basic level, there are two types of workload that may be submitted to a cluster manager: production and batch. Production tasks are long-running with strict performance requirements and heightened penalties for downtime. Batch tasks are more flexible in their ability to handle short-term performance variance. In the context of a large company like Google, a production task would be serving a large website like Gmail or Google Search, which must be continuously accessible with low-latency and little downtime; a batch task would be analyzing advertising analytics data with MapReduce, which can fail or slow without significant external costs [48]. The type of tasks a cluster management system predominantly seeks to run dictates many of the cluster manager's implementation details.

One varying factor in a cluster manager's implementation is the process by which the cluster manager schedules jobs.<sup>2</sup> There exist three predominant methods of scheduling: monolithic, two-level, and shared state. With monolithic scheduling, a single algorithm is responsible for taking the resource requests of all jobs and assigning them to the proper machine. With two-level scheduling, the cluster manager simply offers resources, which can then be accepted or rejected by the distributed

---

<sup>1</sup>Application, job, and task are largely interchangeable names for computing work performed on the cluster.

<sup>2</sup>Just like scheduling jobs on an operating system, scheduling jobs on a cluster equates to assigning jobs to resources on a machine in the cluster.

computing frameworks.<sup>3</sup> Finally, with shared state scheduling, multiple different algorithms concurrently work to schedule jobs on the cluster [44]. Naturally, all of these methods have positives and negatives. While monolithic scheduling is initially simple to implement if the jobs being scheduled are homogeneous, a single-threaded monolithic scheduler does not allow nuanced processing of diverse jobs based on varying heuristics and guidelines. Attempts to support this nuance can create an incredibly complicated algorithm that is difficult to extend [44]. While two-level scheduling is lightweight, simple, and offers advantages with respect to data locality, it is not effective for long-running, production jobs [44]. Finally, while shared state scheduling removes the scheduler as both a computational and complexity bottleneck, it must take steps to guarantee global properties of the cluster and address the typical challenges of concurrent programs [44]. The chosen scheduling method influences the type of applications and distributed computing frameworks runnable on the cluster manager and the efficiency with which these applications and frameworks run.

A final distinction is the licensing and availability of the cluster manager’s code. Because cluster managers are necessary only in the presence of vast amounts of data and computation, predominantly large corporations develop and utilize cluster managers. Often these cluster managers are kept within the confines of the corporation, or only explained by a brief paper or conference talk, with little source code available. In more unique cases, the company will open-source the source code, allowing anyone to view, modify, and run the cluster manager. Such open-sourcing presents a unique opportunity for researchers wishing to experiment with cluster managers, but lacking the resources to create their own from scratch. In rarer instances, a fully-developed cluster manager will originate from academic research. In unique scenarios, a large corporation will adopt a cluster manager originating in academia and the entire code base will be open-sourced. The availability of source code directly impacts the feasibility of pursuing experiments with already existing cluster management systems.

Naturally, cluster managers can vary in multiple additional ways. However, the previous three differences, highlighted in Table 2.1, recognize the most important distinctions in the context of this thesis. Given this understanding, we can now begin to examine specific cluster management implementations and justify our choice of Kubernetes as the cluster manager on which we will ask and answer our research questions.

### 2.2.1 Borg

While just recently described to the public in a 2015 paper, the Borg cluster manager from Google has been in production use for over a decade [48]. Borg incorporates many different objectives, seeking to abstract resource management and error handling, maintain high availability, and efficiently utilize resources on the cluster. It is responsible for managing the hundreds of thousands of batch and production jobs run everyday at Google. Borg utilizes a monolithic scheduler, as jobs specify the resources they need, and a single Borg scheduler decides how to admit and schedule said jobs. Finally, Borg is not open-source. In fact, it was not even publicly announced or described until 2015, despite running at Google for over a decade. However, Kubernetes, Google’s open-source cluster manager and the focus of this thesis, incorporates many of the lesson’s learned from Borg.

---

<sup>3</sup>Distributed computing frameworks are frameworks built to function over multiple machines. Some popular examples include Apache Hadoop, Apache Spark, etc. [38]

Table 2.1: Overview of Cluster Management Paradigms.

	Job Type	Scheduling Model	Open Source
<b>Borg</b> [48]	Both	Monolithic	No
<b>Omega</b> [44]	Both	Shared state	No
<b>Mesos</b> [38]	Batch	Two-level	Yes
<b>YARN</b> [46]	Batch	Monolithic	Yes
<b>Kubernetes</b> [25]	Production	Monolithic (per namespace)	Yes

### 2.2.2 Omega

Also originating at Google, Omega is a cluster manager seen as an extension of Borg [44]. While retaining the mission and goals of Borg, Omega differs in implementation. Specifically, it considers a new method of assigning jobs the resources they need on the cluster by implementing shared state, instead of monolithic, scheduling. As previously mentioned, shared state scheduling allows multiple scheduling algorithms to work in parallel to assign tasks to the resources they request. Research on Omega shows this parallel scheduling implementation both eases the complexity of adding new scheduling behaviors and offers competitive scaling performance. Additionally, in Omega, all schedulers are aware of the entire state of the cluster, meaning that a job’s resource allocation can be varied after the job begins to execute. This flexibility offers significant performance improvements. Like Borg, Omega is not open-source. However, like Borg, much of the work done on Omega is incorporated into Kubernetes.

### 2.2.3 Mesos

Lest we think all cluster managers originate at Google, we now examine Apache Mesos, a cluster manager originating at University of California, Berkeley [38]. Mesos is considerably more lightweight than either Borg or Omega. We can think of Mesos as functioning like the kernel of an operating system (i.e, the Linux kernel) while a system like Borg is like an entire Linux distribution (i.e, Red Hat, Ubuntu, etc.) It does not seek to monitor the health of jobs or provide user-interfaces for viewing the current state of a job, leaving those tasks to the distributed computing framework. Additionally, Mesos predominantly focuses on quick-running, high-volume batch jobs, and is not particularly suited to long-running, high-availability production jobs. In part, Mesos’ job scheduling implementation dictates the singularity of the job types Mesos efficiently processes. Mesos utilizes two-level scheduling, in which the cluster management system simply offers, not assigns, available resources to the distributed computing framework. Predominantly, this decision is made to ensure data locality.<sup>4</sup> Finally, Mesos is interesting in that it is entirely open-source.

---

<sup>4</sup>Data locality is a measure of if a computational task has the necessary input data on its machine, or if it must make a costly request across the network for the data. Mesos works to ensure data locality by allowing multiple frameworks to function on the same machines, and thus share data. Also, it allows frameworks to control their own resource allocations, such that they can work to ensure data locality. If running a large number of data processing tasks with extremely high volumes of data, data locality can be essential to efficient cluster operation.

### 2.2.4 YARN

We now briefly discuss Apache YARN. YARN, an acronym for Yet Another Resource Negotiator, is a cluster manager initially built for use with Apache Hadoop [46]. However, it is now possible to use YARN with a variety of distributed computing frameworks. Unsurprisingly given YARN's initial use case, YARN is predominantly used for running batch jobs.<sup>5</sup> Like Mesos, YARN aims to support data-locality, again a predominant advantage for batch processing. YARN schedules resources by allowing distributed computing framework application masters to request resources from a single resource master. The application master can then assign these resources to specific tasks at its leisure. As a single resource master is assigning all of these resources, YARN is a monolithic scheduler. Similar to Mesos, YARN is both entirely open-source and in use at major corporations like Yahoo.

### 2.2.5 Kubernetes

Finally, we arrive at the cluster manager that is the focus of this thesis: Kubernetes. Kubernetes also originates at Google, although unlike Borg and Omega, it is open-source. Kubernetes is also the most recent of the cluster managers we consider in this chapter.<sup>6</sup> The recent explosion in popularity of containerization<sup>7</sup> heavily impacts the development and implementation of Kubernetes. Additionally, Kubernetes is seen as part of a new paradigm of developing applications through the use of microservices.<sup>8</sup> Kubernetes predominantly focuses on effectively running service jobs, which require high-availability and potentially varying amounts of resources. Additionally, Kubernetes currently allows one scheduler per namespace, making it somewhat of a combination of the monolithic and shared-state schedulers. Finally, Kubernetes is an open-source project, yet is also used in production at Google, and available to the public through the Google Container Engine [9].

We choose Kubernetes as the cluster manager on which to conduct our experiments for a number of reasons. First, unlike many of the aforementioned cluster managers, Kubernetes focuses on service jobs. Service jobs have particularly stringent requirements for availability and are also the most likely to have varying resource needs. Both of these conditions are closely linked with the previously stated goals of this thesis, and Kubernetes is the cluster manager that stands to benefit the most if we achieve our goals. Additionally, Kubernetes is the only open-source cluster manager focusing on long-running services. Working with an open-source cluster manager allows us to benefit from the previous work of others, as well as expand the potential impacts of any successful work.

---

<sup>5</sup>At the time of the publication, YARN was just beginning to be used for production jobs; however, its main focus from creation has been batch processing.

<sup>6</sup>Kubernetes became public in the summer of 2014.

<sup>7</sup>We discuss both the motivations and technology behind containerization in Section 3.2.1. Briefly, containerization is packing everything an application needs to run into a single *container* and then running that container on any desired computer.

<sup>8</sup>Again, we discuss microservices in greater detail in Section 3.2.2. Essentially, microservices are the division of applications into small, easily scalable services which communicate with each other across the network.



## 2.3 Auto-scaling Paradigms

We now consider a subset of cluster management closely related to this thesis’ goal of ensuring efficient resource utilization and quality of service. Specifically, we introduce auto-scaling, a method of ensuring each application has the necessary amount of computational resources to handle varying external demands.

To better understand both the implementation and benefits of auto-scaling, let us consider a simple scenario. Imagine you have an application running on a cluster for a week. On Monday, it needs  $x$  resources.<sup>9</sup> On Tuesday through Thursday, the application needs  $2x$  resources. Finally, on Friday the application again needs  $x$  resources. Without auto-scaling, we are forced to assign a constant amount of resources to the application running on our cluster. However, there is no constant amount of resources that can meet the two goals of efficiently utilizing the cluster’s resources and ensuring the application has the resources needed for maintaining a high-level of service. Specifically, if we assign the application  $x$  resources, then on Tuesday through Thursday the application does not have the amount of resources it needs to handle its load, and quality of service will deteriorate. Alternatively, if we assign the application  $2x$  resources on the cluster, then on Monday and Friday we essentially are wasting  $x$  resources on the cluster, as they are assigned to an application that does not need them. Such waste indicates inefficient resource utilization. If we desire to run additional jobs on the cluster, we must allocate more resources, even though our statically over-provisioned application has plenty of resources it is not using. The difficulties static resource provisioning suggests can be seen in Figure 2.1 and Figure 2.2.<sup>10</sup>




Figure 2.1: An Over Provisioned Application showing poor ERU.

We use auto-scaling to address the inability of statically allocated resources to efficiently handle all the variances in application load. Auto-scaling allows us to assign an application more or less resources based on the status of the cluster. In our previous example, perfect auto-scaling would allow us to assign the cluster  $x$  resources on Monday and Friday and  $2x$  resources on Tuesday through

<sup>9</sup>By *resources*, we mean allocatable units of CPU, memory, etc.

<sup>10</sup>The graphs showing the benefits of auto-scaling are inspired by the informative graphs showing the benefits of auto-scaling in the Amazon EC2 auto-scaling documentation [1].




Figure 2.2: An Average Provisioned Application showing poor QoS.

Thursday. Through auto-scaling, we accomplish both goals: our application has the needed resources for a high quality of service and our cluster is efficiently utilizing resources by only allocating the application what it needs. If we desire to run more jobs on our cluster, they can “fill-in” the resources our application relinquishes when it auto-scales, preventing us from having to purchase more computing power that will just be wasted at certain times. Overall, auto-scaling can make applications on a cluster more performant and the cluster more cost-effective, as can be seen Figure 2.3.




Figure 2.3: A Auto-scaled Application showing good ERU and QoS.

Given an understanding of the importance of auto-scaling, we now begin to examine the differing implementations of auto-scaling. Auto-scaling implementations differ in how the cluster manager assigns an application the new resources it needs<sup>11</sup> and how the cluster manager makes its auto-scaling decisions. Given these two points of variation, there are two predominant characteristics that shape the nature of an auto-scaling implementation. The first is if the auto-scaling is horizontal or

<sup>11</sup>Auto-scaling implementations can also take away resources from an application running on a cluster.

vertical. The second is if the auto-scaling is reactive or predictive.

1. Horizontal vs. Vertical: We begin by examining the difference between horizontal and vertical scaling. To start, assume there is an application assigned  $x$  resources by the cluster manager. The application faces external load such that it needs  $2x$  resources to operate with an acceptable quality of service. There are now two options. In *vertical* auto-scaling, the cluster manager will attempt to assign the application the needed  $2x$  resources without halting the execution of the application. In *horizontal* auto-scaling, the cluster manager will create another instance of the application, so that there are two machines each with  $x$  resources ( $2x$  resources in summation). The load will be split between the two new instances of the application, meaning each machine handles half the requests and requires only the  $x$  resources it has [41]. While both of these variations of auto-scaling accomplish the same goal, horizontal auto-scaling is a little simpler to implement and execute. Given we know how to create an instance of a virtual machine running the application, an entirely safe assumption considering we already created one such instance, in many cases it is fairly trivial to create another instance, and then split the load between these two instances using standard methods of load balancing.<sup>12</sup> Historically, vertical auto-scaling has been more complex, although that is rapidly changing. The complexity of vertical auto-scaling depends on how the application is run. If the application is run directly on a fully utilized machine, then it is extremely difficult to assign the application more resources without stopping it from running, as assigning more resources would require transferring a running process to a new machine with more abundant resources.<sup>13</sup> The complexity slightly decreases, although is still considerable, when the application is running on a virtual machine. Virtual machines can claim or relinquish resources from their host, thus allowing the application the varying resources it needs. KVM, the hypervisor within the Linux kernel, implements this process through “balloon” drivers [5]. Finally, if the application is running within a container, performing vertical scaling is simple. Linux container implementations allocate resources using cgroups, which assign set amounts of resources to certain processes. It is possible to modify the cgroup allocation while the process is still running, meaning vertical auto-scaling without stopping the application is trivial [42]. As containerization becomes increasingly prevalent, the difference in difficulty between horizontal and vertical auto-scaling decreases. The implementations of auto-scaling we examine focuses on horizontal auto-scaling, although the majority of research done for this thesis applies to vertical auto-scaling with only minor modifications [41].
2. Reactive vs. Predictive: We continue by examining the distinction between reactive and predictive auto-scaling. At the simplest level, reactive auto-scaling reacts to the current state of the application and cluster, while predictive auto-scaling reacts to a prediction of the future state of the application and cluster [41]. While reactive auto-scaling must only consider one

<sup>12</sup>Claiming simplicity assumes the application is written such that it can be replicated with no unexpected modifications on operation. For example, a static web server is trivial to horizontally auto-scale, while a relational database is not.

<sup>13</sup>In reality, it would be extremely rare for a cluster manager to run applications directly on the nodes of the cluster with no degree of isolation.

Table 2.2: Overview of Auto-scaling Paradigms.

	<b>Reactive vs Predictive</b>	<b>Implementer</b>
<b>Threshold</b>	Reactive	Amazon Web Services [4]
<b>Time-Series Analysis</b>	Predictive	Netflix [40]
<b>Control-Theory</b>	Both (currently reactive)	Kubernetes [16]

time-frame when gathering and interpreting information, predictive auto-scaling must consider many different time-frames with respect to the most accurate method of projecting past metrics into future metrics. However, predictive auto-scaling has the advantages both of historical insight and allowing the cluster manager to decrease the time-costs of certain actions by performing them before a reactive cluster manager would suggest.<sup>14</sup> Finally, techniques for auto-scaling can be both reactive and predictive as they incorporate both current and projected cluster and application metrics to make auto-scaling decisions.

A number of the major providers of cloud computing resources offer auto-scaling, as can be seen in Table 2.2. The most prominent of these providers is Amazon, which supports threshold-based horizontal auto-scaling on EC2 virtual machine instances [4]. Furthermore, Netflix implements time-series analysis auto-scaling to help it respond to the varying demand placed on its services throughout the day [40]. Finally, Kubernetes implements control-theory auto-scaling [16]. We will examine threshold, time-series analysis, and control-theory auto-scaling in detail in the remainder of this chapter.

### 2.3.1 Threshold-based Rule Policies

The simplest method of auto-scaling is threshold-based rule policies. Threshold-based rule policies are reactive, as they perform scaling behaviors if the current state of the application and host machine is not in accordance with predefined rules. The rules predominantly relate to per machine resource utilization levels. For example, a rule could be that if the average CPU utilization percent for all of the machines is above 80%, then a new machine should be created. This rule would be accompanied with an additional scale-down rule stating that if the average CPU utilization percentage for all of the machines is below 20%, then a machine should be deleted. The most popular implementation of threshold-based rule policies for auto-scaling comes from Amazon Web Services [4].<sup>15</sup>

Threshold-based rule policies offer both advantages and disadvantages with respect to auto-scaling. Predominantly, these advantages and disadvantages arise from threshold-based rule policies' conceptual simplicity. Because threshold-based rule policies are reactive and based on simple metrics like CPU utilization percentage and memory usage, they are simple to write. However, they are

<sup>14</sup>We will spend considerable time later on this concept. Basically, predictive auto-scaling makes it easier to account for the amount of time necessary to create the replicas used in horizontal auto-scaling (i.e. creating a new virtual machine instance running the application). If we know we need a machine in the future, we can start creating it before it is needed, so it is ready by the time it is needed. With reactive auto-scaling, we do not know we need the replication until the current state of the application and cluster indicates it. Thus, we must wait for the application to be created and ready to run, while the application continues to operate with sub-optimal resources.

<sup>15</sup>More specifically, Amazon Web Services uses threshold-based rule policies for auto-scaling with respect to EC2 instances. EC2 instances are essentially rentable cloud virtual machines [1].

difficult to write well, as it is difficult to predict how certain rules will respond to the varying external circumstances. One particular difficulty arises with respect to handling the nebulous time between when the threshold is crossed and auto-scaling triggers the creation of a new application, and when the newly created application can start running and balancing the load.

Overall, there are a number of variables that must be considered when determining the impact of threshold-based rule policies, reinforcing that while it is easy to conceive of a threshold-based rule for auto-scaling, it can be difficult to write a threshold-based rule having the desired effect if an application will face varying external metrics.

### 2.3.2 Time-series Analysis

We now examine an additional, substantially more complex, form of auto-scaling situated upon predictive time-series analysis. Time-series analysis seeks to find a repeating pattern in application load, and then horizontally auto-scale the application based on these patterns [41]. For example, if time-series analysis indicated that a pattern in the application needed  $2x$  resources every Friday at 5pm, it would be possible to auto-scale the application to  $2x$  resources at this time. If we are able to compose a number of these observations, we can create a policy for the entire auto-scaling behavior of the given application by evaluating the application's predicted external environment and determining the resources the application will need to operate in said environment.

There are a variety of techniques for conducting time-series analysis auto-scaling including pattern matching, signal processing, and auto-correlation [41].<sup>16</sup> Like threshold-based rules for auto-scaling, there are significant advantages and disadvantages to time-series analysis. Unlike threshold-based rules which are marked by simplicity, time-series analysis is significantly more complex. This complexity allows time-series analysis to be particularly fine-grained and effective at responding to external changes when said changes have a pattern.<sup>17</sup> However, time-series analysis requires a large amount of data and also substantial mathematical knowledge; it certainly cannot be implemented as easily as specifying a few simple thresholds. Additionally, while time-series analysis works well for auto-scaling with respect to patterns, it does not work well when the external application load is random, or incorporates elements of randomness. As such, predictive time-series analysis is often combined with reactive threshold-based rule auto-scaling to ensure the benefits of both are achieved.<sup>18</sup>

### 2.3.3 Control theory

Our next auto-scaling technique is predicated on control theory. Control theory is normally used for reactive auto-scaling, although it can also be used in a predictive context. The simplest implementation of a control system with respect to auto-scaling utilizes feedback controllers [41]. Abstractly, a feedback model functions by continuously examining a set of output parameters, and then tweaking a set of desired input parameters in an attempt to ensure the output parameters maintain some

<sup>16</sup>Netflix utilizes a combination of methods in their predictive time-series analysis auto-scaler, Scryer [49].

<sup>17</sup>An example of a change with a pattern would be Netflix users who are more likely to watch TV at 10pm than 10am.

<sup>18</sup>Netflix's Scryer implements this combination of time-series analysis and threshold-based rule auto-scaling [49].

desired state. More concretely with respect to auto-scaling, the output parameters would be the current state of the application instances, such as the percent CPU utilization or the amount of memory the instances were using. The input parameters would be the number of instances of the application currently running. This combination of input and output parameters will ensure that the application instances maintain certain operation metrics. For example, we could specify that the feedback controller should auto-scale applications such that all application instances utilize 70% of the CPU.

Done correctly, feedback control theory offers substantial advantages over threshold-based rules. Specifically, it is as simple to write auto-scaling specifications with control theory as it is to write specification with threshold-based policies: in both the author simply defines well-understood resource metrics. Yet, it is easier to determine the effects of feedback control systems. When a new instance is created as the result of the violation of a threshold-based rule, we do not exactly know what the result will be with respect to the metrics we care about. However, with a feedback control system, we are certain about the results of the auto-scaling, as we auto-scale specifically to ensure the maintenance of certain metrics.

Kubernetes currently implements auto-scaling through a feedback control system. More specifically, Kubernetes' auto-scaling utilizes a Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) controller, which is a conventional feedback controller design seen in a variety of mechanical and computational uses [12]. While we will spend substantially more time discussing the Kubernetes auto-scaling implementation later, the basics are as follows. The user specifies a target resource metric, for example CPU utilization. At a specified time interval, Kubernetes then examines the current values of the resource metric, and updates the number of application instances to ensure the current actual value equals the target value [16]. In the context of control theory, the output is the CPU utilization for each machine and the input is the number of application instances, which varies to ensure the output is at the proper level. Using this method, it is possible to auto-scale such that the application is always running with our chosen percent CPU utilization.

## Predictive Feedback Control

As previously mentioned, feedback control systems are typically reactive, meaning that the metrics used are based on the current state of the system. However, we can also consider a feedback control system that is predictive. We call this Model Predictive Control [41]. Again, we will spend significantly more time discussing predictive feedback control later. Put simply, it is an implementation of feedback control based auto-scaling, but the outputs are predictions about the future state of the application instance, instead of the current state of the application instance.

Adding prediction to feedback control offers significant benefits. The most significant benefit is accounting for the application's start up time when auto-scaling. With predictive feedback control, we can create instances of the application so they are ready as soon as they are needed. For example, if it takes 10 minutes for our application to be created and ready to operate, and we predict we will need the application at 4pm, we can begin building it at 3:50pm, so it is ready as soon as needed. If we were using reactive auto-scaling, we would not know we needed the application until 4pm, and

it would not be ready to run until 4:10 pm. Ultimately, we hypothesize that adding a predictive component to Kubernetes' current feedback control auto-scaling will allow us to auto-scale in a manner that improves the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service.

## 2.4 Summary

In summation, we discussed the variety of methods for performing resource intensive computational tasks, before focusing on cluster computing. We examined a variety of popular cluster managers, and investigated the distinguishing characteristics of Kubernetes, the cluster manager which is the focus of this thesis. Finally, we examined a variety of methods of auto-scaling applications running on cluster managers, and suggested a new auto-scaling method for Kubernetes entitled model predictive control. The remainder of this thesis seeks to show the effectiveness of model predictive control in modifying the current implementation of auto-scaling in Kubernetes, such that we will increase the summation of ERU and QoS.

## Chapter 3

# Architecture

### 3.1 Overview of Kubernetes

An in-depth understanding of the architecture of Kubernetes, particularly with respect to the potential implementations of auto-scaling, is vital before progressing into a closer examination of the addition of model predictive control, also known as predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling, in Kubernetes.

#### 3.1.1 History

Active development on Kubernetes began at Google in 2014, and since then, open-source developers have invested approximately 2 years of effort at the time of this thesis being written. However, as was mentioned in the background chapter, Kubernetes is not the first cluster manager developed at Google. Over a decade and a half of Google’s experience informs Kubernetes. In addition, Kubernetes incorporates communally agreed upon new innovations in cluster management [32].

It is important to remember that, in the realm of cluster managers, Kubernetes is still young. While Kubernetes development has been ongoing for the past two years, version 1.0 of Kubernetes was released July 21, 2015 [24]. Again, this recent release means that at the time of this thesis’ work, non-Google users have been running Kubernetes in production for less than a year. In contrast, Mesos and YARN, the other open-source cluster managers, have their origins in projects beginning approximately seven and ten years ago respectively. This history confers both advantages and disadvantages. Long running projects like Mesos and YARN have books, conferences, and multiple companies with business models situated upon the success of this open-source project. While Kubernetes enjoys some of these advantages, particularly related to Google’s sustained support, it does not have the history of some other open-source cluster managers.<sup>1</sup> However, Kubernetes originality means there is lots of exciting innovation left to come, particularly with respect to auto-scaling. Part of why working on Kubernetes during this thesis is so exciting is that it presents the opportunity to

---

<sup>1</sup>However, Kubernetes has a tremendous amount of momentum and particularly impressive engagement considering its limited history.



contribute to an already impressive project with considerable future potential.

### 3.1.2 Values

As with all large computer programs, a number of values inform the development of Kubernetes. The values most pertinent to this thesis are the following:

- Portability: As will be seen in the next section, Kubernetes can be run in a number of different environments. As a result, Kubernetes presents potential solutions to a number of different problems, and increasing Kubernetes performance, as this thesis attempts to do, will assist in this ability.
- Extensibility: Kubernetes is built to easily incorporate pluggable new changes which can be easily enabled or disabled. Understanding the importance of pluggability will motivate this thesis' suggested modifications to Kubernetes.
- Automatic: Kubernetes places an emphasis on important cluster management tasks occurring without necessary user involvement. For example, if an application crashes, Kubernetes will automatically restart it. This emphasis on automation means this thesis' work on auto-scaling should be particularly valuable, as it improves Kubernetes ability to accomplish one of its fundamental goals [32].

### 3.1.3 Running Kubernetes

Finally, it is important to consider the ways in which Kubernetes can be run. Kubernetes is a cluster manager, and as such can be run on any number of commodity computers. These computers can be provided in many different ways. Perhaps the simplest method is running Kubernetes on a single virtual machine on one's own commodity computer. This method simulates running a single-node cluster using Kubernetes as the cluster manager. Obviously this method does not facilitate running production applications. If one does wish to run production applications, the simplest method is using the Google Container Engine, which hosts Kubernetes for the user such that the user just has to submit applications to run. Alternatively, the user can host Kubernetes themselves on a number of platforms including Google Compute Engine, Microsoft Azure, Rackspace, and Amazon Web Services.<sup>2</sup> Kubernetes ability to run on a number of cloud providers allows the user to run Kubernetes with a cluster of the exact size needed for their applications. Overall, Kubernetes' flexibility assists the user in accomplishing a number of different aims [7].

## 3.2 Building Blocks of Kubernetes

As was mentioned in the general overview of Kubernetes, Kubernetes benefits not only from over a decade of experience of utilizing cluster managers at Google, but also from the distributed systems community's mass adoption of new technologies with low barriers to entry for new users. Kubernetes

---

<sup>2</sup>Amazon Web Services is ultimately what we used to host Kubernetes when performing our evaluations.

both benefits from this trend, and contributes to making the benefits of distributed systems more accessible. The most prominent, increasingly popular technologies/paradigms influencing Kubernetes are containerization and microservices. A basic understanding of both will assist in understanding the Kubernetes basic, and auto-scaling specific, design.

### 3.2.1 Containerization

Google often describes Kubernetes as “an open-source orchestration system for Docker containers” [25]. From this statement, it is clear that containers, and more specifically Docker containers, inform much of Kubernetes. To begin, it is important to understand the benefits of containers in comparison to other similar options, and also to understand the technological underpinnings of containerization and the resulting weaknesses.

First, containers are not virtual machines. Though both seek to silo different applications running on the same physical machine, the manner in which they seek to accomplish this task is very different. Virtual machines sit between the operating system and the hardware, ensuring complete separation between two virtual machines running on the same physical machine. While this strong separation ensures applications running on separate virtual machines cannot effect each other, placing a virtual machine monitor between the operating system and the hardware has efficiency costs. More specifically, virtual machines are substantially more memory intensive, and have a higher startup cost, than lightweight containers [45]. In contrast, containers should be thought of as “lightweight wrappers around a single Unix process” [42, pg. 15]. As such, containers require substantially less memory and can be started, destroyed, and restarted in a matter of seconds. However, these ephemeral benefits come at the cost of limited isolation between two containers running on the same physical host. While there are ways to increase container isolation, it is not possible to achieve the complete separation offered by virtual machines [42].

More formally, containers can be thought of as a single Unix process bundled with the operating system and application specific files needed to run said process. Containerizing a process involves saving a snapshot of the Linux operating system running the process. This snapshot can be given to any platform which can run the container, and the platform will then be able to simulate running the application on the operating system bundled in the container.

So far, Docker has been the leading containerization platform. While Docker is a young platform, which has only been in development for since 2013, it has seen tremendous popularity and adoption. Again, while the containerization technology upon which Docker is built was a part of Linux for over a decade, it was the Docker platform that made it truly accessible [42]. Kubernetes is one of many options for running multiple containers in a production environment.

### 3.2.2 Microservices

Additionally, Kubernetes fits within the recent interest in, and adoption of, microservices. Microservices is a new paradigm of developing computer applications. It is particularly suited towards developing large, complex applications requiring many computing resources, which are the same types of applications that are typically benefit from/require being run on a cluster.

In short, microservices are “small, autonomous services that work together.” [43, pg. 2] More specifically, microservices reflect the following characteristics:

- Focused: Each microservice should perform a single task. Furthermore, multiple microservices should be as loosely coupled as possible. Each microservice should present a single API for performing the single task, with which other microservices can communicate without understanding more nuanced implementation details. [43]
- Stateless: Individual instances of microservices should be stateless, in that a single instance can be deleted at any time without losing any state. This requirement often leads to application’s being containerized, and communicating with external, more permanent databases.
- Concurrent: Multiple instances of a microservice should be able to work together to divide up the work presented to a single abstraction API. For example, if there is a microservice to support a search API, then it should be possible to run multiple instances of this search microservice and balance API requests between them so that they concurrently share work without interference.

Microservice design principles are particularly supportive of horizontal auto-scaling. Microservices should be easily replicable and easily replaceable. In other words, because microservices are stateless and can be run concurrently, it is possible to easily scale up a microservice by replicating it and then dividing the work between the replicas. Auto-scaling down is supported as well, as it is possible to delete an instance of the microservice without worrying about losing any important state. When the design principles of microservices are followed, horizontal auto-scaling is possible, and its implementation supports Kubernetes goal of easy automation. Additionally, applications that follow microservice design principles are particularly easy to containerize and run on Kubernetes.

As will become evident in the following sections, Kubernetes is designed to easily run applications developed based on the microservices model.

### 3.2.3 Summary

Again, it is important to remember that containerization, microservices, and cluster management are not entirely new innovations. Yet, what is unique and important is these advancements intended audience. While development to expand the technical merits of containerization, microservices, and cluster management continues, equally important, and more novel, work is being done to increase educational resources and promote accessibility. Kubernetes core value of automation, and this thesis specific goal of improving the performance of auto-scaling, coincides with this goal of accessibility, as it reduces the scope of concern for a new user of these technologies and allows them to focus on their application.

## 3.3 Components of Kubernetes

Introducing the Kubernetes specific vocabulary used through the cluster manager will make the following discussions of auto-scaling easier. In addition to describing each component of Kubernetes

in general, Figure 3.1 presents an overview of the interaction between the different building blocks which compose Kubernetes. Figure 3.1 also gives a sense of the lifecycle of an external request to an application running on Kubernetes.




Figure 3.1: A visualization of Kubernetes

### 3.3.1 Pods

The pod is the smallest deployable unit that Kubernetes can create and manage. A pod can contain one or more containerized applications. Multiple applications should run on the same pod if these applications need to be run in the same physical machine; otherwise, the applications should be in separate pods. Containerized applications within a pod can see each other's processes, access the same IP network, and share the same host name. Like well-designed containers within the microservices model, well-designed containers and pods should be focused, stateless, and concurrent, as Kubernetes assumes that pods can be deleted, created, and replicated at will. The user can either submit a single pod to Kubernetes to schedule and run on a node in the cluster, or multiple replica pods can be created by a replication controller [21].

### 3.3.2 Replication Controllers

As mentioned in the previous section, pods can be created by a replication controller. A replication controller is responsible for ensuring that a given number of replica pods are constantly running. It does this by restarting any deleted or terminated pods. Though the replication controller performs a seemingly simple task, it is useful for scaling the number of pods and performing a rolling update

of the pod [22].

Additionally, auto-scaling is closely associated with replication controllers, as auto-scalers are attached to replication controllers for pods. In short, the auto-scaler tells the replication controller how many pods should exist, and the replication controller ensures that number of pods exist and are operating successfully. This relationship will be discussed in considerably more detail later when examining the architecture and implementation of auto-scaling in Kubernetes [16].

### 3.3.3 Services

The final main architectural building block of Kubernetes is the service. Services are necessary because pods are ephemeral. As a pod may be deleted or replaced at any time, it is important that no entity is trying to communicate with a specific pod, because that pod may disappear. Instead, entities wishing to communicate with a pod always establish contact with a consistent *service*. A service presents a single, long-running access point for multiple replica pods, as the service receives external requests to the pods, and load-balances these requests across the replicas.<sup>3</sup> This endpoint is used within a Kubernetes cluster as pods wish to communicate with each other and it can also be exposed outside of the cluster. Again, the concept of a service is particularly important to auto-scaling, as when the replication controller creates pod replicas, the services ensures work is balanced across them. This load-balancing, and the knowledge of the new replicas on which to share the load, is entirely automated [23].

## 3.4 Autoscaling in Kubernetes

### 3.4.1 Current Implementation

Currently Kubernetes implements horizontal pod auto-scaling. As this title suggests, auto-scaling in Kubernetes involves creating and deleting replica pods for a specific replication controller such that the replicas handling the requests load-balanced by a service operate within a specified resource range. A visual representation of this process can be seen in Figure 3.2.

Kubernetes implementation of auto-scaling is referred to as horizontal because auto-scaling occurs by creating replicas of each pod and then dividing the work among these replicas, as opposed to expanding the resources of any single pod. While not yet implemented, Kubernetes reliance upon containers means vertical auto-scaling is a possibility in the near future, as there are a variety of methods for increasing the resources available to a container without stopping execution [42].

As was distinguished in the background section, Kubernetes currently implements reactive feed-back control auto-scaling, which is when auto-scaling occurs to ensure the preservation of a certain state. In Kubernetes, the auto-scaler operates as a control loop, as it queries pods at a set interval to determine their current resource utilization, and performs auto-scaling actions to preserve our desired level of per replica pod resource utilization. At the start of this thesis, the only resource on which it is possible to determine auto-scaling behavior is CPU utilization percentage, although since

---

<sup>3</sup>The replication of these pods is handled by a replication controller.




Figure 3.2: A visualization of Kubernetes with autoscaler

then Kubernetes has added support for auto-scaling based on custom metrics such as memory usage. Nonetheless, we focus on auto-scaling based on percentage CPU utilization throughout this thesis. Thus, based on the average CPU utilization percentage, the auto-scaler will create or delete replica pods to ensure average CPU utilization percentage is within the target range the user specified when creating the auto-scaler. The algorithm for determining the correct number of replicas will be discussed in detail in the next section. Finally, in order to ensure auto-scaling is not attempted too frequently, once a scale up or scale down happens, no more auto-scaling will occur for a constant threshold interval. As of the implementation at the beginning of this thesis, this interval is currently five minutes from the most recent re-scaling for down-scaling and three minutes from the most recent re-scale for up-scaling. This waiting time prevents thrashing by ensuring auto-scaling can actually take effect before it is potentially attempted again [17].<sup>4</sup>

### 3.4.2 Algorithm

The current algorithm for determining the number of replicas at each interval of the control loop is fairly simple. To begin, it requires the definition of three variables. Let **TargetNumOfPods** be defined as the number of replica pods which should exist. The replication controller will be responsible for ensuring these pods exist. Let **SumCurrentPodsCPUUtilization** be found by multiplying the average pod CPU utilization by the current number of replica pods. Finally, let **TargetCPUUtilization** be the desired level of per pod CPU utilization percentage as specified by the user when they created

<sup>4</sup>We modify the length of the forbidden window when running our predictive auto-scaling trials, as will be discussed in Section 4.2.3.

the autoscaler. The algorithm can now be written as follows:

$$\text{TargetNumOfPods} = \text{ceiling}(\text{SumCurrentPodsCPUUtilization} / \text{TargetCPUUtilization})$$

The `ceiling` function simply ensures that there is no attempt to create fractions of pods. Additionally, to keep auto-scaling from being overly sensitive, scaling will only occur if the current resource utilization is outside of a 10% tolerance range [16].

Implementing this thesis' new auto-scaling additions, namely utilizing predictive feedback control, will require modifications to this algorithm.

## 3.5 Predictive Autoscaling in relation to Kubernetes

### 3.5.1 Overview

As described in the Background chapter, this thesis examines the impacts of implementing model predictive control auto-scaling, instead of the current model reactive control auto-scaling. With a greater understanding of the building blocks of Kubernetes, and the current implementation of auto-scaling in Kubernetes, it is now possible to understand model predictive control in a Kubernetes specific context. Given the Kubernetes specific auto-scaling implementation is horizontal pod auto-scaling, the updated, predictive version investigated in this thesis will be referred to as predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling.

Converting Kubernetes from reactive horizontal pod auto-scaling to predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling requires one major conceptual modification to the auto-scaling process. As the name predictive implies, auto-scaling no longer occurs in reaction to the current resource consumption of the pod. Rather, it occurs predictively based on the pod's predicted future resource consumption. The amount of time ahead for which resource consumption is predicted is dependent on the amount of time it takes a replica pod to achieve the state we desire. With respect to up-scaling (i.e. creating pods) we are interested in how long it takes a replica pod to be ready to partake in the work the service is balancing across all replica pods.<sup>5</sup> This interval of time is referred to as `PodInitializationTime`.

With respect to down-scaling (i.e. removing pods) we are additionally interested in how long it takes for a pod to stop consuming resources and sharing the work. Kubernetes uses *graceful termination* to remove pods. Thus, a number of actions occur when a replication controller terminates a pod. Most importantly with respect to horizontal pod auto-scaling, the pod is removed from the list of endpoints for a service, meaning it is no longer able to share in the work given to the service. However, a pod may continue to handle traffic while it shuts down. Additionally, the processes within the pod are sent the `TERM` Unix signal, alerting said processes that they will soon be terminated. If the pod does not finish these steps, and a couple others unrelated to horizontal pod auto-scaling, within a predefined *grace period*, the `SIGKILL` signal will be sent to all processes

---

<sup>5</sup>For example, a pod may run a web server which takes multiple minutes to initialize, and until that web server is initialized, the pod cannot handle any web requests load balanced to it by the service.

on the pod and the pod is finally deleted. The default *grace period* is 30 seconds. [21] Given this variability, it is difficult to determine exactly when a replica pod can no longer share the service's work. Without this information, we cannot predict how far into the future to predict the replica pods' resource utilization, making predictive down-scaling impossible at this point in time. Because of this, when we discuss the predictive auto-scaling algorithm, we are discussing it with respect to up-scaling. Because the default grace period is a fairly short time frame, we believe there will be limited differences between reactive and predictive down-scaling, particularly because Kubernetes limits the number of down-scalings that can occur within a given time range to prevent thrashing [16]. Still, we discuss the possibility of predictively down-scaling, in addition to predictively up-scaling, in our future work section.

Aside from the switch to using predictive resource measurement, the general architecture of predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling is similar to the architecture of horizontal pod auto-scaling. Again, the auto-scaler operates as a control loop, yet at each looped interval, it utilizes the current resource utilization of pods to predict the resource utilization of the pods after `PodInitializationTime`. Assuming the resource in question is CPU utilization percentage, the auto-scaler will create or delete replica pods to ensure the future CPU utilization percentage will be within the target range the user specified when creating the auto-scaler.

### 3.5.2 Algorithm

A couple of changes need to be made to the current reactive horizontal pod auto-scaling algorithm in order for it to incorporate prediction. Again, we assume that auto-scaling is occurring based on the metric of CPU utilization percentage. Additionally, some of the variables from the reactive horizontal pod auto-scaling algorithm appear again. Again, let `TargetNumOfPods` defined as the number of replica pods which should exist and let `TargetCPUUtilization` be the desired level of per pod CPU utilization percentage that the user specified when the auto-scaler was created. Let the function `LineBestFit` be a line of best fit calculated to fit a plotting of observation time,  $x$ , and previous CPU utilization  $y$ .<sup>6</sup> Finally, let `PredictionTime`,  $t$ , be the time in the future for which we seek to predict the `FutureCPUUtilization`. We calculate `PredictionTime` as follows:

$$t = \text{CurrentTime} + \text{PodInitializationTime}$$

We then use  $t$  and the `LineOfBestFit` function to calculate `FutureCPUUtilization` as follows:

$$\text{FutureCPUUtilization} = \text{LineOfBestFit}(t)$$

The variable `SumFuturePodsCPUUtilization` can be defined by multiplying `FuturePodCPUUtilization` by the current number of replica pods. With these variables defined, it is possible to calculate `TargetNumOfPods` as follows:

---

<sup>6</sup>We will discuss the method for calculating this line of best fit in the implementation section.



$$\text{TargetNumOfPods} = \text{ceiling}(\text{SumFuturePodsCPUUtilization} / \text{TargetCPUUtilization})$$

The `ceiling` function definition and the tolerance range of 10% remains from reactive horizontal pod auto-scaling algorithm. With these changes, `TargetNumOfPods` is now determined predictively.

### 3.5.3 Benefits of Predictive Autoscaling

Overall, this thesis seeks to improve the summation of ERU and QoS for applications running on Kubernetes. With an understanding of Kubernetes' internal components, it is now possible to comprehend the theoretical underpinnings of how predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling accomplishes the stated goal.

Specifically, prediction improves quality of service without requiring any additional resources, thus achieving the goal of increasing the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service. Prediction increases quality of service because it helps avoid the decreases in quality of service that can occur if pod initialization time is not taken into account. These decreases can best be understood in the context of a simple example. Imagine that it takes 10 minutes for a pod to initialize. Imagine that at 5:50pm the reactive algorithm instructs the auto-scaler that 10 pods should exist and at 6:00pm, the reactive algorithm instructs the auto-scaler that 20 pods should exist. Using the reactive algorithm, the 10 replica pods will not be created until 6:00pm, and as a result of the 10 minute pod initialization time, they will not be ready to balance the load until 6:10pm. This delay means that from 6:00 - 6:10pm, 20 pods will be needed to keep the pods operating at a level that ensures high quality of service, but only 10 pods will be operating. Thus, for 10 minutes there will be low quality of service, as pods try to operate without enough resources. This delay is particularly troublesome if pod initialization time is particularly high or if there is a particularly high quality of service cost for pods operating outside of target resource consumption.

Adding prediction avoids this problem, ensuring an improved summation of ERU and QoS. Consider the following example again, yet this time with predictive horizontal auto-scaling. Again, imagine the exact same scenario as above, yet this time, the predictive algorithm will instruct the creation of 10 replica pods at 5:50pm. By 6:00pm, when 20 replica pods are needed, 20 replicas are initialized and ready to balance the load, ensuring that all pods operate at a higher quality of service than they would otherwise, without any wasted resources.

It is clear that adding prediction has the potential to increase the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service for Kubernetes. To what extent it is able to manifest this potential will be made clear in the evaluation section.

## 3.6 Summary

In just a short time, Kubernetes has become a powerful option for open-source cluster management and container orchestration. Kubernetes is particularly important in that decreases the barrier of en-

try for exciting new technologies, particularly containers, and programming paradigms, particularly microservices, and grants users to benefits of portability, extensibility, flexibility, and automation. Kubernetes is based on lower level objects called pods, replication controllers, and services, and builds upon these to implement a model reactive control method of auto-scaling, which it calls horizontal pod auto-scaling. This thesis builds upon this work to implement a model predictive control method of auto-scaling, entitled predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling. The belief is that predictive horizontal pod auto-scaling will increase the summation of quality of service and efficient resource utilization. This hypothesis will be verified through evaluation.

## Chapter 4

# Implementation

### 4.1 Technical Overview

As has been mentioned frequently throughout this thesis, Kubernetes is an open-source project sponsored by Google. Unsurprisingly, given the scope of the problems Kubernetes seeks to solve, the code base is very large. Overall, Kubernetes contains approximately three million lines of application specific code and thousands more of configuration scripts and documentation. The majority of application specific code is written in Go, a relatively recent open-source language also supported by Google. The influence of the Go programming language is seen throughout the project, particularly in Go's native support for parallel processing.

Given the size of Kubernetes, larger contributions adding substantial new functionality, including the contributions made by this thesis, follow a standardized contribution process. First, the developer must submit a proposal with their idea to the community. The community can make comments, and it must receive approval from core members of the Kubernetes if development is to be merged into the master release. Often this discussion involves members of the Kubernetes team focusing on the area relevant to the proposed changes. For this thesis, the proposal was considered by the internal auto-scaling team. After the proposal is approved, code containing the new feature, in this case predictive horizontal auto-scaling, will be added in parts over the course of several smaller contributions. Again, each request must be approved by the Kubernetes core team if it is to become part of the project. Development on Kubernetes follows the standardized Git workflow.

This thesis' specific contributions to Kubernetes, and their justifications, are described in the remainder of this section. The majority of the contributions are in the relatively small horizontal pod auto-scaler controller segment of the code, although an understanding of a greater portion of the code base was needed to make these changes.

Currently, the modifications of this thesis have not been merged into the Kubernetes master branch that forms the basis for the majority of Kubernetes deployments. However, it is possible to deploy our modified version to many of the options for deploying Kubernetes should one desire. As our code continues to go through the submission process, the chances increase for predictive auto-scaling to become a feature in the standard Kubernetes deployment.

## 4.2 Enabling Additions

This section analyzes the specific additions enabling predictive auto-scaling. The changes are broken into four groups: Recording Pod Initialization Time, Storing Previous CPU Utilizations, Autoscaling Predictively, and Enabling Predictive Autoscaling. The first two groups do not directly relate to predictive auto-scaling, but rather are the scaffolding that make predictive auto-scaling possible. The third group, Autoscaling Predictively, builds upon the first two sections in implementing an alternative control flow, which when enabled, causes the auto-scaler to operate predictively instead of reactively. The last group of changes discusses how to turn on this alternative control flow, and thus enable predictive auto-scaling. While breaking this thesis' code into discrete compartments is in part just a reflection proper software design, it is also done to work within the framework of making open-source contributes to Kubernetes. Kubernetes prefers small, self-contained pull requests, which can be added without introducing breaking changes. Implementing the sections sequentially, ensures we never submit code which will not run or build.

### 4.2.1 Recording Pod Initialization Time

This thesis' implementation of predictive auto-scaling uses `PodInitializationTime` to determine at which future time we should predict resource utilization. As was made explicit in section 3.5.3, this time frame allows any replica pods created to be ready to share in the work by the time they are needed.

Pod *initialization* time is distinct from pod *creation* time and the idea of a pod *running*. We define an initialized pod as one that is ready to perform computational work. This contrasts with a *created* pod, which indicates that all the containers within the pod are created. It does not signify that these containers have started running, performed any initialization tasks, and are now ready to share in computational work. The time necessary to create all containers for a pod is not equal to the time necessary for all containers within the pod to perform their computational work. Furthermore, a *running* pod is merely a pod in which all containers have been created, and at least one container is running or in the process of starting. This description does not guarantee that the containers have started and are ready to perform work [20].

Fortunately, Kubernetes defines the idea of a *Readiness Probe*. A readiness probe shows whether a pod is ready to handle incoming requests. Services use this probe to determine whether to pass work along to a replica pod through ensuring that pods with long startup times do not receive proxy traffic until ready to handle it. Pods must implement a readiness probe, or else it will be assumed that if the pod is running, it is ready [20]. Each container within a pod defines its own readiness probe, by specifying an HTTP endpoint that will return a successful HTTP status code when sent a GET request if the replica pod is ready [26].<sup>1</sup> In terms of this thesis, a pod being *ready* and a pod being *initialized* are analogous terms.

We can rely on the existence of the readiness probe to measure the amount of time it took for a pod to initialize. Each pod records the time at which it was first ordered into existence. Subtracting

---

<sup>1</sup>There are alternative methods of defining a readiness probe, but specifying an HTTP endpoint is the most logical within the context of this thesis.

the time at which the pod first came into existence from the time at which a request to the readiness probe was first successful. results in the pod initialization time we desire. However, while Kubernetes records the time at which the pod first came into existence as `pod.CreationTimestamp`, it does not record the time at which the readiness probe first returned *Success*. Fortunately, Kubernetes pods record their current state, all states in which they have been, and the time at which they assumed said states. As such, the following algorithm calculates the average initialization time for all pods controlled by the auto-scaler.

- For all pods controlled by the auto-scaler.
  - If the pod was ever in the ready state, find the first time that event occurred. If the pod has never been in the ready state, skip this pod.
  - If an `InitializationTime` value has not already been recorded for this pod, then subtract the `CreationTime` from the time at which the pod entered the ready phase, and record this time as `InitializationTime`
  - Add the value for `InitializationTime` to `TotalInitializationTime`.
- Divide `TotalInitializationTime` by the total number of pods that have been ready at some point.

This algorithm allows us to record the initialization time for each pod controlled by the auto-scaler, as well as calculate the average pod initialization time for all pods controlled by this auto-scaler.<sup>2</sup>

At this point, all recorded initialization time values factor into the average. This inclusion could lead to a problem with extreme outliers drastically affecting the average value. Perhaps in future iterations of predictive pod auto-scaling it would make sense to only average values that fit within some multiple of the standard deviation.

With this implementation, we can now use initialization time to determine how far into the future to predict the state of the application on the cluster, and thus how far into the future to auto-scale.

### 4.2.2 Storing Previous CPU Utilizations

Recording pod initialization time tells us how far into the future we want to predict the resource usage of the application. However, we still need a method of predicting the resource usage of the application at this point in time. To make this prediction of future CPU utilization values, we need to store multiple previous CPU utilization values.

The following changes must be made to the Kubernetes to facilitate this recording. To start, consider the contents of a `HorizontalPodAutoscaler` object, which is just an Kubernetes API object representing an auto-scaler. This object contains two objects entitled `HorizontalPodAutoscalerSpec` and `HorizontalPodAutoscalerStatus`. Traditionally within Kubernetes, `Spec` represents the desired state of the object and `Status` represents the current state of the object. Before the addition

---

<sup>2</sup>We record the value in the `Annotations` map for each pod, which is basically a map for writing values that are not necessarily in the `Pod` API object. If predictive auto-scaling becomes particularly popular, `InitializationTime` may be included as a field in the `Pod` API object, although making such a change would be a fairly substantial process.

of predictive auto-scaling, the `HorizontalPodAutoscalerStatus` object contained fields for the current and desired number of replicas, the last time at which scaling occurred, and the current average CPU utilization percentage for all pods controlled by this auto-scaler object. This last field, entitled `CurrentCPUUtilizationPercentage`, provides part of the information needed to estimate and predict the future CPU utilization percentage [15]. However, to make any decent estimation, we need to know the previous CPU utilization percentages at least as far into the past as we wish to predict into the future.

Thus, we start tracking a new field entitled `PreviousCPUUtilizationPercentages`. This field is a list of average previous CPU utilization percentages in integer form. Fortunately, Kubernetes already implements code that updates the `CurrentCPUUtilizationPercentage` value at a set duration interval. We modify the code such that every time a new `CurrentCPUUtilizationPercentage` is recorded, we add it onto the queue of `PreviousCPUUtilizationPercentages` along with the timestamp at which this observation occurred. We implement our queue such that it is of a fixed length, and newer utilization percentage readings bump older ones from the queue should we exceed the total number of observations we feel we need to keep to be able to make accurate predictions about the future. In other words, at time  $t_j$ , the `HorizontalPodAutoscaler` object will have access to CPU utilization percentage values from  $t_i$  to  $t_j$ , where  $t_i$  is the first observation recorded after  $t_i - (p * c)$ , where  $p$  is the amount of time it takes an average pod being run by this auto-scaler to initialize,<sup>3</sup> and  $c$  is a constant multiplier.<sup>4</sup> With this recorded info, we can now easily find a simple line of best fit for the graph in which time is the independent variable and CPU utilization is the dependent variable. Extrapolating with this line of best fit allows us to predict the future CPU utilization of our pods.

### 4.2.3 Autoscaling Predictively

Now that we have methods to calculate the average pod initialization time and keep records of previous average CPU utilizations, we can auto-scale predictively. To do so, we must add an alternative branch of execution to the current method of reactive auto-scaling.

With reactive auto-scaling, Kubernetes calculates the average current CPU utilization across all pods and divides this number by the target CPU utilization percentage to obtain the `UsageRatio`. This usage ratio is then multiplied by the current number of replica pods, resulting in the desired number of replica pods. A similar process occurs through predictive auto-scaling, with one significant change. Instead of calculating the average current CPU utilization, we seek to calculate the average predicted CPU utilization at `PodInitializationTime` into the future. Given this value, we again calculate `UsageRatio` and multiply that value by the current number of replica pods to give us the target number of replica pods.

Thus, the final step to implementing predictive auto-scaling is calculating average predicted CPU utilization. There are a variety of different methods that we could use for making this prediction,

---

<sup>3</sup>The amount of time it takes an average pod being run by this auto-scaler to initialize is how far into the future we seek to predict the state of the cluster.

<sup>4</sup>In our current implementation,  $c$  has a value of 20, indicating that we will predict based on measures twenty times as far from in distance from the current time as the point in the future at which we wish to predict. However, if  $p * c$  is greater than 3 minutes, we simply record observations 3 minutes into the past.

but for our initial experiments, we choose the simplest method of generating a linear line of best fit for a plotting of *Time*,  $x$ , as the independent variable and *CPUUtilization*,  $y$  as the dependent variable. As the points on our plot, we use all of our previous CPU utilization measurements and the current CPU utilization measurement, with *Time* recorded as Unix seconds<sup>5</sup> and CPU utilization recorded as a average percent CPU utilization. Given these separate lists of  $x$  and  $y$  values, we can now find a line of best fit. We define the line of best fit as the line minimizing the squares of any derivations between predicted and actual average CPU utilization. We calculate the slope of this line,  $b$ , with the following equation:

$$b = \frac{Cov_{xy}}{Var_x}$$

$Cov_{xy}$  is a measure of how *Time* and *CPUUtilization* vary with respect to each other, while  $Var_x$  is a measure of the squared standard deviation of all the different *Time* values from the mean *Time* measurement.

Additionally, it has been proven that a linear line of best fit calculated in this manner will pass through the sample mean of *Time* and *CPUUtilization* respectively. Thus, we can calculate the y-intercept of our line of best fit, with  $a = \bar{y} - (b * \bar{x})$ . With these variables, we have a linear line of best fit, which we can use to make simple predictions about future CPU utilization [27].

Our final step with respect to prediction is to get a *Time* value to plug into this line of best fit to receive a future prediction.<sup>6</sup> As we want to predict `PodInitializationTime` into the future, we simply add `PodInitializationTime`, measured in seconds, to the current time, for a new value  $t_p$ . By calculating  $a + b * t_p$ , we have a prediction of the future average CPU utilization. As mentioned previously, given this prediction, we can now plug it in as if it was the current CPU utilization, and proceed with the typical reactive method of auto-scaling.

Naturally, our method here is making a considerable assumption that a linear line of best fit can accurately model CPU utilization and also the amount of time we attempt to extrapolate when making our prediction is not too extreme. Our evaluation section will help us quantify the validity of this assumption. Fortunately, should a linear line of best fit not prove to be a suitable first attempt, our implementation is designed such that it would be easy to examine a number of alternative modeling solutions, such as quadratic, exponential, or logarithmic lines of best fits. It would even be possible to try all the different modeling options, and ultimately select the one that had proven itself most accurate for this given auto-scaler.

Finally, we should note that when using predictive auto-scaling for our evaluations, we decrease the forbidden window for which the auto-scaler must wait before adding or deleting replica pods after it auto-scales from five minutes for down-scaling and three minutes for up-scaling, to a universal thirty seconds. This decision was somewhat predicated on the `PodInitializationTime` of the test applications we evaluate. These pods have `PodInitializationTime` less than the forbidden window, which limits the potential benefits of auto-scaling.

<sup>5</sup>Unix seconds are the number of seconds from a specific date in 1970

<sup>6</sup>As was mentioned in the Architecture section, we only utilize the predictive method when up-scaling. Otherwise, if we notice the line of best fit has a negative slope, we simply return the current CPU estimation, essentially reactively auto-scaling.

#### 4.2.4 Enabling Predictive Autoscaling

With all of the pieces for predictive auto-scaling in place, the final step is making it so that a user running pods on the Kubernetes cluster can turn prediction on and off. We seek a lightweight method for accomplishing this, so as to not have to make drastic changes to the Kubernetes user interface before being confident that predictive auto-scaling is a generally useful addition.

As was previously mentioned, Kubernetes makes it possible to attach key/value pairs to any resource through the concept of annotations. As was mentioned in the section on recording pod initialization time, the annotations of an object are a useful way to record information without going through the long process of making an official update to the API for an object in Kubernetes. Thus, to turn on auto-scaling for an individual auto-scaler object, we simply record in the annotations for that object the key `predictive` with the value `true`. This annotation can easily be done using Kubernetes command line client [18]. For example, if our auto-scaler had the name `foo`, the following command would turn on prediction.

```
kubectl annotate hpa foo predictive='true'
```

It follows that auto-scaling could just as easily be turned off by rewriting the annotated value to anything other than `true`.

```
kubectl annotate hpa foo predictive='false'
```

Within the code for determining the number of replica pods to create when auto-scaling, we can easily check if the `predictive` annotation is `true` for that particular auto-scaler. If the value is not set, or is anything other than `true`, the auto-scaler will reactively auto-scale as normal. This flexibility allows different auto-scalers to utilize different auto-scaling methods. Additionally, it allows a single auto-scaler to utilize different auto-scaling methods throughout its lifetime, and even automatically stop using predictive auto-scaling if it is performing poorly.

If the benefits of predictive auto-scaling are substantial, then it will make sense to transition this value from one recorded in `Annotations` to a more permanent field defined in an auto-scaler's `HorizontalPodAutoscalerSpec` object. A field entitled `Predictive` could be added to this object which, if set to `true`, would turn on predictive auto-scaling. This addition would enable the user to configure an auto-scaler to perform predictively from the start, as opposed to having to first create the auto-scaler and then turn on prediction. Making prediction a part of the static configuration for an auto-scaler has the benefit of linking predictive behavior with all other pod state, especially as configuration files are used among multiple projects. However, until the benefits of predictive auto-scaling are demonstrated, it does not make sense to undertake this effort.

### 4.3 Summary

In all, we have added predictive auto-scaling to Kubernetes, as well as creating the infrastructure to make this addition possible. We added calculation of the average pod initialization time as well as storing previous measurements of CPU utilization and the time at which they occurred. These two



pieces of information allowed us to create a linear line of best fit which we used to predict the future CPU utilization, and thus predict the number of replica pods we would need in the future. In short, it allowed us to predictively auto-scale. Finally, we specified a mechanism for turning predictive auto-scaling on and off. Our version of Kubernetes, with predictive auto-scaling operational, can be deployed to Amazon Web Services, Google Compute Engine, or physical hardware just like any other Kubernetes version.

## Chapter 5

# Evaluation

Given an addition of auto-scaling, we can now progress to evaluation. This section contains a more thorough definition of what entails successful modification of current Kubernetes auto-scaling behavior, the metrics used to determine if efforts were successful, an analysis of the control groups with which the new predictive auto-scaling will be compared, a description of the environment and process used for evaluation, the results of said evaluations, and the real world impacts of this thesis' findings.

### 5.1 Goals of Evaluation

In the introduction section of this thesis, we defined success as implementing modifications to Kubernetes that increase the summation of the efficient resource utilization and quality of service metrics. Careful evaluation can confirm whether we succeeded in this objective. In all, we seek to determine both the extent and significance of the addition of predictive auto-scaling in comparison to reactive auto-scaling, and highlight the scenarios in which the addition of predictive auto-scaling is the most, and the least, beneficial.

#### 5.1.1 Predictive Auto-scaling's Impact

It is important to present a number of different scenarios, based on independent variables that will be discussed later, in which to evaluate predictive auto-scaling in comparison to the alternative methods of assigning resources. This type of evaluation focuses on how predictive auto-scaling is an improvement, or regression, on the currently existing options. Furthermore, this type of evaluation focuses on to what extent predictive auto-scaling's difference from current implementations, is statistically and practically significant. Finally, this type of evaluation provides a number of visualizations and summary statistics, allowing for easily accessible comparisons between different types of resource assignment in different scenarios.

### 5.1.2 Scenario Analysis

Our evaluation provides further insight into predictive auto-scaling through analyzing the impacts of predictive auto-scaling in different scenarios. In other words, we seek to identify the scenarios in which benefits or detriments of predictive auto-scaling are the most pronounced, and also the scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling has little impact. This method of analysis is useful in recommending when to enable predictive auto-scaling and also suggests avenues for future work.

## 5.2 Evaluation Metrics

Before progressing any further, it is important to state the metrics we used to measure the efficacy of predictive auto-scaling. We seek specific metrics relating to the general concepts of efficient resource utilization and quality of service. A selection of a “typical” service to run on Kubernetes influences how exactly we measure efficient resource utilization and quality of service. We posit a web service as the best choice for a representative application. A number of factors support our decision. First, Kubernetes is built for running long-term, stable service jobs, and a well-built web application desires to be both long-running and crash free [14]. Second, Kubernetes focuses on running ephemeral, containerized applications which can be started or stopped at any time. Containerized web services achieve these goals as, as long as the database layer is abstracted, web applications are stateless and can restart with few ramifications. Third, applications on Kubernetes should be concurrent, meaning replicas can be added or removed to divide the work any individual application must handle. Stateless web services are easily parallelized, as the requests can be easily distributed across all of the replicas. Finally, much of the appeal of the simplicity of Kubernetes is that a user can construct a containerized application and then pass it to an externally managed Kubernetes cluster for hosting. This hosting simplicity is particularly appreciated by burgeoning startups, who typically develop web applications and may face extreme variance in external demand.

### 5.2.1 Efficient Resource Utilization

We define efficient resource utilization as a measure of whether an application has enough, but not too many resources given to it by the operating system or the cluster manager. For example, editing a text file in Vim on a supercomputer would be terrible efficient resource utilization since editing a text file requires only a small fraction of the supercomputer’s available CPU and memory, meaning the unneeded resources are wasted. In contrast, running a web browser on a laptop is proper efficient resource utilization, because a web browser requires an appropriate percentage of the laptop’s available resources. In the context of Kubernetes, an application with poor efficient resource utilization would be a web server that uses many replica pods, each reserving considerable resources, to serve a very low volume of web requests. In such a situation, the resources reserved for the application would be entirely underutilized.

Specifically, we measure efficient resource utilization with respect to Kubernetes through examining the percentage of idle CPU. The amount of CPU that a pod reserves is the summation of all resources that containers within the pod reserve [13]. If our application is only using a small

amount of that reserved CPU to run, than a large amount of CPU will be left idle. The larger the percentage of CPU that is left idle, the worse the efficient resource utilization, as many resources are just sitting unused. We measure our specific metric for efficient resource utilization in percentage of CPU that is idle and we name it `IdleCPU`. When we use this metric to indicate efficient resource utilization, if the ERU value is high, the application is not using resources efficiently. If the metric is low, the application is using resources efficiently.<sup>1</sup>

Our decision to use idle load to measure efficient resource utilization in Kubernetes makes the assumption that creating pods equates to reserving the pod's resources such that they cannot be used by other pods. In the default case, the previous statement is not necessarily true, yet it is possible to craft specialized pods which validate this equality. To start, remember that pods contain containers. When Kubernetes receives a pod, it seeks to schedule all of its containers on a physical node within the cluster. By default, containers within the pod run with no bounds on their CPU and memory beyond the constrictions of the physical node on which they are scheduled. As such, declaring  $x$  number of pods does not give any guarantees of resource usage, as the amount of resources available to the containers within the pod vary drastically based on their specific node [19]. Without modification, this variability would undermine `IdleCPU` as our metric for ERU.

Fortunately, there is a way to configure Kubernetes such that a pod equates to a static number of resources.<sup>2</sup> This configuration involves setting resource requests and limits for each container within the pod. A resource request for a container indicates the minimum amount of resources that should always be available. A pod will not be scheduled on a node within the cluster, unless that node can guarantee the requested amount of resources to all containers within the pod. A resource limit for a container indicates the maximum amount of resources that a container can claim. Depending on the resource, a container exceeding the maximum amount of resources will either be throttled (CPU) or killed (memory).<sup>3</sup> A pod's resource request/limit is the summation of the resource request/limit for all of its containers. Setting a container's, or pod's, resource request equal to its resource limit essentially guarantees that the existence of a pod represents the claiming and utilization of a static amount of resources [13]. Ensuring static provisioning is reserving a consistent amount of resources allows us to still examine idle CPU percentage, our way of investigating efficient resource utilization.

The efficient resource utilization metric has direct links to the costs of running applications on a cluster manager. If applications are given resources they do not need, and the cluster manager does not reclaim these unused resources, then additional applications added to the cluster must claim new resources. The inability to utilize inefficient applications' wasted resources requires the expansion of the cluster. This increase in cost will be felt both by those running the cluster and those running an application on the cluster.

---

<sup>1</sup>In a similar vein, a low measure for quality of service is actually preferable to a high value for quality of service when we are measuring quality of service through request response time. However, when summing ERU and QoS we consider the inversion of this measurement of ERU, meaning a large summation of ERU and QoS is preferable to a small summation of ERU and QoS.

<sup>2</sup>Right now in Kubernetes, resources relates to either CPU or memory. CPU is requested in cores. Memory is requested in bytes of RAM.

<sup>3</sup>It is also possible to configure Kubernetes such that a container using too much CPU is killed.

### 5.2.2 Quality of Service

We additionally define quality of service as a measure of how well an application is accomplishing its goal. There does not exist a singular consistent specific metric for measuring quality of service, as measures of quality of service are dependent on the specific application. Furthermore, it is difficult to measure quality of service as a variety of difficult-to-control-for external factors impact an application’s ability to perform its goal.

In the context of the typical web application run on Kubernetes, we measure quality of service based on the server side **ResponseTime** to an HTTP request. An application with a high quality of service will have a low response time, while an application with a low quality of service will have a high response time. We measure our specific metric for quality of service in seconds.

The quality of service metric has links to the type of application which can be run on Kubernetes. As Kubernetes supports as best as possible a high quality of service, more and more important applications will run on Kubernetes. For example, if Kubernetes works to improve the quality of service of an application, important web applications serving vital medical data or political information will seek Kubernetes as a platform on which to run.

### 5.2.3 Summation of ERU and QoS

We are most interested in testing for an improvement in the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service metrics. It is easy to improve quality of service by decreasing efficient resource utilization, as we can just assign the application the largest amount of resources it could ever need. It is equally easy to improve efficient resource utilization by decreasing quality of service, as we can just assign an application the fewest amount of resources it will ever use. As such, we want to ensure that this thesis improves efficient resource utilization or quality of service, without negatively impacting the other. This realization leads us to evaluating our modifications to auto-scaling by measuring its impact on the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service.

While conceptually summing efficient resource utilization and quality of service is simple, care must be taken when combining the specific metrics of **IdleCPU** and **ResponseTime**. The metrics are measured in unrelated units. Furthermore, the scale for these metrics may be entirely different, meaning that small changes in one could completely overshadow larger changes in the other. Additionally, for both **IdleCPU** and **ResponseTime** low measures are desirable, while intuitively with summation of ERU and QoS, high measures are desirable.

We combine these *ERU* and *QoS* through the following process. First, we gather all measurements of *ERU* and *QoS*, distinguished by the variables  $E_A$  and  $Q_A$  respectively, from our predictive and reactive measurements for a single combination of independent variables. Next, we define  $e_t$  and  $q_t$  as the respective *ERU* and *QoS* measurements at time  $t$ . We first normalize these measurements through calculating their respective z-scores, by first subtracting the individual observation value from the mean of all observations, and then dividing by the standard deviation of all observations. This operation leaves us with  $ne_t$  and  $nq_t$  respectively. Then, as with our current implementation of the *ERU* and *QoS* metrics smaller values indicate “better” performance, and with respect to summation of *ERU* and *QoS*, we expect larger values to indicate “better” performance, we negate

$ne_t$  and  $nq_t$ . Finally, we sum  $-ne_t$  and  $-nq_t$  together to get  $s_t$ , where  $s_t$  is the summation of *ERU* and *QoS* at time  $t$ . In short, we add the negation of the z-score for *ERU* and *QoS*. Mathematically, this process can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} ne_t &= ((e_t - \text{MEAN}(E_A))/\text{STDDEV}(E_A)) \\ nq_t &= ((q_t - \text{MEAN}(Q_A))/\text{STDDEV}(Q_A)) \\ s_t &= -ne_t + -nq_t \end{aligned}$$

Given a measurement of the summation of *ERU* and *QoS* for a set of observations, in which *ERU* and *QoS* have an equal impact in the summation, it is now possible to compare the summations of *ERU* and *QoS* within the different scaling methods or traffic patterns included in our evaluation trials.

## 5.3 Control Groups

To determine the impact of adding prediction to horizontal pod auto-scaling, we must establish baseline standards of performance with which we can perform comparisons. These “normal” standards of performance come from the control group, which includes all of the methods of scaling pods before this thesis. These methods can be divided into the two general categories of *static* and *reactive auto-scaling*. The inclusion in our control group of all previous methods of auto-scaling allows us to answer one fundamental question of this thesis: does adding prediction to Kubernetes auto-scaling improve its ability to reliably and resourcefully run containerized applications?

### 5.3.1 Static

The first, and the simplest method, of scaling pods is *static* provisioning. Static provisioning requires one wishing to deploy an application on Kubernetes to determine ahead of time a constant amount of pods for that application. Any desire to update that static value will require a manual change. Put simply, with the static method there will be a constant number of pods, and the application will have a constant amount of resources, throughout its entire lifetime, regardless of the amount of work the application is asked to perform.

There are multiple possible heuristics for statically assigning resources to an applications, as it is possible to over, under, or average provision.

- **Over Provision:** With over provisioning, an application is given the greatest amount of resources that it will ever require. With respect to horizontal pod auto-scaling, over provisioning means the user of the application statically sets the replication controller to ensure that  $x$  pods always exist, where  $x$  is the number of pods needed to maintain high quality of service when the application is asked to perform the most work.<sup>4</sup> While over provisioning ensures a high

---

<sup>4</sup>In this discussion, references to *most*, *least*, and *average* work assume that there exist bounds on the work the external environment can ask the application to do.

quality of service, it has extremely poor efficient resource utilization.

- **Under Provision:** With under provisioning, an application is given the least amount of resources that it will ever require. Again, in the context of horizontal pod auto-scaling, under provisioning leads to user to statically set the replication controller to ensure the existence of  $y$  pods, where  $y$  is the number of pods needed to maintain quality of service when the application is asked to perform the least work. Under provisioning ensures efficient resource utilization, as the application will never reserve any resources and then leave them idle. However, in all situations except for when the application performs the minimum possible amount of work, quality of service will suffer because the application does not have enough resources.
- **Average Provision:** With average provisioning, an application is given the average amount of resources that it needs. With respect to horizontal pod auto-scaling, average provisioning guides the user to statically set the replication controller to maintain  $z$  pods, where  $z$  is the number of pods needed to maintain quality of service when the application is asked to perform the average amount of work. Average provisioning can be seen as somewhat of a middle ground between under and over provisioning, offering decent quality of service and efficient resource utilization.

Ultimately, we do not devote significant time to considering any type of static provisioning, as we are confident that it would at best be equal to reactive auto-scaling. Thus if our implementation of predictive auto-scaling outperforms reactive auto-scaling, we are confident that it will also outperform any type of static provisioning, and as such we only compare predictive auto-scaling to reactive auto-scaling in our evaluation.

### 5.3.2 Reactive Auto-scaling

Additionally, previous to this thesis, it was possible to scale applications in Kubernetes using horizontal, reactive pod based auto-scaling. We examine the implementation and utilization of this method of scaling in depth in the section 3.4, so we will not repeat it here.

## 5.4 Independent Variables

We examine two independent variables, traffic request pattern and pod initialization time, with respect to the different scaling types' performance. In other words, for reactive and predictive auto-scaling, we examine the impacts of varying the request pattern of traffic to our testing application and the impacts of differing pod initialization times. This allows us to determine under what combinations of traffic request patterns and pod initialization time predictive auto-scaling is most effective, and also under what combinations it is the least effective. Furthermore, because we utilize the same independent variables for all of the different scaling types, and because these independent variables are relevant to all scaling types, we can make comparisons across predictive and reactive auto-scaling. For example, we could determine that predictive auto-scaling outperforms reactive auto-scaling most when pod initialization time is lengthy and the traffic pattern is a simple linear

slope, but predictive auto-scaling exhibits very little difference from reactive auto-scaling when pod initialization time is very small and we see a *flash crowd* traffic pattern.

### 5.4.1 Pod Initialization Time

As will be discussed in detail in section 5.5.1, we’ve created a web server application that allows us to specify any `PodInitializationTime` we desire. As such, we have considerable flexibility with respect to what initialization time values we test. To begin, we decided to test the following value of 135s.

We initially believed 5s and 135s would be important independent variables to test because they are indicative of different classes of applications that could be run on Kubernetes. A pod initialization time of 5s is commonly found among web application frameworks, as we showed when writing simple HTTP servers using both Go and the Spring Java web application framework [30]. These web frameworks initialized, and were ready to serve requests, in 1s and 5s respectively. It is our belief that any web framework that simply needs to initialize, without any external communicating of data, can accomplish this task in under 5s. Thus, testing a pod initialization time of 5s would allow us to consider how any web application framework would perform with predictive auto-scaling. However, when pod initialization time is as little as 5s, there is essentially no difference between predictive and reactive auto-scaling, because Kubernetes imposes a multi-minute threshold between auto-scalings. As such, while 5s is a representative time value, it is not one for which predictive auto-scaling’s behavior is particularly interesting.

We derive a pod initialization time of 135s from a simulation of downloading a shard database file, loading it into a database, and then starting a web application to process data from said database. More specifically, our sample pod downloaded a 25.2MB file and then batch inserted it into an Elasticsearch database [6]. It then started a web application framework. In all, this process took approximately 135s, although it is easy to imagine the time varying based on the size of the initial shard file. The file we downloaded came from an Elasticsearch tutorial on pre-populating a database [10], and thus we believe it is a fairly representative size. By examining the pod initialization time of 135s, we are confident that we are capturing the majority of the potential interesting use cases for predictive auto-scaling.

We believe that there exists a sweet spot of pod initialization times for which predictive auto-scaling demonstrates the most benefits over reactive auto-scaling. Obviously the smaller the pod initialization time value, the lesser the difference between reactive and predictive auto-scaling. However, the larger the pod initialization time value, the further into the future we must predict the state of the application. While large pod initialization times have the potential for considerable benefits when using predictive auto-scaling, we can only realize that potential if predictions of future application state are accurate. As the prediction window gets larger and larger, accuracy becomes substantially more difficult to obtain.



### 5.4.2 Traffic Request Pattern

We are also interested in the impacts of different traffic patterns on scaling performance. As such, we send our test web server application web requests in a variety of patterns and examine which traffic pattern the scaling method handles well, and which traffic pattern the scaling method does not handle well. Moreover, we also examine scaling methods in relation to each other with respect to different traffic patterns, seeking to answer for which traffic patterns predictive auto-scaling is beneficial and which traffic patterns predictive auto-scaling is detrimental or meaningless.

In this thesis we examine four different traffic patterns that we feel are fairly indicative of the different traffic patterns a web application may face. We entitle these patterns *step-ladder*, *jagged-edge*, *increase-decrease*, and *flash-crowd*.<sup>5</sup> We describe each of these patterns, and offer a visual representation for each, below. Each pattern runs for at least twenty minutes and at most forty minutes, and makes at most 20 requests per second.<sup>6</sup> These values were chosen to give space for the lengthier pod initialization times and to keep the network from becoming too congested respectively. We can imagine the all traffic seen by a typical web server as being composed of different combinations of these patterns across longer time spans.

- **step-ladder:** The traffic pattern *step-ladder*, visible in Figure 5.1, represents a web server which faces a load pattern which increases immediately at predicted intervals. This scenario can be seen as representing, for example, an video streaming website which experiences predictable increases in traffic as different shows are streamed. This traffic pattern begins with 1 request per second for 3 minutes, before immediately increasing to 4 requests per second. The process of increasing by 3 requests per second and then staying constant for 3 minutes continues for 6 more iterations until it reaches 19 requests per second.




Figure 5.1: The step-ladder Traffic Pattern

- **jagged-edge:** The traffic pattern *jagged-edge*, visible in Figure 5.2, is similar to *step-ladder*, although it reflects a more gradual increase and decrease in load. Thus, it applies to a similar

<sup>5</sup>There are of course an infinite number of traffic patterns that we could examine, and examining other options is an exciting opportunity for future work.

<sup>6</sup>All traffic patterns have a start and end buffer at which they receive only 1 request per second, to ensure we do not immediately overload the application.

scenario as *step-ladder*. It begins at 1 request per second before 3 minutes before increasing to 10 requests per minute over the course of 5 minutes. It then decreases to 5 requests per second over the course of 2 minutes. This pattern of increasing by 10 requests per second over the course of 5 minutes and then decreasing by 5 requests per second over the course of 2 minutes continues until reaching 20 requests per second, and which point we transition to the end buffer period of 1 request per second for 5 minutes.




Figure 5.2: The jagged-edge Traffic Pattern

- **increase-decrease:** The traffic pattern *increase-decrease*, visible in Figure 5.3, represents a web server facing constantly increasing and then constantly decreasing load. This scenario can be seen as representing, for example, a restaurant in which people increasingly visit the site as it becomes closer and closer to a meal time, and decreasingly visit the site as a meal time becomes farther and farther away. After five minutes of initialization at 1 request per second, our load generator builds from sending 1 request per second to 20 requests per second over the course of 15 minutes. After reaching the apex, the traffic generator then reduces from sending 20 requests per second to sending 1 request per second, again over the course of 15 minutes.




Figure 5.3: The increase-decrease Traffic Pattern

- **flash-crowd:** The traffic pattern *flash-crowd*, visible in Figure 5.4, represents a web server facing a suddenly increasing, and then suddenly decreasing, amount of load. This scenario is

indicative of, for example, a news website which will suddenly receive a short-lived burst of traffic when a major story hits. After five minutes of sending 1 request per second, our load generator builds from sending 1 request per second to sending 5 requests per second, over the course of 5 minutes. Then, in just 2 minutes, our load generator jumps from sending 5 requests per second to sending 20 requests per second. After reaching the apex, the traffic generator decreases from sending 20 requests per second to sending 5 requests per second, again in just 2 minutes. Finally, our load generator decreases from sending 5 requests per second to 1 request per second, over the course of 5 minutes, before transitioning to the end buffer period of 1 request per second for 5 minutes.




Figure 5.4: The flash-crowd Traffic Pattern

## 5.5 Methodology

Kubernetes does not currently contain either the tools or processes for performing the evaluation this thesis needs. This section gives an overview of tools and processes we created for testing different types of scaling in Kubernetes.

### 5.5.1 Tools

Pursuing the evaluation method previously outlined in this thesis requires both the creation of new tools and the utilization of previously existing open-source tools.

#### **test-server**

We seek to measure variations in a web server application’s efficient resource utilization and quality of service across a variety of scaling methods. Many of the previous sections of this thesis, and the majority of this thesis’ contributions to Kubernetes, relate to implementing predictive horizontal auto-scaling as a new scaling method. Yet, to evaluate we must also create a web server application. Ultimately, the created web server application, entitled *test-server*, allows us refined control over the independent variables we wish to control during experimentation.

*test-server* is a HTTP server written in Go. It defines two API endpoints, “/” and “/ready”.

- **“/” - Load:** Traffic generators simulating user requests sends GET requests to the endpoint at “/”, also known as the *Load* endpoint. This endpoint has two functions. First, it must perform a task that is somewhat CPU intensive so that our application uses enough CPU that auto-scaling may be triggered. Second, it must record the percent of idle CPU and an estimation of request response time as measures of efficient resource utilization and quality of service respectively. The function assigned to handle the GET request accomplishes these tasks as follows. Upon receiving a GET request to this endpoint, the handler function records the start time of the function. It then executes a computationally intensive task, which we define as repeatedly encrypting a password. Once this task is over, we once again record the time and check the idle CPU percentage through parsing the output of the *top* Unix command. Having these two values allows us to calculate average amount of idle CPU and function execution time, which function as measurements of efficient resource utilization and quality of service. The function then records these values as a new point in the database, along with a an indicator of the values of independent variables in place for this trial (i.e. pod initialization time, scaling method, traffic pattern). The function finishes by returning a status code of 200.
- **“/ready” - Ready:** The *Ready* endpoint is used to allow us fine grained control over pod initialization time during experimentation. Kubernetes determines if a pod is initialized based on a *ReadinessProbe*. This probe was discussed in greater detail earlier, but suffice to say it works by defining an HTTP endpoint that will return a successful status code if the pod is initialized. During experimentation, we are particularly interested in how predictive auto-scaling is effected by different pod initialization times. Thus, we utilize the following setup. First, when defining our pod, we specify the *ReadinessProbe* should use “/ready” as the HTTP endpoint. The function handling responses for requests to “/ready” works by reading in an environment variable indicating the pod initialization time value we wish to test.<sup>7</sup> The function parses this time, and waits that amount of time before returning a status code of 200. This wait ensures that we can control exactly when the *ReadinessProbe* receives a successful response, and thus can control exactly the amount of time before a pod initializes.

This application closely fits within the guidelines microservice theory establishes and it is easy to containerize it and then run it on Kubernetes. It is *focused*, as it performs the single task of returning to HTTP requests. It is *stateless*, as all containers communicate with an external database, that is not stored within the container. The container can be deleted and restarted at anytime with no errors or sustained interrupts. Finally, the container can easily be replicated and run concurrently, as a load balancer can distribute discrete requests across multiple replica HTTP servers with no threat of race conditions. It is thus simple to package this webserver into a container, and then package said container into a pod.

As was previously mentioned, the pod containing the container for this application implements a *ReadinessProbe* pointing to the “/ready” endpoint. Additionally, the pod limits and requests an explicit amount of CPU, currently .1 cores, for the container running the application. This en-

---

<sup>7</sup>Any method of running containers, whether locally during testing or in a pod on Kubernetes allows us to easily set environment variables.

sures measures of efficient resource utilization are consistent across scaling method. Finally, our pod contains a number of environment variables including *SCALING\_METHOD* and *INITIALIZATION\_TIME* which allow us the fine grained control previously mentioned. Additionally, regardless of the scaling method, we define a replication controller for ensuring whatever the scaled amount of pods exist, and a service for balancing requests across all *test-server* containers and exposing *test-server* to an external IP address that can receive our generated traffic.

### InfluxDb

Our evaluation strategy generates an immense amount of time-series data, which we need to store in a database that we can later query and manipulate. *InfluxDB*, an open-source time-series database from InfluxData, is a natural choice for recording such data. InfluxDB makes it easy to collect, store, manage, and visualize the large amount of data that we generate. InfluxDB provides a simple HTTP API which we use both for recording our data throughout are evaluations, and also for querying and modifying later. Finally, InfluxDB has a variety of hosting options, meaning our containerized application does not have to hold any data, and thus remains stateless and concurrent.

### JMeter

As mentioned in the discussion of independent variables, we need to generate substantial traffic conforming to a specific pattern. Fortunately there a variety of open-source tools that can assist us in this task. Ultimately, the one selected for this thesis is Apache JMeter [3]. JMeter has considerable functionality, but most appealing is its *Throughput Shaping Timer* plugin [31]. This plugin allows us to use JMeter to send HTTP requests with a vary specific pattern, by specifying exactly how many requests should be sent per second, and for what length of time they should be sent. Using this tool, it is easy to create our previously described patterns of traffic that we seek to test.

We containerize JMeter and place it into a pod which we run on Kubernetes. This gives us considerably more resources with which to generate traffic, as opposed to trying to generate a high volume of network requests from a laptop.

## 5.5.2 Evaluation Process

Given the tools created and utilized for evaluation, we must consider how to utilize these tools in order to create a robust, automated testing environment.

### Hosting

For evaluation, we must run *test-server* on a hosted Kubernetes instance. It is necessary to use a hosted Kubernetes instance, instead of just running Kubernetes locally, because we send our pod an amount of traffic too great for any single commodity machine to handle. Additionally, we want to simulate running Kubernetes in as realistic a production environment as possible, and of course all instances of running Kubernetes in production host Kubernetes on external cloud servers.

There are a couple of different options for a hosting service which will provide the machines for our Kubernetes cluster. The simplest method of using Kubernetes is to use *Google Container Engine*. Google Container Engine is a version of Kubernetes hosted by Google itself. While this method is admired for its simplicity, it is not feasible for this thesis. Because we want to be able to test our modifications to Kubernetes, without waiting for them to be accepted in the stable version of Kubernetes used for Google Container Engine, we must instead use a platform that allows greater control [7].

Fortunately, Kubernetes can be run on a number of cloud providers, including *Google Compute Engine*, *Amazon AWS*, and *Microsoft Azure* [7]. The Kubernetes source code provides a number of simple scripts for configuring one of these providers to run Kubernetes. Importantly, the version of Kubernetes running on these providers can be any version we desire, meaning that we can test our modified version that incorporates predictive auto-scaling, even if our updates are not yet merged into a stable Kubernetes master version. Because of previous development experience, we decided to pursue hosting on Amazon AWS. Kubernetes typically runs 1 *m3.medium* EC2 instance as the master and 4 *t2.micro* instances as workers, all running in the *us-west-2a* region. These defaults make sense for the workload we expect [29].

Additionally, for simplicity's sake, we decided to host the InfluxDB database instance used for storing our evaluation data. It would have also been possible to run an instance of InfluxDB ourselves on an Amazon EC2 machine, but the potential cost benefit did not message the time and complexity costs. Because all of the data being stored is small key/value pairs, we only use a 10GB Storage, 1GB RAM, 1 Core machine [11].

## Kubernetes Configuration

Additionally, we need a method for configuring *test-server* to incorporate the different variables that we wish to test. Specifically, we need a way to ensure that *test-server* can be run on a Kubernetes cluster utilizing a variety of different methods for scaling, and also that we can control the amount of time it takes for a pod to initialize. In addition, we need *test-server* to know the exact values of its independent variables so that it can record them to the database, ensuring all data is properly labeled. Our *test-server* application reads all of these dynamic values from Unix environment variables.

It is possible to utilize Kubernetes's configuration language to work with this method of controlling independent variable values through environment variables. We place our containerized *test-server* application within a pod, and Kubernetes allows the specification of environment variables within a pod. The only issue is that these environment variables in the pod configuration file must be static. We solve this issue by creating a template of our pod configuration file, with indications of the dynamic environment variables. We can then run a custom python script that reads in configuration values, and creates distinct configuration files incorporating each of these values. Thus, each different file specifies a different pod configuration. Utilizing the proper set of independent variables for a pod is as simple as creating a pod from the correct configuration file. This entire process has been automated, meaning this implementation detail has been largely abstracted.

## Running Tests

Given the powerful tooling described in the previous section, the process for running a set of tests is completely automated and quite simple. Each test must specify a traffic pattern, a scaling method, and a pod initialization time. These variables influence the *ReplicationController* and thus the appropriate configuration file must be utilized.

We do this selection using environment variables, which allow us to run the tests with the following single *make* command.

```
export TS_RC=test-server-controller-reactive-135s.yaml;  
export TG_RC=traffic-generator-increase-decrease-test-plan.yaml;  
export HPA=TRUE;  
export PREDICTIVE=TRUE;  
make test_start
```

The above command indicates a wish to start a test instance with reactive auto-scaling, a 135s pod initialization time, and an *increase-decrease* traffic pattern. It also rebuilds all containerized applications and ensures the configuration files are up to date.

Once complete, all of the pods, replication controllers, services, and auto-scalers on Kubernetes can be destroyed with the following *make* command.

```
make test_stop
```

As such, running a single test requires very little human involvement. The only task is monitoring the tests to ensure they are no errors. Particularly, we are concerned about writing our metrics to the database failing, Kubernetes running out of space to schedule replica pods, and potential errors in our predictive auto-scaling implementation. Fortunately, either Kubernetes provides, or we have implemented, methods for highlighting such errors and making the necessary adjustments to the evaluation process. In addition, after all the tests run, we are able to determine what percent of requests to *test-server* were successful, and take action accordingly.

## Interpreting Results

Just as we have automated the process for running our evaluation tests, we have also automated the process for interpreting the results from these tests. As all of the results from our evaluation tests are stored in InfluxDB, we need to write a script that retrieves these results in aggregated 1 minute intervals, sums ERU and QoS for each observation, and generates graphs and summary statistics comparing the difference in the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling. We run this same script for all combinations of traffic pattern and pod initialization time that we are interested in. A more in-depth discussion of the analysis performed and the combinations of traffic pattern and pod initialization time that we wish to test will occur in the section 5.6.

## 5.6 Results

With our test information generated, and the architecture for processing our test information in place, we can now interpret our results to determine the impact of predictive auto-scaling.

### 5.6.1 Impact of Predictive Auto-scaling

As has been discussed in the previous sections, we are interested in visualizing and understanding the difference in performance between predictive and horizontal auto-scaling for one pod initialization time and four different traffic patterns. As such, we have four different tests on which we compare ERU and QoS: step-ladder traffic pattern with 135s pod initialization time, jagged-edge traffic pattern with 135s pod initialization time, increase-decrease traffic pattern with 135s pod initialization time and flash-crowd traffic pattern with 135s pod initialization time.

For each test on the matrix, we provide two different sources of information. First, we generate a graph comparing the summation of ERU and QoS across the evaluation time for predictive and reactive auto-scaling. Additionally, we provide statistical measurements for the difference of predictive and reactive auto-scaling at the same point in the evaluation sequence (i.e. we compare the summation of ERU and QoS after 10 minutes for predictive with the summation of ERU and QoS after 10 minutes for reactive). With respect to statistical measurements, we calculate a one-sided p-value based on the null hypothesis that the difference between the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling is 0. As we are interested in seeing if predictive auto-scaling performs better than reactive auto-scaling, we calculate a one-sided p-value,  $p$ , with the alternative hypothesis that the difference between the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling is greater than 0. We test for significance at the 5% significance level, meaning that if  $p < 0.05$ , we can reject our null hypothesis in favor of our alternative hypothesis that predictive auto-scaling performs better than reactive auto-scaling for this combination of traffic pattern and pod initialization time.

#### 135s and step-ladder

Figure 5.5 contains a graph showing predictive and reactive auto-scaling's different summations of efficient resource utilization and quality of service over the course of trial. The traffic pattern super imposed below reflects the load placed on the sample application, indicating the effect of the traffic pattern on the summation of ERU and QoS. Given the larger the summation of ERU and QoS the more desirable, times when the predictive line rises above the reactive line reflect moments at which predictive auto-scaling is outperforming reactive auto-scaling. Specifically, we can see three moments, labelled 1, 2, and 3 on the graph, in which predictive auto-scaling is particularly effective in comparison to reactive auto-scaling. These moments help reveal a true strength of predictive auto-scaling. While reactive auto-scaling under provisions because it purely predicts based on the current moment, predictive auto-scaling is able to recognize the general linearly upward pattern and auto-scale accordingly. As such, the predictively auto-scaled application always has the resources it needs to remain performant, as can be seen when examining the comparison of just negated QoS in






Figure 5.5: A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder

Figure 5.7.<sup>8</sup> Finally, there is no cost in ERU for auto-scaling, as can be seen when we just compare ERU in Figure 5.7.<sup>9</sup> Overall, the included graphs clearly demonstrate the benefits of predictive auto-scaling for this traffic pattern.

While Figure 5.5 shows the benefits of predictive auto-scaling on the *step-ladder* traffic pattern, we are additionally interested in knowing if said benefits are statically significant. As can be seen

<sup>8</sup>Again, because we negated QoS when showing this graph, the larger the negated QoS measure, the more performant the application, so it is desirable for the predictive line to rise above the reactive line.

<sup>9</sup>This observation holds true throughout the majority of the thesis. When the summation of predictive and reactive auto-scaling diverges, it is because in variation of QoS. ERU stays relatively constant between the two, which is necessary because it shows QoS improvements are not coming at the cost of decreased ERU. Thus for the remainder of the traffic patterns we show only the summation of ERU and QoS with the understanding that predominately QoS is contributing.




Figure 5.6: A comparison of negated ERU for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder

from the summary statistics in Table 5.1, with a p-value of .315 we are not able to reject our null hypothesis that there is no difference between the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling in favor of our alternative hypothesis that there is a positive difference in the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling. Essentially, this p-value indicates that if there was truly no different between predictive and reactive auto-scaling, we could expect to get these results about three out of ten times we ran trials. Additionally, for the remainder of our trials with different traffic patterns we were unable to obtain statistical significance. This lack of statistical significance is likely the result of too little data, given that we only ran one trial for each traffic-pattern, instead of combining the results of multiple trials. Additionally, it may also be the case that the inclusion of buffer periods, and periods when the requests per second are sufficiently

Table 5.1: Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder

Measure	Value
p-value	0.315
z-score	0.482
std_dev	1.084
mean	0.522




Figure 5.7: A comparison of negated QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, step-ladder

low such that only one pod needs to exist, is muting the differences that occur when auto-scaling begins.

### 135s and jagged-edge

Figure 5.8 contains a graph showing predictive and reactive auto-scaling’s different summations of efficient resource utilization and quality of service over the course of the *jagged-edge* trial. The traffic pattern super imposed below reflects the load placed on the sample application, indicating the effect of the traffic pattern on the summation of ERU and QoS. Again, we significant times for which predictive auto-scaling has a higher summation of ERU and QoS, and as such is outperforming reactive auto-scaling. The decrease in the summation of ERU and QoS for reactive auto-scaling, labelled with the 2 on the graph, again reflects the advantageous of predictive auto-scaling’s ability to understand the general linear pattern and not drastically under-provision as the result of temporary downturns.

Again, while Figure 5.8 shows the benefits of predictive auto-scaling on the *jagged-edge* traffic pattern, Table 5.2 shows that we are unfortunately not able to claim statistical significance with respect to these results.




Figure 5.8: A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, jagged-edge

### 135s and increase-decrease

Figure 5.9 contains a graph showing predictive and reactive auto-scaling’s different summations of efficient resource utilization and quality of service over the course of the *increase-decrease* trial. In contrast to our previous two traffic patterns, we find that predictive auto-scaling is not particularly beneficial in this context. Specifically, if we look at the moment labelled 1 on 5.9, we an instance in which predictive auto-scaling suffers a severe performance decrease in comparison to reactive auto-scaling. We trace this decrease again to under-provisioning. In this scenario, the introductory buffer period has caused our linear prediction algorithm to underestimate the slope of the line indicating the rise in load. As such, the reactive auto-scaling algorithm actually has a more aggressive opinion of the load the application will face. As this aggressive understanding is confirmed by our actual increase, reactive auto-scaling outperforms predictive auto-scaling on the *increase-decrease* traffic-pattern.

Table 5.2: Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, jagged-edge

Measure	Value
p-value	0.374
z-score	0.320
std_dev	1.062
mean	0.340




Figure 5.9: A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, increase-decrease

Figure 5.9 shows that predictive auto-scaling is actually slightly detrimental on the *increase-decrease* traffic pattern, Still, Table 5.3 shows that we are not able to claim statistical significance with respect to these results, and thus should not be too confident that prediction plays a negative effect. Rather, it appears to have very little impact in either direction on this traffic pattern.

Table 5.3: Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, increase-decrease

Measure	Value
p-value	0.638
z-score	-.0352
std_dev	0.680
mean	-0.234

### 135s and flash-crowd




Figure 5.10: A comparison of the summation of ERU and QoS for predictive and reactive auto-scaling for 135s, flash-crowd

Figure 5.10 contains a graph showing predictive and reactive auto-scaling’s different summations of efficient resource utilization and quality of service over the course of the *flash-crowd* trial. Again, we find that predictive auto-scaling is not particularly beneficial in this context. Specifically, if we look at the moment labelled 1 on 5.10, we see another instance in which predictive auto-scaling suffers a severe performance decrease because of under-provisioning. Because this traffic pattern occurs over such a short interval, the predictive auto-scaling algorithm is unable to fully recognize and respond

to the flash crowd, and is instead hampered by previous measurements with a significantly lesser slope. Our line-of-best-fit for prediction has too small a slope, and thus predictive auto-scaling functions worse than reactive auto-scaling.

Table 5.4: Difference in Predictive and Reactive Auto-scaling for 135s, flash-crowd

Measure	Value
p-value	0.802
z-score	-.850
std_dev	0.685
mean	-0.591

Figure 5.10 shows that predictive auto-scaling is fairly detrimental on the *flash-crowd* traffic pattern. Given Table 5.4, we are still not able to claim statistical significance with respect to these results, but we should be fairly confident that this current iteration of predictive auto-scaling is not an advisable addition when expecting flash crowds.

### 5.6.2 Scenarios

Given the evaluation of a typical application benefiting from horizontal auto-scaling on four distinct test patterns, we can comment on the general scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling is effective and beneficial, and the situations in which reactive auto-scaling is either less effective or detrimental.

To begin, we consider when predictive auto-scaling is less effective. Predictive auto-scaling offers little distinction from reactive auto-scaling when the pod initialization time approaches 0s. Thus, predictive auto-scaling is not particularly interesting for containerized web server applications. This lack of difference is particularly noticeable given the multi-minute threshold Kubernetes imposes between when auto-scalings can occur. Our decision to not even evaluate a 5s pod initialization time reflected our understanding of the lack of utility for predictive auto-scaling for web servers that start particularly quickly.

Predictive auto-scaling has a greater positive and negative impact with a longer pod initialization time, as we saw when auto-scaling on an application simulating downloading shard data. From our graphs, we could see repeatable performance differences, and scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling offered the most benefits and scenarios in which reactive auto-scaling offered the most benefits. Specifically, predictive auto-scaling performed well in comparison when there were general long-trending linear patterns which it could recognize. This benefit was particularly noticeable with respect to reactive auto-scaling when there were temporary deviations from the pattern, such as in *step-ladder* and *jagged-edge*. Reactive auto-scaling would not be able to detect these as deviations, and would misallocate accordingly, while predictive auto-scaling would stay true to the overall pattern.

In contrast, predictive auto-scaling at times suffered when it was too eager to recognize patterns or when multiple patterns existed and we used observations from the previous pattern to try and predict the new pattern. The troublesome impacts of this improper prediction can be seen in the *increase-decrease* and *flash-crowd* traffic patterns.

In the end, predictive auto-scaling presents a choice. If one is fairly confident one's application load will face load following a fairly consistent linear pattern,<sup>10</sup> then predictive auto-scaling is a powerful tool. Again, we could expect this consistency in the instances we describe as being reflected by the *step-ladder* and *jagged-edge* patterns, such as individuals consistently entering a video streaming website to watch a regularly scheduled video. If one's application load will vary between different patterns, or has no pattern in any form, than predictive auto-scaling does not make sense as a solution. It will actively deny reality to try and conform to whatever pattern it best recognizes, which can have negative results. Again, this difficulty is particularly reflected in traffic patterns like *flash-crowd*, suggesting this iteration of predictive auto-scaling may not be the best idea for news providers, or other similar applications.

## 5.7 Summary

In all, our evaluation makes a number of contributions. First, it outlines the evaluatory goals of our thesis and how they are to be measured. It then discusses in depth how we measure the success of our implementation, through ERU, QoS, and the sum of ERU and QoS. It then introduces reactive auto-scaling as the predominant control group, and different traffic patterns and pod initialization times as the predominant independent variables. It highlights a representative application and pod initialization time on which to perform our evaluation. It also describes the considerable tooling created to make evaluation possible, and the process for using said tools. Finally, it discusses our results, which shows scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling is beneficial compared to reactive auto-scaling, and extrapolates the real-world impacts of our specific results.

---

<sup>10</sup>Again, one of the first components of future work would be expanding our prediction beyond just linear lines-of-best-fit, in which case the possible patterns predictive auto-scaling would be useful for would drastically expand.



## Chapter 6

# Conclusion

With our changes postulated, enacted, and evaluated, we can now consider avenues for future exploration of this topic, before conducting one more broad overview of the contributions of this thesis.

### 6.1 Future Work

While this thesis accomplishes much in the realm of auto-scaling, and more specifically predictive auto-scaling, there are multiple exciting paths available for future exploration. Predominately these paths relate to expanding our implementation of predictive auto-scaling, as well as expanding the conditions under which we perform evaluation. Hopefully this process will be positively cyclical in that new types of evaluation will engender new implementation variables, which will enable new avenues for evaluation, and so on.

First off, it would be fascinating to consider alternative traffic patterns. Both of the increase-decrease and flash-crowd test plans are linear, yet real world network traffic does not always follow a linear pattern. Thus it would be fascinating to analyze the performance of predictive auto-scaling when the traffic pattern is polynomial, exponential, logarithmic, etc. Furthermore, it would be fascinating to identify real-world use cases in which auto-scaling is particularly important, for example news websites, video streaming services, and e-commerce retailers. We could then partner with websites in these categories to obtain their real world traffic patterns. Utilizing these real-world patterns for evaluation would give us tremendous insight into the real-world scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling is effective and the real-world scenarios in which it is equivalent, or worse, than reactive auto-scaling.

This recognition of alternative traffic patterns suggests implementing different prediction mechanisms as another exciting avenue for future work. As the traffic patterns on which we evaluate our predictive auto-scaling implementation are no longer strictly linear, we expect our linear line-of-best-fit method for predictive future resource utilization will be significantly less accurate. As a result of this decreased accuracy, we would expect predictive auto-scaling to perform substantially worse. Fortunately, a number of opportunities exist for addressing the inability of a simple linear line-of-best-fit to model a variety of different traffic patterns. First, instead of only creating a linear

line of best fit, we could create a number of line of best fits, modeling the different possible equations for a line, and then choose the one that best explained our observations so far. Additionally, given more divergent real-world traffic patterns, we may wish to examine the applicability of machine learning algorithms to the problem of predicting future resource utilization. Machine learning algorithms could be particularly useful in those scenarios in which traffic follows a repeatable pattern, yet that pattern does not fit nicely within the category of a polynomial, exponential, or logarithmic equation. Finally, even if we remain only processing a singular linear line-of-best-fit, currently we record only the average per pod CPU utilization, and make predictions accordingly. We could also experiment with recording total CPU utilization across all pods, and meaning that CPU utilizations which were seen when more pods existed would have a greater effect on prediction. It remains to be seen what the subsequent results of such a modification would be. Such improvements to our ability to accurately predict future resource utilization would vastly expand the scope under which predictive auto-scaling would be useful and should greatly increase the benefits of predictive auto-scaling in relation to reactive auto-scaling.

In a similar vein, we mentioned how the previous implementation of a threshold time interval that must be observed between scalings was at times conceivably detrimental to the performance of predictive auto-scaling. It would be interesting to vary the length of this interval, in order to determine if it is possible to maintain the benefits of such an interval in preventing thrashing, while also diminishing any negative impacts on predictive auto-scaling. Again, this analysis would be dependent on the given traffic patterns on which we are analyzing predictive and reactive auto-scaling.

Additionally, as was previously mentioned, when work on this thesis began, Kubernetes only supported scaling based on CPU utilization. Yet, since then, it is now possible to auto-scale with respect to custom metrics such as memory usage. While our current auto-scaling implementation only works for CPU utilization, the general algorithm should work, with small modifications, for any metric that can be reactively auto-scaled. Particularly interesting would be auto-scaling with respect to network congestion on the pod.

We previously mentioned in this thesis how we predictively auto-scaled only when the application was up-scaling (i.e. increasing the number of replica applications). When the auto-scaling was down-scaling, meaning the current resource utilization was less than previous observations, we did not auto-scale predictively due to a difficulty in determining the amount of time it took for a replica pod to stop sharing in work. Again, when down-scaling, predictive auto-scaling worked exactly as reactive auto-scaling does. Given we predictively auto-scale in only half of the possible situations for auto-scaling, it would be interesting to begin tracking the amount of time it takes for replica pods to stop sharing in the computational work,  $t$ , and down-scale predictively based on predictions of the application's state at time  $t_{now} + t$ . In scenarios in which predictive auto-scaling is beneficial, predictively down-scaling, in addition to predictively up-scaling, should double the benefits of predictive auto-scaling in improving the summation of ERU and QoS.

Fortunately, the majority of the tooling we built for this thesis is general enough to be used for the majority of our areas of future exploration. Furthermore, care was taken to implement predictive auto-scaling in an easily extensible manor. As both the predictive auto-scaling implementation, and

the testing infrastructure for performing evaluations are open-sourced, any interested individual should be able to contribute to future work.

Finally, one of the most important goals of this thesis remains as future work. Much of the initial excitement about Kubernetes arose from its status as an increasingly popular open-source application. While our predictive auto-scaling implementation has not yet been merged into the Kubernetes master branch, we remain working with core Kubernetes engineers to continue to implementation process, and are excited about the potential for such contributions happening.

## 6.2 Summary of Contributions

This thesis makes a number of contributions to distributed systems, cluster managers, auto-scaling and Kubernetes. Most importantly, we posited, implemented, and evaluated predictive auto-scaling in Kubernetes. To begin, we formalized the problem of auto-scaling, suggesting a consistent definition of what success in auto-scaling looks like. Next, we conceived of a modification to the reactive auto-scaling algorithm to support predictive auto-scaling in Kubernetes. Then, we implemented our proposal, which will hopefully be part of the general Kubernetes code base soon. Next, we built an extensive test frame work for evaluating predictive auto-scaling. These evaluatory efforts provided greater insight into when predictive auto-scaling is and is not effective and beneficial as measured through improving the summation of efficient resource utilization and quality of service. Finally, we suggested a number of avenues to continue exploring predictive auto-scaling in Kubernetes, and cluster managers in general. Overall, we took one more step along the path of making distributed systems more accessible and reliable, which enables the solving of ever larger and more important problems.

## Chapter 7

# Appendix

### 7.1 Accessing Code

As a popular open-source project, Kubernetes codes is rapidly changing. Thus it does not make sense to include significant portions of the Kubernetes code in this section. However, the modifications made to this thesis are all publicly accessible on our fork of the Kubernetes project, with the eventual hope that they will additionally be available on the Kubernetes master branch. The code can be found at <https://github.com/mattjmcnaughton/kubernetes/tree/add-predictive-autoscaling>.

Almost all of the modifications made over the course of this thesis occurred in the `pkg/controller/podautoscaler`.

Additionally, all of the code written to perform the evaluations is open-source. It can be found at <https://github.com/mattjmcnaughton/thesis/tree/master/evaluation>.

# Bibliography

- [1] Amazon ec2. <https://aws.amazon.com/ec2/>.
- [2] Amazon web services. <https://aws.amazon.com/>.
- [3] Apache jmeter. <http://jmeter.apache.org/>.
- [4] Auto scaling developer guide. <http://aws.amazon.com/documentation/autoscaling/>.
- [5] Automatic ballooning. <http://www.linux-kvm.org/page/Projects/auto-ballooning>.
- [6] Elasticsearch. <https://www.elastic.co/>.
- [7] Getting started: Get started running, deploying, and using kubernetes. <http://kubernetes.io/docs/getting-started-guides/>.
- [8] Google compute engine. <https://cloud.google.com/compute/>.
- [9] Google container engine. <https://cloud.google.com/container-engine/docs/>.
- [10] Import some data. <https://www.elastic.co/guide/en/kibana/3.0/import-some-data.html>.
- [11] Influxdb pricing. <https://customers.influxdb.com/pricing>.
- [12] Introduction: Pid controller design. <http://ctms.engin.umich.edu/CTMS/index.php?example=Introduction&sec>
- [13] Kubernetes compute resources. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/user-guide/compute-resources.html>.
- [14] Kubernetes design overview. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/design/README.html>.
- [15] Kubernetes horizontal pod autoscaler object. <https://github.com/kubernetes/kubernetes/blob/release-1.2/docs/design/horizontal-pod-autoscaler.md>.
- [16] Kubernetes horizontal pod autoscaler proposal. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/design/horizontal-pod-autoscaler.html>.
- [17] Kubernetes horizontal pod autoscaler user guide. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/user-guide/horizontal-pod-autoscaler.html>.

- [18] Kubernetes kubectl annotate. <https://cloud.google.com/container-engine/docs/kubectl/annotate>.
- [19] Kubernetes limit range. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/admin/limitrange/README.html>.
- [20] Kubernetes pod states. <http://kubernetes.io/docs/user-guide/pod-states/>.
- [21] Kubernetes pods documentation. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.0/docs/user-guide/pods.html>.
- [22] Kubernetes replication controllers. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.0/docs/user-guide/replication-controller.html>.
- [23] Kubernetes services. <http://kubernetes.io/v1.0/docs/user-guide/services.html>.
- [24] Kubernetes v1 released - cloud native computing foundation to drive container innovation. <http://googlecloudplatform.blogspot.com/2015/07/Kubernetes-V1-Released.html>.
- [25] Kubernetes website. <http://kubernetes.io>.
- [26] Kubernetes working with containers. <http://kubernetes.io/docs/user-guide/production-pods/>.
- [27] Linear regression tutorial for biology 231. [http://www.radford.edu/~rsheehy/Gen\\_flash/Tutorials/Linear\\_Regression/reg-tut.htm](http://www.radford.edu/~rsheehy/Gen_flash/Tutorials/Linear_Regression/reg-tut.htm).
- [28] Microsoft azure. <https://azure.microsoft.com/en-us/>.
- [29] Running kubernetes on aws ec2. <http://kubernetes.io/docs/getting-started-guides/aws/>.
- [30] Spring by pivotal. <https://spring.io/>.
- [31] Throughput shaping timer. <http://jmeter-plugins.org/wiki/ThroughputShapingTimer/>.
- [32] What is kubernetes? <http://kubernetes.io/v1.1/docs/whatisk8s.html>.
- [33] BAKER, M., AND BUYYA, R. Cluster computing: the commodity supercomputer. *Software-Practice and Experience* 29, 6 (1999), 551–76.
- [34] BECKMAN, P. H. Building the teragrid. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 363, 1833 (2005), 1715–1728.
- [35] CORPORATION, I. D. The digital universe of opportunities: Rich data and the increasing value of the internet of things, 2014.
- [36] COULOURIS, G., DOLLIMORE, J., KINDBERG, T., AND BLAIR, G. *Distributed Systems: Concepts and Design*, 5th ed. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, USA, 2011.
- [37] FOX, A., GRIBBLE, S. D., CHAWATHE, Y., BREWER, E. A., AND GAUTHIER, P. Cluster-based scalable network services. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* 31, 5 (Oct. 1997), 78–91.

- [38] HINDMAN, B., KONWINSKI, A., ZAHARIA, M., GHODSI, A., JOSEPH, A. D., KATZ, R., SHENKER, S., AND STOICA, I. Mesos: A platform for fine-grained resource sharing in the data center. In *Proceedings of the 8th USENIX Conference on Networked Systems Design and Implementation* (Berkeley, CA, USA, 2011), NSDI'11, USENIX Association, pp. 295–308.
- [39] ISARD, M. Autopilot: Automatic data center management. *SIGOPS Oper. Syst. Rev.* 41, 2 (Apr. 2007), 60–67.
- [40] JACOBSON, D., YUAN, D., AND JOSHI, N. Scryer: Netflix's predictive auto scaling engine, 2013.
- [41] LORIDO-BOTRÁN, T., MIGUEL-ALONSO, J., AND LOZANO, J. A. Auto-scaling Techniques for Elastic Applications in Cloud Environments. Research EHU-KAT-IK, Department of Computer Architecture and Technology, UPV/EHU, 2012.
- [42] MATTHIAS, K., AND KANE, S. *Docker Up & Running: Shipping Reliable Containers in Production*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., California, USA, 2015.
- [43] NEWMAN, S. *Building Microservices: Designing Fine-Grained Systems*. O'Reilly Media, Inc., California, USA, 2015.
- [44] SCHWARZKOPF, M., KONWINSKI, A., ABD-EL-MALEK, M., AND WILKES, J. Omega: flexible, scalable schedulers for large compute clusters. In *SIGOPS European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)* (Prague, Czech Republic, 2013), pp. 351–364.
- [45] TANENBAUM, A. S., AND STEEN, M. V. *Distributed Systems: Principles and Paradigms (2Nd Edition)*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 2006.
- [46] VAVILAPALLI, V. K., MURTHY, A. C., DOUGLAS, C., AGARWAL, S., KONAR, M., EVANS, R., GRAVES, T., LOWE, J., SHAH, H., SETH, S., SAHA, B., CURINO, C., O'MALLEY, O., RADIA, S., REED, B., AND BALDESCHWIELER, E. Apache hadoop yarn: Yet another resource negotiator. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Symposium on Cloud Computing* (New York, NY, USA, 2013), SOCC '13, ACM, pp. 5:1–5:16.
- [47] VERMA, A., PEDROSA, L., KORUPOLU, M., OPPENHEIMER, D., TUNE, E., AND WILKES, J. Large-scale cluster management at google with borg. In *Proceedings of the Tenth European Conference on Computer Systems* (New York, NY, USA, 2015), EuroSys '15, ACM, pp. 18:1–18:17.
- [48] VERMA, A., PEDROSA, L., KORUPOLU, M. R., OPPENHEIMER, D., TUNE, E., AND WILKES, J. Large-scale cluster management at Google with Borg. In *Proceedings of the European Conference on Computer Systems (EuroSys)* (Bordeaux, France, 2015).
- [49] YUAN, D., JOSHI, N., JACOBSON, D., AND OBERAI, P. Scryer: Netflix's predictive auto scaling engine - part 2, 2013.