

## **Practical and White-Box Anomaly Detection through Unsupervised and Active Learning**

Yao Wang wangyao18@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

1

# Background

> Enterprises rely on complex systems

- Systems are made up by many hardware and software
- There exists many component dependencies and call relationships
- The required operation and maintenance manpower grows with the expansion of scale

#### ➢ Failure occurs from time to time

- Bad impact on business, resulting in loss of users
- Faults may spread between components
- The loss increases as the fault continues



## System failure affects business







On March 3, 2019, some ECS servers in the Alibaba Cloud North China region appeared IO HANG, and a large number of Internet company websites/Apps were paralyzed. On the evening of April 23, 2019, the Ctrip App was down, and many services such as hotel, ticket search, and reservations were down for more than 2 hours. On October 22, 2019, the GitHub database failed, some data was inconsistent with the latest version, which lasted more than 24 hours.

#### The key to finding faults: anomaly detection

75% of fault recovery time is used for fault detection<sup>[1]</sup>

Timely/real-time anomaly detection can improve the timeliness of fault detection, which is the key to troubleshooting and ensuring stable operation of the system.



[1] da Rocha Fonseca, Paulo Cesar, and Edjard Souza Mota. "A survey on fault management in software-defined networks." *IEEE Communications Surveys & Tutorials* 19.4 (2017): 2284-2321.

## **Key Performance Indicator**

#### Data source

- Network (Traffic, Bandwidth)
- Business (PV, Response Time)
- Metric (CPU usage, Mem usage)
- Application (Database, MiddleWare, JVM, .etc)



#### Data Format

• Time Series Data

#### Data

KPI-A,Timestamp1,ValueA1 KPI-A,Timestamp2,ValueA2 KPI-B,Timestamp1,ValueB1 KPI-B,Timestamp2,ValueB2

## Definition

#### Anomaly

- Violation of the obvious law of historical data over the same period
- Large spike in a short time
- Strend change, and beyond a certain range compared with historical data
- Detection: Identify the above anomalies through a specific method



## Challenges

♦ KPI varies: Periodicity, glitches, missing data……

- Avoid the reappearance of false positive
- Limited resources
- ◆ Amount of KPI is rapidly growing
- ◆ Lack of labels

#### [ACM IMC'15] Opprentice<sup>[2]</sup>

Supervised learning, relying on labels, using Random Forest to select suitable features from a large number of detectors.



[2] Dapeng Liu, Youjian Zhao, Haowen Xu, Opprentice: Towards Practical and Automatic Anomaly Detection Through Machine Learning, ACM IMC 2015, Tokyo, Japan, Oct 2015.

#### [WWW'18] Donut<sup>[3]</sup>

Unsupervised learning, using variational autoencoder (VAE) to build deep generative models, can obtain very accurate detection results on periodic KPI data.



[3] Haowen Xu, Wenxiao Chen, Nengwen Zhao, Unsupervised Anomaly Detection via Variational Auto-Encoder for Seasonal KPIs in Web Applications, **WWW 2018**, Lyon, France, 23-27 April 2018

#### [IPCCC'18] Bagel<sup>[4]</sup>

Improve some defects of Donut, add time information to reconstruct the normal mode of KPI, add random inactivation layer to avoid overfitting, and thus improve the detection effect of strong time-related anomalies.



[4] Zeyan Li, Wenxiao Chen, Dan Pei, Robust and Unsupervised KPI Anomaly Detection Based on Conditional Variational Autoencoder, **IPCCC 2018**, Orlando, Florida, USA, November 17-19, 2018.

## **Comparison summary**

	Traditional statistical learning	Supervised learning	Traditional unsupervised learning	Unsupervised deep learning model	RRCF- Active
Adapt to KPI variations	Bad	Good	Normal	Good	Good
Low tuning overhead	Bad	Good	Good	Normal	Good
Low labeling overhead	Good	Bad	Good	Good	Good
Fast	Good	Normal	Normal	Normal	Good
Require less resources	Good	Normal	Good	Bad	Good
Learn artificial experience	Bad	Good	Normal	Bad	Good

# **RRCF-Active Architecture**



## **Algorithm Design**

Challenge: High-quality labels are difficult to obtain in actual scenes

There are **too many KPIs** to label, and each KPI has a long time span. I will miss many anomalies, and the selecting operations on the timeline are easy to mislabel.

Possible anomalies have been selected, just **click to confirm** whether it is correct or not?



Unsupervised learning
Improve labeling
efficiency by actively
learning recommended

labels

### **Algorithm Design**





Donut/Bagel



Statistical learning method based on regression





High consumption of training resources and high requirements for KPI periodicity

. . . . . .

Need to carefully adjust the parameters

Can't support precise intervention for a single case

Re-Train Slightly adjustment



#### **Optimization – Feature Selection**



## Challenge: The algorithm has **poor** adaptability to different KPIs

FEATURES AND THEIR APPLICABLE CONDITIONS

Feature	Applicable Condition
Median	Few spikiness [29]
Standard deviation	Stationary
Difference from previous period point	Seasonal
Difference from previous point	Trendiness
Second-order difference from the first point	Meet the above 4 points
Third-order exponential average	Predictability

#### **Optimization – Node Cut Dimension Selection**



Cut Feature selection affects decision tree quality

#### **Optimization – Node Cut Threshold Selection**



- 1) Divide the feature extracted from the training set into N intervals  $[l_0, h_0, l_1, h_1, \dots, l_{N-1}, h_{N-1}]$
- 2) Compute the density of feature in every interval  $d_i = Count(p, p \in [l_i, h_i])$
- 3) Choose a random interval *i* proportional to  $\frac{d_i}{\sum_i d_i}$
- 4) Choose  $X_i \sim Uniform[l_i, h_i]$

#### **Optimization – Anomaly Score Calculation**



- 1) Find the leaf node Node of the sample  $x_i$  in each tree T
- 2) Count the number of samples in the subtree rooted by sibling and parent of *Node*, denoted by  $S_{Node.sibling}$  and  $S_{Node.parent}$ , and calculate  $CoDisp_{Node} = \frac{S_{Node.sibling}}{S_{Node.parent}}$
- 3) Go up one level in the tree, Node = Node. parent
- 4) Repeat 2 to 3 for N times, where N is the number of features used
- 5)  $CoDisp_T$  is the max value of each  $CoDisp_{Node}$
- 6) The final  $CoDisp_{x_i}$  for sample  $x_i$  is  $\overline{CoDisp_T}, T \in forest$

$$CoDisp_{Node} = rac{S_{Node.sibling}}{S_{Node.parent} imes Node.depth}$$

19

#### **Optimization – Active Learning**

#### Challenge: Adjust algorithm through labels



**Recommand strategy** 

#### **Require:** 1: Number of trees in forest m2: Number of labels n3: Anomaly score metric $CoDisp_M[i][j]$ for label *i* calculated from tree j4: labels provided by users label 5: function GET TREE WEIGHT $(m, n, CoDisp_M, label)$ $tw \leftarrow Zeros(1, m)$ 6: for $i = 0 \rightarrow n$ do 7: if label[i] == 1 then 8: $tw[:] \leftarrow tw[:] + \delta \times CoDisp_M[i,:]$ 9: end if 10: end for 11: return tw 12. 13: end function

Algorithm 2 Update Weight of Trees based on Labels

20





#### **Distance: Dynamic Time Wrapping Clustering: DBSCAN**

29 KPIs -> 12 Group

#### **Model Update Process**

Algorithm 1 Obtain Anomaly Score and Update Model					
<b>Require:</b> New data point $p$ , the original tree $tree$					
1: function GET SCORE(p, tree)					
2: $Node \leftarrow tree.root$					
3: <b>if</b> $isinstance(Node, LEAF)$ <b>then</b>					
4: <b>if</b> $p$ is <i>extreme</i> or already skip 100 points <b>then</b>					
5: $INSERT_POINT(p, tree)$					
6: end if					
7: return $CODISP(p)$					
8: end if					
9: <b>if</b> $p[Node.dim] \le Node.threshold$ <b>then</b>					
10: return GET SCORE $(p, Node.left)$					
11: <b>else</b>					
12: <b>return</b> GET SCORE(p, Node.right)					
13: <b>end if</b>					
14: end function					

 At least Update for every 100 points
Only use extreme points to update (first anomaly in a continuous segment or a normal but extreme value)

#### **Evaluation**



#### **OVERALL PERFORMANCE**

Method	Best F1-score		Train Time		Detection Time	
	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\alpha$	$\beta$	$\alpha$	$  \beta$
Donut	0.72	0.46	10.9	1.7	2.1	0.43
IF-Active	0.76	0.58	1.4	0.43	1.2	0.25
<b>Isolation Forest</b>	0.58	0.28	0.17	0.09	0.11	0.06
Random Forest	0.69	0.44	0.4	0.14	0.5	0.07
Original RRCF	0.70	0.31	0.48	0.37	12.1	3.8
iRRCF-Active	0.89	0.81	0.93	0.88	7.8	1.6

# 7 months29 KPIs1 min sampling interval



# Thank you!

Yao Wang 2020/07