Making your Automation a Better Team Player
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Operators are very special users of software
Cognitive Work

- Understanding
- Planning
- Problem solving
- Analysing and Synthesising
- Judging
Joint Cognitive Systems

Systems where computers and humans collaborate on cognitive work.

JCS is all about thinking about cognitive systems as a whole - not as discrete parts done by humans or by computers.
MABA-MABA or Abracadabra?
Progress on human-automation coordination

Abstract

In this paper we argue that substitution-based function allocation methods (such as MABA-MABA, or Men-Are-Better-At/Machines-Are-Better-At lists) cannot provide progress on human-automation coordination. Quantitative “who does what” allocation does not work because the real effects of automation are qualitative: it transforms human practice and forces people to adapt their skills and routines. Rather than re-inventing or refining substitution-based methods, we propose that the more pressing question on human-automation coordination is “how do we make them get along together”.
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“I think the key thing is that you’re enabling people to do what people are really, really good at, and you’re enabling machines to do what machines are really, really good at.”

– Trae Stephens, Anduril
“Robots will be able to do everything better than us.”

– Elon Musk
Ironies of Automation*
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Abstract—This paper discusses the ways in which automation of industrial processes may expand rather than eliminate problems with the human operator. Some comments will be made on methods of alleviating these problems within the 'classic' approach of leaving the operator with responsibility for abnormal conditions, and on the potential for continued use of the human operator for on-line decision-making within human-computer collaboration.

designer errors can be a major source of operating problems. Unfortunately people who have collected data on this are reluctant to publish them, as the actual figures are difficult to interpret. (Some types of error may be reported more readily than others, and there may be disagreement about their origin.) The second irony is that the designer who tries to eliminate the operator still leaves the operator to do the tasks which the designer cannot think how to automate. It is this approach which causes the problems to be discussed here, as it means that the
Some examples of JCSes in Software

● Monitoring and alerting - Prometheus, Grafana, DataDog, etc
  ○ And your particular configurations
● CI/CD systems: Jenkins, ArgoCD, etc
● Config management: Chef, Terraform, Kubernetes operators, etc
● Orchestration: Kubernetes, autoscaling groups, systemd, etc
● Consoles and status pages for software infrastructure
● Runbooks and other kinds of operator documentation
● Logs and metrics that your systems emit
JOINT COGNITIVE SYSTEMS EVERYWHERE
Are we doing a good job?

Lily Cohen 🦊
@lily

7d ago

Bad news everyone. It is with immense regret that I write to inform you we have suffered a total loss of data for firefish.lgbt, musician.social, and outdoors.lgbt.

How did we get here?

During a routine #GitOps repository cleanup a subdirectory containing yaml manifests that create our namespaces was moved to directory not visible by ArgoCD. From Argo’s perspective, the directory and yaml manifests no longer existed so it went to do its job and clean things up. Had the directory just contained the manifests for the Helm deployments, this would have been okay as the Persistent Volume Claims would have persisted, but deleting a namespace deletes everything it contains.
Two Antipatterns to Avoid
Automation Surprise

“Why did it do that!?”
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Two leading causes of automation surprise

- **Autonomous processes** that don’t behave as intended
  - Push a bug in a reported metric, autoscale your systems into the ground automatically!

- **Human-triggered processes** that do things the user didn’t want
  - Example: taking down your systems with a terraform apply run by hand or a CD tool
Avoid scattered autonomous processing

- Autonomous automation scattered through lots of scripts and hooks and crons is very hard to manage
- Out of sight, out of mind is bad for autonomous tooling
  - Running as a full-fledged service
  - Status pages and alerting
- Behaviour should be predictable and as simple as possible
  - Avoid modes and other complexity
Example: Unattended upgrades

- Often enabled by default, and run close to the same time on all hosts
- No central coordination or validation
- Silent, but deadly - zero visibility to operators
- Occasionally breaks things badly
  - for example, Datadog, March 2023
Clearly display intended actions

- Status displays or uncluttered logs that show past actions and intended/scheduled future actions
  - Full details of execution steps - in order - with configuration values and all parameters
  - Estimated resource usage (e.g. API calls, quota, IP addresses) versus available resources
  - Other relevant context or warnings

- Operators should be able to suspend, cancel, or immediately trigger automated actions
Example: Terraform plan

Plan: 2 to add, 0 to change, 4 to destroy.
Example: TF hides warnings

“All our DNS configuration is managed in Terraform. Terraform is great for managing infrastructure as code, but in this case it made us miss a critical warning when trying to disable DNSSEC signing in Route53.”

Rafael Elvira, Slack

https://slack.engineering/what-happened-during-slacks-dnssec-rollout/
Example: Kube pod priorities

“The config for the new Cortex cluster did not include the new Pod Priorities, so all the new Pods were given the default priority, medium. There were not enough resources on the Kubernetes cluster to fit the new Cortex cluster, and the existing production Cortex cluster had not been updated to include the high priority designation for their Ingesters. As the new cluster’s Ingesters had medium priority (the default) and the existing production Pods had no priority, the new cluster’s Ingesters preempted an Ingester from the existing production Cortex cluster.

…. This triggered a cascading failure that eventually caused the preemption of all the Ingester Pods for the production Cortex clusters.”

Tom Wilkie, Grafana Labs

https://grafana.com/blog/2019/07/24/how-a-production-outage-was-caused-using-kubernetes-pod-priorities/
It looks like you’re trying to fix prod - can I roll back the last release for you?

Research shows that making specific recommendations tends to reduce the ability of humans to generate alternative hypotheses.

In troubleshooting, it’s important not to get too attached to any hypothesis, but to keep an open mind until the failure mechanism is clear.
Be careful with suggestions and recommendations

- Lots of automated root-cause detection software systems - AIOps hype cycle continues
- Can be useful, but can also be wrong
- This also applies to lower-tech systems - like runbooks!
  - Say ‘This has been caused by XYZ in the past and here is how to check’ rather than ‘This alert is caused by XYZ’
- Related: reflexively blaming the network and not investigating further!
Providing ways to understand system behaviour is often more useful than targeted suggestions

“Participants formed, tested, and abandoned multiple hypotheses during their exploration of the anomaly and search for its sources. This work was quite fast and efficient; participants were quick to seek and use information, especially in the early stages of the response when the nature, extent, and severity of the anomaly was unknown. The earliest activities, however, did not appear to be hypothesis-driven but instead focused on hypothesis generation (Woods and Hollnagel 2006). These efforts were sweeping looks across the environment looking for cues.”

David Woods, STELLA report

https://snafucatchers.github.io/
todd underwood  19 hours ago
another one: “we have a lot of internal documentation about troubleshooting and fixing different issues. do you think LLM is the right why to make some smart/gpt-like bot that is trained on this data ?
would this be a valid use-case to train data yourself ?”

i think that applications like this are one of the most likely applications
Laura Nolan  19 hours ago
I really worry about that kind of usecase, are we going to be here in 2 years talking about the horrible incident because someone ran a command that a LLM told them to run and it made a giant mess
Who will eat humble pie?
or
There are two types of tool (in JCS theory)
“By providing a ready-to-go Kafka client, we ensured teams got up and running quickly, but we also abstracted some core concepts of Kafka a little too much, meaning that small unassuming configuration changes could have a big impact.

One such example led to partition skew (a large portion of messages being directed towards a single partition, meaning we were not processing messages in real time.”

Matt Boyle, Cloudflare

Building Amplifiers

Don’t try to hide complexity: actively try to help operators build a useful mental model of the system

- Summarise to avoid overwhelming operators
  - But avoid strongly suggesting causes for problems
- Provide ability to drill down and explore all the details (including exact times)
- Try to expose how things really work under the hood
- Explain why all automated actions are taken
- Make constraints and limitations clear
Use this ONE WEIRD trick when working on a JCS...
In order to take your SREing to the NEXT LEVEL!

[CLICK HERE]
Ask: How does this system help the operator build an accurate mental model of how it works?
Thank you!

Contact me:

- [laura@sre.is](mailto:laura@sre.is)
- [@lauralifts.bsky.social](https://www.bsky.social/@lauralifts) on BlueSky

Let’s be reliable together!

We’re looking forward to speaking with you. Book with Calendly or reach out to us:

[hello@sre.is](mailto:hello@sre.is)