



# CHAOSEATER: FULLY AUTOMATING CHAOS ENGINEERING WITH LARGE LANGUAGE MODELS


Daisuke Kikuta, Hiroki Ikeuchi, Kengo Tajiri, Yuusuke Nakano

NTT Corporation

[daisuke.kikuta@ntt.com](mailto:daisuke.kikuta@ntt.com)


## ABSTRACT

Chaos Engineering (CE) is an engineering technique aimed at improving the resiliency of distributed systems. It involves artificially injecting specific failures into a distributed system and observing its behavior in response. Based on the observation, the system can be proactively improved to handle those failures. Recent CE tools realize the automated execution of predefined CE experiments. However, defining these experiments and reconfiguring the system after the experiments still remain manual. To reduce the costs of the manual operations, we propose CHAOSEATER, a *system* for automating the entire CE operations with Large Language Models (LLMs). It pre-defines the general flow according to the systematic CE cycle and assigns subdivided operations within the flow to LLMs. We assume systems based on Infrastructure as Code (IaC), wherein the system configurations and artificial failures are managed through code. Hence, the LLMs' operations in our *system* correspond to software engineering tasks, including requirement definition, code generation and debugging, and testing. We validate our *system* through case studies on both small and large systems. The results demonstrate that our *system* significantly reduces both time and monetary costs while completing reasonable single CE cycles.

 **Project** : <https://ntt-dkiku.github.io/chaos-eater>

 **Code** : <https://github.com/ntt-dkiku/chaos-eater>

 **Demo** : <https://huggingface.co/spaces/ookiku/chaos-eater>

 **Video** : Coming soon

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Modern software-based services, such as streaming, e-commerce, and conversational AI platforms, are implemented as distributed systems, where each service is divided into smaller services according to specific functionalities. These small services (i.e., functions), along with the communication network that connects them, constitute the entire service. This design, known as microservice architecture (Bucchiarone et al., 2020), enables scalable and continuous deployment while supporting the integration of heterogeneous technologies. On the other hand, the complex dependencies among small services can lead to unexpected, chaotic behavior in the entire system from even minor failures. However, proactively predicting and addressing such complex behavior is challenging.

To address this and improve the resiliency of distributed systems, numerous organizations, including Netflix, Amazon, and Microsoft, have recently adopted Chaos Engineering (CE) (Basiri et al., 2016; 2019). Its concept is that *rather than predicting the chaotic behavior, let's observe it directly by artificially injecting the failures into the system*. Based on the observation, we can proactively rebuild a new system that is resilient to the assumed failures. Systematically, CE cycles through four phases for a system:

1. **Hypothesis**: Define steady states (i.e., normal behavior) of the system and injected failures. Then, make a hypothesis that *the steady states are maintained in the system even when the failures occur*.
2. **(Chaos) Experiment**: Inject the failures into the system while logging the system's response behavior.

3. **Analysis:** Analyze the logged data and check if the hypothesis is satisfied. If so, this CE cycle is finished here. If not, move to (4).
4. **Improvement:** Reconfigure the system to satisfy the hypothesis. The reconfigured system is tested again in (2) and (3), i.e., repeat (2) to (4) until the hypothesis is satisfied.

In recent years, several CE tools (Netflix, 2012; Amazon Web Services, 2021; Chaos Mesh, 2021; Microsoft, 2023) have advanced the automation of chaos-experiment execution. Moreover, monitoring tools (Prometheus, 2012; Grafana Labs, 2021) enable automating metric collection, aggregation, and threshold-based testing during chaos experiments. Hence, the *experiment* and *analysis* phases have been mostly automated. However, defining a hypothesis in the *hypothesis* phase, planning a chaos experiment to test the hypothesis in the *experiment* phase, and reconfiguring the system in the *improvement* phase still remain manual. These manual operations require a complex set of skills, including domain knowledge in networking and CE, the ability to interpret system configurations, logs, and error messages, as well as creative problem-solving for requirement definition, planning, and system reconfiguration. Consequently, while the costs of these operations remain high, their automation has not been achieved yet with existing algorithmic approaches.

We believe that Large Language Models (LLMs) are the key to overcoming this challenge. LLMs have recently shown promising capabilities across a wide range of tasks, including natural language processing, coding, and operations for networking (Zhao et al., 2023; Jiang et al., 2024; Ahmed et al., 2024; Piovesan et al., 2024). In more recent years, LLMs have also provided promising performance on software engineering (SE) benchmarks (Yang et al., 2024b; Cognition Labs, 2024). In the context of software-based systems configured by the Infrastructure as Code (IaC) paradigm, where the system configurations and artificial failures are managed through code, CE operations can be regarded as SE tasks. The *hypothesis* phase corresponds to a requirement definition to determine the resilience required for the system. In the *experiment* phase, planning an experiment corresponds to the design of testing, and running the experiment requires coding. The *analysis* corresponds to the verification of the tests. Lastly, the *improvement* phase corresponds to code debugging. Considering their general capabilities, domain knowledge in networking, and potential in SE, it is also expected that the automation of the entire CE cycle can be achieved with LLMs.

Here, we propose CHAOS EATER, a *system* for automating the entire CE cycle with LLMs. It pre-defines the general flow according to the systematic CE cycle and assigns subdivided CE operations within this flow to LLMs. The flow (i.e., CE cycle) then progresses by sequentially performing subdivided operations using the assigned LLMs, while processing data inputs and outputs through rule-based algorithms. Our *system* assumes CE for IaC-based systems, specifically Kubernetes (K8s) (Kubernetes, 2014) systems. In this paper, we present the flow design, rule-based algorithms, CE operations performed by LLMs, and the integration of the latter two to achieve the designed flow. In evaluation, we validate our *system* through case studies on both a small system and a large system. The results demonstrate that our *system* significantly reduces both time and monetary costs while completing a reasonable CE cycle. Lastly, we discuss the broader impacts, limitations, and future directions of our *system* based on this study.

The main contributions of this paper are organized as follows:

- We are the first to propose a *system* for automating the entire CE cycle with LLMs, which reduces time and monetary costs in a CE cycle. This proposal would be a starting point towards the full automation of system resilience improvement.
- We publicly release all code for our *system*. This release provides development practices for constructing complex systems that combine LLMs and rule-based algorithms.
- We validate our *system* through case studies and discuss its broader impacts, limitations, and future directions. The results demonstrate the new potential of LLMs in CE, while our discussion provides insights for advancing the full automation of CE.

## 2 PROPOSED SYSTEM: CHAOS EATER

In this section, we describe the technical details of CHAOS EATER. Figure 1 shows its simplified system diagram. It takes as input instructions for the CE cycle (optional) and a folder containing K8s manifests (Kubernetes, 2014) and a Skaffold configuration file (Google, 2019). In short, K8s manifests are system configuration files that define the resources (i.e., small services) that constitute




Figure 1: A simplified system diagram of CHAOS EATER and its input and output. CHAOS EATER autonomously completes the systematic CE cycle using internal agents and IaC tools. Note that only the representative inputs and outputs of agents are illustrated within the diagram. The two K8s clusters within the diagram refer to the same one.

a system, while a Skaffold configuration file defines the process to automatically deploy those resources in a K8s cluster. It then conducts a CE cycle for those inputs through five divided phases: pre-processing, *hypothesis*, *experiment*, *analysis*, *improvement*, and post-processing phases. Finally, it outputs a summary of the completed CE cycle and a modified folder containing K8s manifests that have been modified to satisfy the hypothesis defined in the *hypothesis* phase and their Skaffold configuration file.

To ensure that the LLMs perform as intended, our *system* fixes the general flow according to the systematic CE cycle. It then guides LLMs by assigning them subdivided CE operations within this flow. Hereafter, we define each LLM assigned a CE operation as an agent. Our *system* prepares prompt templates for each agent,<sup>1</sup> which include placeholders that can be dynamically filled with text. Therefore, once a user inputs the data, prompts for each agent are dynamically generated according to that data, and the internal agents autonomously complete the flow (i.e., CE cycle). To facilitate data processing within our *system*, all agents output JSON data. This is achieved by instructing agents in their input prompts to output text in JSON format, and then parsing the output text as JSON data. Our *system* uses the JSON output instruction and parser of LangChain (LangChain, 2023). Our *system* has 18 agents, 21 system prompts, 26 user prompts, and two AI prompts.<sup>2</sup> In the following sections, we describe the details of our *system*'s internal process from input to output, breaking it down into the five phases. See Appendix A for the detailed agentic workflow and all our *system*'s prompt templates.

## 2.1 PHASE 0: PRE-PROCESSING

Given user inputs, our *system* first deploys the user's system to the K8s cluster by running the Skaffold configuration file. Then, the agents sequentially process the user inputs as follows:

1. Summarize each of the input K8s manifests separately.
2. Identify potential issues for resiliency and redundancy in the K8s manifests.
3. Assume a possible application of the K8s manifests.

<sup>1</sup>Instead of simply appending previous data and agent outputs to the conversation history to create the next agent's prompt, we create a new conversation for each agent every time and embed the organized previous data and agent outputs within it. However, the verification loop, which will be discussed later, is an exception.

<sup>2</sup>As our *system* uses chat models, prompts with three different roles—system, human, and AI—are required.

4. Summarize user instructions for the CE cycle if provided. At the same time, filter out suspicious prompts, e.g., jailbreak prompts.

This phase is for deploying the user’s system and explicitly filling in the implicit context of the user’s input. In the subsequent phases, this added context will also be provided as input.

## 2.2 PHASE 1: HYPOTHESIS

The *hypothesis* phase defines the system’s resiliency for an assumed failure scenario. Following the principles of CE (Basiri et al., 2016), our *system* first defines steady states and then defines failure injections.

**Steady-state definition** Steady states are the expected, normal behaviors of a system. Each steady state is defined by a pair of a state value and a threshold, and a steady state is considered satisfied when the state value meets the threshold. Therefore, the state values must be measurable outputs of the system, such as the number of active resources, error rates, and response time. Given the pre-processed user inputs, the agents define steady states as follows:

1. Select measurable states critical to maintaining the system’s application. If any weak configurations are identified from the K8s manifests, their related states are preferentially selected.
2. Select tools to inspect the states. K8s API and k6 (Grafana Labs, 2021) are supported. Then, write the corresponding inspection scripts and inspect the current (normal) values of the states in the system by running the scripts.
3. Define the thresholds for each state based on the inspected values (steady states must be satisfied under the current condition).
4. Write unit-test scripts to validate whether each steady state is satisfied by adding threshold-based assertions to the corresponding inspection scripts.

(a) VaC script for K8s API (Python)	(b) VaC script for k6 (Javascript)
<pre> 1 def check_podcount(label, expected_count, duration): 2     consistent_count = True 3     for i in range(duration): 4         pods = self.v1.list_namespaced_pod( 5             namespace='default', 6             label_selector=label) 7         pod_count = len(pods.items) 8         print(f"current pod count: {pod_count}") 9         consistent_count = pod_count == expected_count 10        if not consistent_count: 11            break 12        time.sleep(1) 13    assert consistent_count, "Pod count was inconsistent." 14 ... </pre>	<pre> 1 export const options = { 2     vus: 10, 3     duration: '10s', 4     thresholds: { 5         http_req_duration: ['p(95)&lt;500'], 6     }, 7 }; 8 9 export default function () { 10    const res = http.get('http://example.com'); 11    check(res, {'status was 200': (r) =&gt; 12        r.status == 200 }); 13    sleep(1); 14 } </pre>

Figure 2: Examples of unit-test scripts to validate steady states.

The unit-test scripts are used in the experiment workflow to automatically validate the steady states during chaos experiments. We here call this unit-test-based validation approach *Validation as Code* (VaC). Validating steady states by an LLM taking log data does not guarantee the consistency of the validation process and may even result in incorrect judgments. On the other hand, with VaC, the validation process becomes fixed once a unit test is written, guaranteeing its consistency. Furthermore, the explicit definition of the process in code enhances its transparency. Figure 2 shows examples of VaC scripts for K8s API (Python) and k6 (Javascript). k6 can collect communication metrics (e.g., response times, error rates, etc) while conducting load tests. In VaC, k6 is used to inspect the communication metrics, while K8s API is used to inspect the other states of K8s resources. Both scripts allow for adjusting test durations through command-line arguments. For k6, the script also sets an appropriate number of virtual users for the load tests.

In steps 2 and 4, scripts are repeatedly debugged until they terminate successfully. In this verification loop, as an exception, our *system* simply appends the previous agent’s output and the resulting error messages to the initial conversation as conversation history, and uses it as the agent’s prompt in the next loop. The verification loops that appear later are similar.

**Failure definition** For failure injection, our *system* employs Chaos Mesh (Chaos Mesh, 2021), which can manage chaos experiments for K8s through code. Given the pre-processed user inputs and the steady states, the agents define failures that may occur in the system as follows:

1. Assume a failure scenario (e.g., a surge in access due to a promotional campaign, cyber attack, etc.) that may occur in the system. Then, define the sequence of failures that simulates the scenario and may affect the defined steady states. The failures are selected from the failure types supported in Chaos Mesh.
2. Define detailed parameters for each failure, such as the scope of the failure injection, the failure sub-type, the failure strength, etc.

In step 1, the agent outputs a 2D list of Chaos Mesh failure type names arranged in the order of insertion. The inner lists involve concurrent failures, and the outer list represents the injection order of each concurrent failure set. For example, `[[StressChaos, NetworkChaos], [PodChaos]]` represents that `PodChaos` is injected after simultaneously injecting `StressChaos` and `NetworkChaos`.

In step 2, the agent separately defines the detailed parameters of each failure. Each failure type requires a different parameter set. Therefore, given a failure type name, our *system* dynamically selects the corresponding JSON output instruction. The agent then outputs the corresponding parameter set. Figure 3 shows an example of the parameter set of `PodChaos`. There are seven failure types, the instructions of which are prepared in advance referring to the Chaos Mesh documentation. The parameter sets are verified through a verification loop, which repeatedly debugs them until their Chaos Mesh manifests pass the `kubectl apply --dry-run=server` command. The failure injection duration and more detailed injection timing are defined in chaos experiment planning (see next section), along with the duration and timing for running the VaC scripts.

```
PodChaos parameters
1 action: pod-kill
2 mode: one
3 selector:
4   labelSelectors:
5     app: example
6 namespaces:
7   - default
```

Figure 3: An example of detailed parameters.

At this point, the hypothesis is reinterpreted as *all VaC scripts pass, even when failure injections are performed*.

### 2.3 PHASE 2: (CHAOS) EXPERIMENT

The *experiment* phase plans a chaos experiment to validate the hypothesis and executes it.

**Experiment planning** To enable systematic planning, we divide a chaos experiment into three phases: pre-validation, failure-injection, and post-validation. In the pre-validation phase, VaC scripts are executed to ensure that the steady states are satisfied under normal conditions. In the failure-injection phase, fault injections are executed. If a steady state, such as response time, needs to be validated during fault injections, the corresponding VaC scripts are executed concurrently. In the post-validation phase, VaC scripts are executed to ensure that steady states have been recovered after the fault injections. Given the pre-processed user inputs and the hypothesis, the agents plan a chaos experiment by dividing it into these three phases as follows:

1. Determine the duration of each phase.
2. Determine the VaC scripts and failure injections to be executed in each phase. For each of them, specify the duration and grace period within a range that does not exceed the duration of the phase.
3. Summarize the timeline of the chaos experiment (i.e., the order of each node) in detail. This summary is referred to when analyzing the experiment results.

In step 2, the agent outputs a list of dictionaries (i.e., schedule list) separately for each phase, with each dictionary containing three keys: `name`, `grace_period`, and `duration`. The `name` is either a steady state name or a failure type name, and each corresponds one-to-one with the VaC script and failure injection defined in the hypothesis. The `grace_period` is the waiting time from the start of each phase until the execution of the VaC script or failure injection, allowing flexible adjustment of the execution timing. The `duration` is the execution period after the grace period.

Based on these schedule lists, our *system* configures the chaos experiment using the Chaos Mesh workflow. This workflow supports three types of nodes: `failure` node to execute failure injection,






Figure 4: Hierarchical grouping for implementing a complex chaos experiment plan in Chaos Mesh.




Figure 5: Reconfiguration process by the agent and a file management algorithm.

task node to execute VaC scripts, and suspend node to wait for a specified duration. By grouping these nodes into a serial or parallel group, the nodes within the group are executed sequentially or in parallel. Our *system* configures the schedule by grouping nodes and groups hierarchically as follows (Figure 4): For each phase, it first creates failure and task nodes according to the schedule list. Next, it serially groups each node that has a grace period greater than zero with a suspend node. This suspend node is placed before the grouped node and waits for the duration of the grace period of that node. It then groups all the serial groups and remaining nodes in parallel in each phase. Finally, it serially groups the parallel groups of each phase. Its Chaos Mesh workflow manifest is generated by formatting this hierarchical group.

**Experiment replanning (within the improvement loop)** Resource types and metadata defined in the K8s manifests may be changed during the *improvement* phase. Therefore, replanning inspection targets in VaC scripts and the scope of failure injections is required between the *improvement* phase and the next experiment execution. Given the original and reconfigured K8s manifests, as well as the previous VaC scripts, the agent adjusts or retains the inspection-target specifications in the VaC scripts. The inspection targets refer to resource specifications (line 11 and 12 in (a)), the request DNS (line 13 in (b)), etc., in Figure 2. Given the original and reconfigured K8s manifests, as well as the previous failure-injection scope, the agent adjusts or retains the scope for the reconfigured manifests. The scope refers to the `selector` filed in Figure 3. These adjustments are also debugged through the verification loop. After the adjustments, our *system* regenerates a new ChaosMesh workflow manifest by replacing only the path of VaC scripts of task nodes and the `selector` field of failure nodes with adjusted ones. Note that this replanning only makes minor adjustments to reflect the changes in the K8s manifests, without altering the chaos experiment’s original intent.

**Experiment execution** After a Chaos Mesh workflow manifest is (re-) generated, our *system* applies it to the K8s cluster. Once the workflow is deployed, the workflow (i.e., chaos experiment) will be executed automatically. Therefore, our *system* simply waits for the workflow to finish after that deployment.

## 2.4 PHASE 3: ANALYSIS

After the chaos experiment is finished, our *system* mechanically checks whether the VaC scripts have passed. If all of them have passed, that means the current system configurations (i.e., K8s manifests) already satisfy the hypothesis. Therefore, our *system* finishes the current CE cycle at this point and moves to the extra phase. If at least one has failed, our *system* moves to the next *improvement* phase after analyzing the experiment results. In this analysis, given the K8s manifests, the timeline of the chaos experiments, and the list of failed scripts with their logs, the agent identifies the cause of the fails and then generates a report containing the causes and recommended countermeasures.

## 2.5 PHASE 4: IMPROVEMENT

The *improvement* phase reconfigures the K8s manifests to satisfy the hypothesis. Given the K8s manifests, the hypothesis, the experiment plan, and the improvement loop history, the agent reconfigures the K8s manifests so that all the VaC scripts pass in the chaos experiment. The improvement

loop history stores the history of the experiment results, their analysis reports, and their reconfigurations, within the improvement loop. The history suppresses the repetition of the same reconfiguration. There are three reconfiguration modes: create, delete, and replace. The agent first selects the reconfiguration mode while specifying the file name, and then writes the reconfigured K8s manifest only for the create and replace modes. The file manager of our *system* then edits the folder from the previous improvement loop (in the first improvement, it corresponds to the user’s input folder) according to the agent’s output. Figure 5 illustrates these reconfiguration processes. The verification loop is also conducted here: the agent’s output is debugged repeatedly until all the K8s manifests in the edited folder are correctly applied to the K8s cluster.

**Improvement loop** After the reconfiguration, our *system* applies the reconfigured K8s manifests to the K8s cluster. Then, they will be validated again through the *experiment* and *analysis* phases. That is, as in the systematic CE cycle, our *system* also repeats the *experiment*, *analysis*, *improvement* phases until the hypothesis is satisfied. We define this loop as the improvement loop.

## 2.6 EXTRA PHASE: POST-PROCESSING

After the CE cycle is completed, our *system* finalizes its entire process by summarizing the completed CE cycle. The agent summarizes the user’s input and each of the four completed phases. Finally, our *system* provides the user with the summary of the completed CE cycle and the folder containing K8s manifests that have been reconfigured to satisfy the hypothesis defined in the *hypothesis* phase and their Skaffold configuration file.

## 3 CASE STUDY

In this section, we validate the entire process of our *system* through case studies on two different scale systems: NGINX and SOCKSHOP (Weaveworks, 2023). NGINX is a small-scale system that consists of two K8s manifests (i.e., two resources): `pod.yaml` and `service.yaml`. The former defines a `Pod` resource including a Nginx server, and the latter defines `Service` resource routing TCP traffic to the `Pod`. To verify whether our *system* can improve the system when there are resiliency issues, we intentionally configure the resource with a non-resilient setting; we set `restartPolicy` to `Never` in `Pod.yaml`. With this configuration, once the `Pod` goes down, it will never restart, resulting in extended service outages. On the other hand, SOCKSHOP is a practical and large-scale e-commerce system that consists of 29 manifests, which define the resources and databases for front-end pages, user information, order, payment, shipping, and so on. The number of replicas of all the `Deployment` resources is originally set to one. However, this setting could lead to downtime of the single replica when it goes down. To narrow down this original resiliency issue to a single point, we increase the replicas for `Deployment` resources other than `front-end-dep.yaml` to two, while keeping a single replica for `front-end-dep.yaml`. This RELATIVELY reduces the redundancy/resiliency of the front-end resource. In this case study, we validate whether our *system* correctly identifies and addresses these resiliency issues through a reasonable CE cycle.

Long-term experiments are not required for the resiliency issues here. Therefore, to save time, we input the following instruction along with the K8s manifests: “Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute”. For SOCKSHOP, we additionally instruct on how to access its web page as follows: “When using `k6` in steady-state definition, always select a request URL from the following options (other requests are invalid): 1. `http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/`, 2. `http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/detail.html?id=ID, ...`”. We use GPT-4o (gpt-4o-2024-08-06) (OpenAI, 2024) as LLMs for our *system*. To improve the reproducibility of this case study, its temperature is set to zero with the seed fixed at 42. We run a single CE cycle for each system five times under the same settings.<sup>3</sup> In the following, we first discuss the aggregated results obtained from multiple runs of single CE cycles: the time and monetary costs, the completion rate, and the reconfiguration rate. Then, we qualitatively validate the operations within the CE cycles conducted by our *system*. See also Appendix B for more details on the inputs and outputs for each system.

---

<sup>3</sup>Due to the non-deterministic nature of GPT-4o, the outputs are not fully reproduced every time even when the temperature is set to zero and a seed is provided. Therefore, the multiple runs aim to ensure the stability of our *system* under such randomness.

Table 1: Time and monetary costs of single CE cycles conducted by CHAOSEATER. The values for each phase are averaged across runs that did not skip that phase, while the values for overall are averaged across runs that involved system reconfiguration.

Metric	NGINX						
	Overall	Pre-process	Hypothesis	Experiment	Analysis	Improvement	Post-process
Input tokens	59k	2.6k	25k	13k	4.4k	5.5k	8.2k
Output tokens	5.9k	0.5k	2.5k	1.7k	0.6k	0.2k	0.4k
API billing (\$)	0.21	0.01	0.09	0.05	0.02	0.02	0.02
Time	11m	21s	2.6m	4.4m	50s	12s	21s

Metric	SOCKSHOP						
	Overall	Pre-process	Hypothesis	Experiment	Analysis	Improvement	Post-process
Input tokens	284k	30k	150k	57k	14k	15k	18k
Output tokens	13k	5.7k	3.8k	1.8k	0.7k	0.6k	0.5k
API billing (\$)	0.84	0.13	0.41	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.05
Time	25m	4.6	4.3m	3.3m	36s	4.3m	21s

**Time and monetary costs** Table 1 shows our *system*’s time and monetary costs of single CE cycles for each system. We first count the input and output tokens using the tokenizer of GPT-4o (o200k\_base). We then calculate the monetary costs based on the official OpenAI API pricing table in September 2024. For NGINX, our *system* completes single CE cycles in just \$0.21 and 11 minutes (including 2 minutes for the chaos experiment execution). Although we do not have statistical data on the actual working time and labor costs for the same CE cycles performed by human engineers, these total operational time and monetary costs are obviously lower than that. For SOCKSHOP, the monetary cost increases by approximately four times (\$0.84), and the time doubled (25m). However, these values are still intuitively lower than those of human engineers. Even with the number of resources increasing by more than ten times compared to NGINX, the cost increase remains minimal, demonstrating that our *system* can maintain low costs even for large-scale systems.

**Completion rate and reconfiguration rate** Table 2 shows the completion rate and reconfiguration rate. The former refers to the percentage of runs where our *system* successfully completes the CE cycle without runtime errors (e.g., the verification loop or improvement loop reaching the maximum limit of three iterations), while the latter represents the percentage of runs where our *system* not only completes the CE cycle without runtime errors but also successfully reconfigures the input system. The 100% completion rates reported in Table 2 demonstrate the stability of our *system* across both systems. Our *system* also achieves the 100% reconfiguration rate for NGINX; it consistently reconfigures the system using a `Deployment` with multiple replicas, which addresses the resiliency issue of never restarting policy. For SOCKSHOP, in four out of five runs, our *system* reconfigures the system by setting the number of replicas in the front-end `Deployment` to two or more. This addresses the downtime issue of the single replica. In other run, our *system* completes a CE cycle skipping the system reconfiguration. In this case, as the steady states are only checked before and after the pod-kill (i.e., in the pre/post-validation phase), the front-end replica has already recovered by the time of the check, and the downtime issue is not detected. Although this is not the outcome we expected, it is still a valid CE cycle that verifies whether the target `Pod` can recover properly after a certain period of time. Overall, our system stably completes single CE cycles for both NGINX and SOCKSHOP without any critical issues.

Table 2: Completion rate and reconfiguration rate in five runs of single CE cycles for each system.

System	Completion (%)	Reconfig (%)
NGINX	100	100
SOCKSHOP	100	80

**Qualitative validation on NGINX** Here, we pick up one of the five runs for NGINX and qualitatively validate its outputs at each representative phase. The top of Figure 6 shows the highlighted outputs for NGINX. In the *hypothesis* phase, our *system* first defines two steady states: 1) “The `Pod` should be running at least 90% of the time during the check period”; 2) “Service availability should






Figure 6: The highlighted outputs for NGINX and SOCKSHOP. See Appendix B for the full results.

be at least 99.9% with a response status of 200". The VaC scripts shown in Figure 6 correctly implement these steady states. It then defines a failure sequence that injects `NetworkChaos` (delay) into the `Nginx Pod` following `PodChaos` (pod-kill) to simulate a cyberattack.

In the experiment planning, it plans the following chaos experiment: 1) the two steady states are sequentially validated in the pre-validation phase; 2) in the failure-injection phase, the two steady states are sequentially validated alongside the injection of each failure that may affect them; 3) the two steady states are validated sequentially once again in the post-validation phase.

The first chaos experiment reveals that the two steady states are currently not satisfied in both the failure-injection and post-validation phases. Our *system* successfully identifies the cause as the `Nginx Pod`'s never restarting policy and replaces it with a `Deployment` with three replicas. It then adjusts the success criteria of the VaC script to ensure that at least one Pod out of three replicas is running and conducts the chaos experiment for the reconfigured system again. Finally, the additional chaos experiment confirms that the hypothesis is satisfied in the reconfigured system.

Intuitively, these operations and outputs follow best practices, demonstrating that our *system* can complete our expected CE cycle for the small-scale system, NGINX, without explicit user instructions.

**Qualitative validation on SOCKSHOP** Similarly, we qualitatively validate the outputs of a run for SOCKSHOP. The bottom of Figure 6 shows the highlighted outputs for SOCKSHOP. In the *hypothesis* phase, our *system* first defines two steady states: 1) "At least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas at least 80% of the time during the monitoring period" for the carts `Deployment`; 2) "At least 1 ready replica must be present 100% of the time during the monitoring period" for the front-end `Deployment`. The VaC scripts shown in Figure 6 correctly implement these steady states.

It then defines a failure sequence that injects `StressChaos` (CPU) into all the carts-db replicas following `PodChaos` (pod-kill) that targets the single front-end replica to simulate possible problems in a black Friday sale.

In the experiment planning, it plans the following chaos experiment: 1) the two steady states are simultaneously validated in the pre-validation phase; 2) in the failure-injection phase, the two steady states are sequentially validated alongside the injection of each failure that may affect them; 3) the two steady states are validated simultaneously once again in the post-validation phase.

The first chaos experiment reveals that the second steady state is currently not satisfied in both the failure-injection and post-validation phases. Our *system* successfully identifies the cause as the single replica setting of the front-end `Deployment` and increases the number of replicas to two. It then conducts the chaos experiment for the reconfigured system again without experiment adjustments (no adjustment is needed as the resource type remains unchanged). Finally, the additional chaos experiment confirms that the hypothesis is satisfied in the reconfigured system.

This case also broadly follows best practices, demonstrating that our *system* can complete our expected CE cycle even for the comparatively large system, SOCKSHOP, without explicit user instructions.

## 4 RELATED WORK

**Chaos engineering** Since Basiri et al. (2016) introduced its name, CE has gained attention and is currently employed in various services (Basiri et al., 2019; De, 2021). The major research question of CE is how we can efficiently test meaningful failures to identify system vulnerability. To address this, various optimization methods for failure selection have been proposed (Alvaro et al., 2016; Torkura et al., 2019; Kesim et al., 2020; Sharma et al., 2022; Ikeuchi et al., 2023; Chen et al., 2024). In application, several automation tools have been developed from both the open-source software (Chaos Mesh, 2021; Netflix, 2012) and commercial sectors (Amazon Web Services, 2021; Microsoft, 2023). While these technologies have advanced CE automation, its full automation has not yet been achieved due to the complexities of generative tasks, such as hypothesis formulation and reconfiguration. Our work is the first to fully automate CE with LLMs.

**LLMs for software engineering** LLMs for coding have been actively explored from various aspects: Pretraining models (Chen et al., 2021; Rozière et al., 2024; Guo et al., 2024), prompt engineering (Chen et al., 2022; Jiang et al., 2023), and evaluation (Austin et al., 2021; Chen et al., 2021). For more general SE tasks, LLMs that solve issues in GitHub repositories have also emerged (Yang et al., 2024b; Cognition Labs, 2024; Xia et al., 2024). Since CE for software systems are regarded as SE, our work can be considered a part of this trend. Unlike existing SE benchmarks, CE requires autonomously setting goals and achieving them. Our work demonstrates the potential of LLMs to tackle such new complex SE tasks.

**LLMs for networking (NW)** LLMs for networking have also been explored from various aspects in recent years: Datasets (Bariah et al., 2023; Karim et al., 2023), benchmarks (Maatouk et al., 2023; Miao et al., 2023), fine-tuned models (Bariah et al., 2023), an agent framework for NW-related tasks (Huang et al., 2023), and comprehensive evaluation (Ahmed et al., 2024; Piovesan et al., 2024). These works empirically demonstrate the promise of applying LLMs to the NW domain. In parallel with the research side, applications have also been developed, especially for software systems. They range from LLM-based IaC code generation (Firefly, 2022; Özercan, 2023; Pulumu, 2023) to diagnostic tools (K8sGPT, 2023; Robusta, 2023) and misconfiguration remediation (Malul et al., 2024). Despite the advancements of LLMs in the NW domain, their application to CE remains unexplored. Our work is the first to demonstrate the capabilities of LLMs in CE, which involves complex NW operations.

**Concurrent works<sup>4</sup>** In parallel with our work, some other projects have shown promising results in applying LLMs to CE. From a security perspective, Bedoya et al. (2024) leverage LLMs to construct attack-defense trees, which assist security analysts in designing security chaos experiments. The major differences from ours lie in their use of LLMs as a supplementary support tool and designing the LLM workflow specialized to the *hypothesis* phase based on the methodology of security CE. AIOpsLab (Chen et al., 2025) is an LLM agent-based framework for automating the operations of cloud (i.e., software) systems. It includes failure injection as a feature and supports both functional failures, such as system misconfigurations, and independent symptomatic failures, such as server downtime and network delays. However, while it provides cause analyses and solutions for functional failures, it is limited to identifying the presence of failure and pinpointing their locations for symptomatic failures. On the other hand, our *system* focuses on the symptomatic failures and provides more sophisticated CE for them. For example, it supports complex failure scheduling to simulate symptomatic failure scenarios, analyzes system behavior during symptomatic failure injection, and enables reconfigurations to address unexpected behavior due to the failures. While these concurrent works, including ours, share a similar goal, each focuses on a different aspect of CE. We hope to integrate the strengths of each work in the future to realize more comprehensive LLM-enhanced CE.

## 5 DISCUSSION

**Broader impacts** Numerous systems, including the increasing number of LLM applications in recent years, are built in the microservice architecture, and their number is expected to continue to grow in the future. By fully automating CE, it will be possible for anyone to build resilient systems. Moreover, it is expected to combine our *system* with other LLM systems, such as improving the resiliency of applications created by other LLM systems through our *system*. Although our *system* is not yet at a practical level, we believe that our *system* would be a good starting point toward such use cases. Even at its current level, our *system* can be sufficiently used as training materials (including both good and bad practices) for the Chaos Game Day, which is a training exercise for CE engineers.

**Limitations** Our *system* currently has three limitations: 1) Limited deployment environment; Although CE should ideally be conducted in actual production environments, our *system* is currently only supported in development environments. 2) Limited to GPT-4o only; Our *system*'s prompt templates are highly tuned only for GPT-4o. Therefore, other LLMs can not currently be used for our

---

<sup>4</sup>This discussion was added after completing this paper. The original manuscript was submitted to a conference in March 2024, and the premise of this paper is mainly based on the circumstances of that time. Therefore, we here treat studies published from that time to the present (January 2025) as concurrent works.

*system*. 3) Vulnerability discovery; In the case study, our *system* improved systems with relatively simple resiliency issues. However, for systems that already possess a certain level of resiliency, our *system* fails to find new hidden issues through a CE cycle. Given that this is a challenging task even for human engineers, our *system* is currently considered to perform at a level comparable to, or lower than, that of engineers. To find such issues, it is necessary to conduct multiple CE cycles over extended operational periods.

**Future directions** Given the current limitations above, we share several future directions for our *system* and the full automation of system resiliency improvement:

1. **Full automation of long-term multiple CE cycles;** By using the *system*'s output as input for the next CE cycle, we can automate multiple CE cycles even with our current *system*. However, we additionally need to develop techniques to manage the long-term history of completed CE cycles and continuous learning (if LLMs are fine-tuned).
2. **Support for various LLMs;** As our *system*'s prompt templates are tuned manually, supporting various LLMs significantly increases their management costs. To address this, automatic prompt tuning is considered an effective solution. Our current prompt templates may be used as the seed prompts.
3. **Fine-tuning LLMs specifically for CE;** Fine-tuning is necessary to improve the quality of CE cycles and expand supported LLM types. Our *system*'s outputs may be used as the instruction-tuning data.
4. **Evaluation frameworks;** There are no datasets and benchmarks for CE. New metrics should be also carefully proposed.
5. **Production deployment and security;** If our *system* is deployed in production environments, further research on security will be necessary. This includes controlling more carefully the impact range of failures (i.e., blast radius), preventing our *system* from becoming a proxy for attacking production services, and proposing emergency response measures, such as a higher-level monitoring system that always monitors our *system*.
6. **Improvement for more complex systems;** We need to incorporate the recent advances in LLMs x graph approaches to extract necessary sub-graphs from large system graphs. This sub-graph extraction is important to organize the agent's inputs in each phase.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we proposed CHAOSEATER, a *system* for automating the entire CE workflow with LLMs. We presented the technical details of our *system* and validated it through case studies of small and large systems. The results demonstrated that our *system* successfully reduces the time and monetary costs while completing reasonable single CE cycles. In future work, we will improve our *system* following the future directions discussed above. We are also excited that other researchers and developers will propose related works in the same or different directions. We hope this paper helps promote the full automation of system resilience improvement.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

**Daisuke Kikuta** proposed the project, designed and implemented the *system*, conducted the experiments, and wrote the paper. **Hiroki Ikeuchi**, **Kengo Tajiri**, and **Yuusuke Nakano** provided technical feedback and supported revising the paper.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank NTT TechnoCross members, especially Kensuke Yagura, Yoshitaka Sadohara, and Tamotsu Ohyama, for trying out the *system* and sharing their valuable feedback. We also thank the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback and valuable suggestions. Finally, the *system* would not have been possible without LLM providers and relevant OSS projects. We deeply appreciate their continuous efforts and dedication.

## REFERENCES

- Tasnim Ahmed, Nicola Piovesan, Antonio De Domenico, and Salimur Choudhury. Linguistic intelligence in large language models for telecommunications. 2024.
- Peter Alvaro, Koltan Andrus, Chris Sanden, Casey Rosenthal, Ali Basiri, and Lorin Hochstein. Automating failure testing research at internet scale. In *Proceedings of the Seventh ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, SoCC '16, pp. 17–28, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450345255. doi: 10.1145/2987550.2987555. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2987550.2987555>.
- Jacob Austin, Augustus Odena, Maxwell Nye, Maarten Bosma, Henryk Michalewski, David Dohan, Ellen Jiang, Carrie Cai, Michael Terry, Quoc Le, and Charles Sutton. Program synthesis with large language models, 2021.
- Lina Bariah, Hang Zou, Qiyang Zhao, Belkacem Mouhouche, Faouzi Bader, and Merouane Debbah. Understanding telecom language through large language models, 2023.
- Ali Basiri, Niosha Behnam, Ruud de Rooij, Lorin Hochstein, Luke Kosewski, Justin Reynolds, and Casey Rosenthal. Chaos engineering. *IEEE Software*, 33(3):35–41, 2016. doi: 10.1109/MS.2016.60.
- Ali Basiri, Lorin Hochstein, Nora Jones, and Haley Tucker. Automating chaos experiments in production. In *2019 IEEE/ACM 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: Software Engineering in Practice (ICSE-SEIP)*, pp. 31–40, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICSE-SEIP.2019.00012.
- Martin Bedoya, Sara Palacios, Daniel Díaz-López, Estefania Laverde, and Pantaleone Nespoli. Enhancing devsecops practice with large language models and security chaos engineering. *International Journal of Information Security*, 23:3765–3788, 10 2024. doi: 10.1007/s10207-024-00909-w.
- Antonio Bucchiarone, Nicola Dragoni, Schahram Dustdar, Patricia Lago, Manuel Mazzara, Victor Rivera, and Andrey Sadovykh (eds.). *Microservices, Science and Engineering*. Springer, 2020. ISBN 978-3-030-31646-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-31646-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-31646-4>.
- Bei Chen, Fengji Zhang, Anh Nguyen, Daoguang Zan, Zeqi Lin, Jian-Guang Lou, and Weizhu Chen. Codet: Code generation with generated tests, 2022.
- Hongyang Chen, Pengfei Chen, Guangba Yu, Xiaoyun Li, and Zilong He. Microfi: Non-intrusive and prioritized request-level fault injection for microservice applications. *IEEE Transactions on Dependable and Secure Computing*, 21(5):4921–4938, 2024. doi: 10.1109/TDSC.2024.3363902.
- Mark Chen, Jerry Tworek, Heewoo Jun, Qiming Yuan, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Jared Kaplan, Harri Edwards, Yuri Burda, Nicholas Joseph, Greg Brockman, Alex Ray, Raul Puri, Gretchen Krueger, Michael Petrov, Heidy Khlaaf, Girish Sastry, Pamela Mishkin, Brooke Chan, Scott Gray, Nick Ryder, Mikhail Pavlov, Alethea Power, Lukasz Kaiser, Mohammad Bavarian, Clemens Winter, Philippe Tillet, Felipe Petroski Such, Dave Cummings, Matthias Plappert, Fotios Chantzis, Elizabeth Barnes, Ariel Herbert-Voss, William Hebgen Guss, Alex Nichol, Alex Paino, Nikolas Tezak, Jie Tang, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Shantanu Jain, William Saunders, Christopher Hesse, Andrew N. Carr, Jan Leike, Josh Achiam, Vedant Misra, Evan Morikawa, Alec Radford, Matthew Knight, Miles Brundage, Mira Murati, Katie Mayer, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Dario Amodei, Sam McCandlish, Ilya Sutskever, and Wojciech Zaremba. Evaluating large language models trained on code, 2021.
- Yinfang Chen, Manish Shetty, Gagan Somashekar, Minghua Ma, Yogesh Simmhan, Jonathan Mace, Chetan Bansal, Rujia Wang, and Saravan Rajmohan. Aiopslab: A holistic framework to evaluate ai agents for enabling autonomous clouds, 2025. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.06706>.
- Suman De. A study on chaos engineering for improving cloud software quality and reliability. In *2021 International Conference on Disruptive Technologies for Multi-Disciplinary Research and Applications (CENTCON)*, volume 1, pp. 289–294, 2021. doi: 10.1109/CENTCON52345.2021.9688292.



- Firefly. Aiacc (github repository), 2022. URL <https://github.com/gofireflyio/aiacc>.
- Google. Skaffold (github repository), 2019. URL <https://github.com/GoogleContainerTools/skaffold>.
- Daya Guo, Qihao Zhu, Dejian Yang, Zhenda Xie, Kai Dong, Wentao Zhang, Guanting Chen, Xiao Bi, Y. Wu, Y. K. Li, Fuli Luo, Yingfei Xiong, and Wenfeng Liang. Deepseek-coder: When the large language model meets programming – the rise of code intelligence, 2024.
- Cho-Jui Hsieh, Si Si, Felix Yu, and Inderjit Dhillon. Automatic engineering of long prompts. In Lun-Wei Ku, Andre Martins, and Vivek Srikumar (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2024*, pp. 10672–10685, Bangkok, Thailand, August 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.findings-acl.634. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.findings-acl.634>.
- Shengran Hu, Cong Lu, and Jeff Clune. Automated design of agentic systems, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.08435>.
- Yudong Huang, Hongyang Du, Xinyuan Zhang, Dusit Niyato, Jiawen Kang, Zehui Xiong, Shuo Wang, and Tao Huang. Large language models for networking: Applications, enabling techniques, and challenges. 2023.
- Hiroki Ikeuchi, Akio Watanabe, and Yousuke Takahashi. Coverage based failure injection toward efficient chaos engineering. In *ICC 2023 - IEEE International Conference on Communications*, pp. 4571–4577, 2023. doi: 10.1109/ICC45041.2023.10279387.
- Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jiasi Shen, Sungju Kim, and Sunghun Kim. A survey on large language models for code generation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00515>.
- Shuyang Jiang, Yuhao Wang, and Yu Wang. Selfevolve: A code evolution framework via large language models, 2023.
- K8sGPT. K8sgpt (github repository), 2023. URL <https://github.com/k8sgpt-ai/k8sgpt>.
- Imtiaz Karim, Kazi Samin Mubasshir, Mirza Masfiquur Rahman, and Elisa Bertino. SPEC5G: A dataset for 5G cellular network protocol analysis. In Jong C. Park, Yuki Arase, Baotian Hu, Wei Lu, Derry Wijaya, Ayu Purwarianti, and Adila Alfa Krisnadhi (eds.), *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: IJCNLP-AACL 2023 (Findings)*, pp. 20–38, Nusa Dua, Bali, November 2023. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2023.findings-ijcnlp.3>.
- Dominik Kesim, André van Hoorn, Sebastian Frank, and Matthias Haussler. Identifying and prioritizing chaos experiments by using established risk analysis techniques. pp. 229–240, 10 2020. doi: 10.1109/ISSRE5003.2020.00030.
- Tushar Khot, Harsh Trivedi, Matthew Finlayson, Yao Fu, Kyle Richardson, Peter Clark, and Ashish Sabharwal. Decomposed prompting: A modular approach for solving complex tasks. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. URL [https://openreview.net/forum?id=\\_nGgzQjzaRy](https://openreview.net/forum?id=_nGgzQjzaRy).
- Kubernetes. Kubernetes (github repository), 2014. URL <https://github.com/kubernetes/kubernetes>.
- Kubernetes. kind (github repository), 2018. URL <https://github.com/kubernetes-sigs/kind>.
- Minchan Kwon, Gaeun Kim, Jongsuk Kim, Haeil Lee, and Junmo Kim. StablePrompt : Automatic prompt tuning using reinforcement learning for large language model. In Yaser Al-Onaizan, Mohit Bansal, and Yun-Nung Chen (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 9868–9884, Miami, Florida, USA, November 2024. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2024.emnlp-main.551. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2024.emnlp-main.551>.

- LangChain. Langchain (github repository), 2023. URL <https://github.com/langchain-ai/langchain>.
- Zelong Li, Shuyuan Xu, Kai Mei, Wenyue Hua, Balaji Rama, Om Raheja, Hao Wang, He Zhu, and Yongfeng Zhang. Autoflow: Automated workflow generation for large language model agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.12821>.
- Ali Maatouk, Fadhel Ayed, Nicola Piovesan, Antonio De Domenico, Merouane Debbah, and Zhi-Quan Luo. Teleqna: A benchmark dataset to assess large language models telecommunications knowledge, 2023.
- Ehud Malul, Yair Meidan, Dudu Mimran, Yuval Elovici, and Asaf Shabtai. Genkubesecc: Llm-based kubernetes misconfiguration detection, localization, reasoning, and remediation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.19954>.
- Yukai Miao, Yu Bai, Li Chen, Dan Li, Haifeng Sun, Xizheng Wang, Ziqiu Luo, Yanyu Ren, Dapeng Sun, Xiuting Xu, Qi Zhang, Chao Xiang, and Xinchu Li. An empirical study of netops capability of pre-trained large language models, 2023.
- Microsoft. Azure chaos studio (product page), 2023. URL <https://azure.microsoft.com/products/chaos-studio/>.
- Netflix. Chaos monkey (github repository), 2012. URL <https://github.com/Netflix/chaosmonkey>.
- OpenAI. Gpt-4o system card, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.21276>.
- Nicola Piovesan, Antonio De Domenico, and Fadhel Ayed. Telecom language models: Must they be large?, 2024.
- Prometheus. Prometheus (github repository), 2012. URL <https://github.com/prometheus/prometheus>.
- Reid Pryzant, Dan Iter, Jerry Li, Yin Tat Lee, Chenguang Zhu, and Michael Zeng. Automatic prompt optimization with "gradient descent" and beam search. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=WRyhaSrThy>.
- Pulumi. Pulumi ai (github repository), 2023. URL <https://github.com/pulumi/pulumi-ai>.
- Robusta. Kubernetes chatgpt bot (github repository), 2023. URL <https://github.com/robusta-dev/kubernetes-chatgpt-bot>.
- Baptiste Rozière, Jonas Gehring, Fabian Gloeckle, Sten Sootla, Itai Gat, Xiaoqing Ellen Tan, Yossi Adi, Jingyu Liu, Romain Sauvestre, Tal Remez, Jérémy Rapin, Artyom Kozhevnikov, Ivan Evtimov, Joanna Bitton, Manish Bhatt, Cristian Canton Ferrer, Aaron Grattafiori, Wenhan Xiong, Alexandre Défossez, Jade Copet, Faisal Azhar, Hugo Touvron, Louis Martin, Nicolas Usunier, Thomas Scialom, and Gabriel Synnaeve. Code llama: Open foundation models for code, 2024.
- Ojaswa Sharma, Mudit Verma, Saumya Bhadauria, and Praveen Jayachandran. A guided approach towards complex chaos selection, prioritisation and injection. In *2022 IEEE 15th International Conference on Cloud Computing (CLOUD)*, pp. 91–93, 2022. doi: 10.1109/CLOUD55607.2022.00025.
- Snowflake. Streamlit (github repository), 2020. URL <https://github.com/streamlit>.
- Hong Sun, Xue Li, Yinchuan Xu, Youkow Homma, Qi Cao, Min Wu, Jian Jiao, and Denis Charles. Autohint: Automatic prompt optimization with hint generation, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.07415>.
- Amazon Web Services. Aws fault injection service (product page), 2021. URL <https://aws.amazon.com/fis/>.

- Chaos Mesh. Chaos mesh (github repository), 2021. URL <https://github.com/chaos-mesh/chaos-mesh/>.
- Cognition Labs. Introducing devin, the first ai software engineer (official blog), 2024. URL <https://www.cognition.ai/blog/introducing-devin>.
- Grafana Labs. k6 (github repository), 2021. URL <https://github.com/grafana/k6>.
- Kennedy A. Torkura, Muhammad I.H. Sukmana, Feng Cheng, and Christoph Meinel. Security chaos engineering for cloud services: Work in progress. In *2019 IEEE 18th International Symposium on Network Computing and Applications (NCA)*, pp. 1–3, 2019. doi: 10.1109/NCA.2019.8935046.
- Weaveworks. Sock shop (github repository (archived in 2023)), 2023. URL <https://github.com/microservices-demo/microservices-demo>.
- Chunqiu Steven Xia, Yinlin Deng, Soren Dunn, and Lingming Zhang. Agentless: Demystifying llm-based software engineering agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.01489>.
- Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. Large language models as optimizers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024a. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=Bb4VGOWELI>.
- John Yang, Carlos E. Jimenez, Alexander Wettig, Kilian Lieret, Shunyu Yao, Karthik Narasimhan, and Ofir Press. Swe-agent: Agent-computer interfaces enable automated software engineering, 2024b. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.15793>.
- Jiayi Zhang, Jinyu Xiang, Zhaoyang Yu, Fengwei Teng, Xionghui Chen, Jiaqi Chen, Mingchen Zhuge, Xin Cheng, Sirui Hong, Jinlin Wang, Bingnan Zheng, Bang Liu, Yuyu Luo, and Chenglin Wu. Aflow: Automating agentic workflow generation, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.10762>.
- Wayne Xin Zhao, Kun Zhou, Junyi Li, Tianyi Tang, Xiaolei Wang, Yupeng Hou, Yingqian Min, Beichen Zhang, Junjie Zhang, Zican Dong, Yifan Du, Chen Yang, Yushuo Chen, Zhipeng Chen, Jinhao Jiang, Ruiyang Ren, Yifan Li, Xinyu Tang, Zikang Liu, Peiyu Liu, Jian-Yun Nie, and Ji-Rong Wen. A survey of large language models. 2023.
- Wangchunshu Zhou, Yixin Ou, Shengwei Ding, Long Li, Jialong Wu, Tiannan Wang, Jiamin Chen, Shuai Wang, Xiaohua Xu, Ningyu Zhang, Huajun Chen, and Yuchen Eleanor Jiang. Symbolic learning enables self-evolving agents, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.18532>.
- Mingchen Zhuge, Wenyi Wang, Louis Kirsch, Francesco Faccio, Dmitrii Khizbullin, and Jürgen Schmidhuber. GPTswarm: Language agents as optimizable graphs. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=uTC9AFXIhg>.
- Sertaç Özeran. Kubectl ai (github repository), 2023. URL <https://github.com/sozeran/kubectl-ai>.

## APPENDICES

<b>A</b>	<b>Implementation Details</b>	<b>17</b>
A.1	System Deployment . . . . .	17
A.2	Graphical User Interface . . . . .	17
A.3	Supported Failures . . . . .	18
A.4	Agentic Workflow . . . . .	20
A.5	System Prompt Templates . . . . .	20
A.5.1	Pre-processing . . . . .	22
A.5.2	Hypothesis . . . . .	26
A.5.3	Experiment . . . . .	69
A.5.4	Analysis . . . . .	81
A.5.5	Improvement . . . . .	83
A.5.6	Post-processing . . . . .	86
<b>B</b>	<b>Full Results of Case Studies</b>	<b>87</b>
B.1	NGINX . . . . .	88
B.1.1	Inputs . . . . .	88
B.1.2	Dialogue (Outputs generated by ChaosEater) . . . . .	89
B.2	SOCKSHOP . . . . .	103
B.2.1	Inputs . . . . .	103
B.2.2	Full Dialogue (Outputs generated by ChaosEater) . . . . .	117

## A IMPLEMENTATION DETAILS

## A.1 SYSTEM DEPLOYMENT

Figure 7 illustrates the deployment environment of CHAOSEATER. CHAOSEATER currently supports only development environments, where K8s clusters are constructed on a single machine using kind (Kubernetes, 2018). The web application of CHAOSEATER is implemented with Streamlit (Snowflake, 2020) and is deployed in a Docker container. Users can interact with it via the Graphical User Interface (GUI). After receiving the user inputs, CHAOSEATER autonomously completes a CE cycle for them while calling LLM API. CHAOSEATER interacts with the K8s (kind) clusters via K8s API, requesting resource deployment, monitoring, and failure injection. See README.md<sup>5</sup> for specific instructions on setting up this environment.

## A.2 GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE

Figure 8 shows the GUI of CHAOSEATER. The GUI resembles a typical chatbot interface, with a sidebar that allows for detailed parameter settings. After sending a Skaffold folder and instructions from the input box, a single CE cycle for them is completed automatically until the end. We describe each representative component in the following.

**(a) LLM setting** You may change the LLMs used by CHAOSEATER from the model dropdown button. The currently supported LLMs are GPT-4o (openai/gpt-4o-2024-08-06, openai/gpt-4o-2024-05-13), Claude (claude-3-5-sonnet-20240620), Gemini (google/gemini-1.5-pro).

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/ntt-dkiku/chaos-eater/blob/main/README.md>




Figure 7: The deployment environment of CHAOSEATER.

**(b) Cluster setting** The Cluster selection dropdown button lists currently available clusters. You may change the working kind cluster here. While the GUI browser is open, the selected cluster will be occupied, and other users will not see the same cluster in the dropdown button.

**(c) Input examples** We prepare three types of input examples. When you press each button, the content of the K8s manifests to be input, and the instructions are displayed in a dialog. Click the `Try this one` button for the example you want to try, and a CE cycle will start for that input example.

**(d) Input box** You can try your custom system by inputting its data into the input box. First, input a zipped folder to the file uploader box following the input format instructions below (this step is mandatory). If you don't have any instructions for the CE cycle, click the `Submit w/o instructions` button, and a CE cycle will start for that input system. If you do, write your instructions in the chat box and click the send icon `►` or `Enter`. Then, a CE cycle that follows the instructions will start for that input system.

**Input format** As input, CHAOSEATER currently supports only a zipped Skaffold project folder that involves a Skaffold configuration file and K8s manifests. The Skaffold configuration file must be placed in the root directory of the folder. The K8s manifests can be placed anywhere, but ensure that their relative paths are correctly specified in the manifest section of the Skaffold configuration file. More specifically, refer to our example folders: `nginx`, `sock shop`.

### A.3 SUPPORTED FAILURES

CHAOSEATER supports most of the Chaos Mesh ([Chaos Mesh, 2021](#)) failure types except for `KernelChaos`. Table 3 shows the supported failure types and their short descriptions. In the following, we provide some remarks on the supported failure types.

`KernelChaos` is one of the strongest failures and can affect other `Pods` that share the same kernel as the target `Pod`. We believe that various failure scenarios can be sufficiently simulated with only other types of failures. Therefore, we have currently put the somewhat too strong `KernelChaos` on hold. We may consider adding `KernelChaos` in the future.

`PodChaos`, `HTTPChaos`, `StressChaos`, and `IOChaos` include the `duration` parameter, which specifies the duration of the failure injection. However, Chaos Mesh workflow manifests do not currently support the `duration` parameter. Therefore, we remove the `duration` parameter from the JSON output instructions when detailing the failure parameters in the failure definition

<sup>6</sup><https://chaos-mesh.org/docs/basic-features/>






Figure 8: The GUI of CHAOSEATER

Table 3: Chaos Mesh failure types supported by CHAOSEATER. The descriptions are quoted from the official document.<sup>6</sup>

Failure type	Description
PodChaos	It simulates Pod failures, such as Pod node restart, Pod’s persistent unavailability, and certain container failures in a specific Pod.
NetworkChaos	It simulates network failures, such as network latency, packet loss, packet disorder, and network partitions.
DNSChaos	It simulates DNS failures, such as the parsing failure of DNS domain name and the wrong IP address returned.
HTTPChaos	It simulates HTTP communication failures, such as HTTP communication latency.
StressChaos	It simulates CPU race or memory race.
IOChaos	It simulates the I/O failure of an application file, such as I/O delays, read and write failures.
TimeChaos	It simulates the time jump exception.

of the *hypothesis* phase. Alternatively, CHAOSEATER specifies the duration of the failure injection using the *deadline* parameter in the experiment planning of the *experiment* phase. This replacement is officially recommended.<sup>7</sup>

The original PodChaos supports three sub-types: pod-kill, pod-failure, and container-kill. On the other hand, CHAOSEATER supports only pod-kill and container-kill, but not pod-failure. Regarding the pod-failure, the official document says “Pod Failure Chaos Experiment would change the image of each container in the target Pod to the ‘pause image’, which is a special image that does not perform any operations. if the container is configured without command, livenessProbe and readinessProbe, the container would be inspected as Running and Ready, although it had been changed to the ‘pause image’, and actually does not provide functionalities as normal or not-available.”<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the state changes of a Pod caused by pod-failure depend on the configuration of live-

<sup>7</sup><https://chaos-mesh.org/docs/create-chaos-mesh-workflow/#template-field-description>

<sup>8</sup><https://chaos-mesh.org/docs/simulate-pod-chaos-on-kubernetes/#some-notes-for-pod-failure-chaos-experiment>

nessProbe and readinessProbe. Depending on their interval settings, it is possible for the Pod to be recognized as being in the Running state even while pod-failure is being injected. Considering this issue and some reported bugs<sup>9,10</sup>, we have currently put pod-failure on hold.

#### A.4 AGENTIC WORKFLOW

Figure 9 shows the agentic workflow of CHAOSEATER. Agents are chained in series according to the systematic CE cycle, with verification loops at several points. See Appendix A.5 for the system prompt templates for each agent. The advantages of dividing operations into smaller tasks and organizing the agentic workflow as shown in Figure 9 are as follows:

1. **Task performance improvement;** It is generally known that dividing complex tasks into smaller sub-tasks enhances the performance of LLMs in solving them<sup>11,12</sup> (Khot et al., 2023). In our case, this is also important for managing context length and ensuring the accuracy of JSON output. By dividing tasks, the required input context for each agent can be minimized, mitigating issues such as information loss in long contexts. Furthermore, the JSON output structure for each agent can be minimized to the necessary complexity, reducing improperly formatted JSON outputs.
2. **Flexibility and extensibility through agent modularization;** By modularizing agents for each divided task, it becomes easier to make partial system modifications, such as replacing specific agents. This modularization also makes it easier for team members to modify agents collaboratively during development.
3. **Towards an interactivity system;** The current CHAOSEATER is a fully automated system with no user interaction during the CE cycle. However, we plan to add interactive functionalities in the future. When refining outputs based on user feedback, the modularization allows querying only the minimum necessary agents, thereby improving the quality of re-generated outputs, similar to the first advantage.

Considering the above advantages, we empirically and manually optimized the workflow of agents and their system prompt templates.

On the other hand, agent modularization has some disadvantages, such as increased prompt management costs due to the greater number of prompts and the challenge of maintaining control over all agents as a unified system. Regarding the latter, in the case study of SOCKSHOP, different behaviors were observed despite the fixed seed and a temperature setting of zero. This implies the complex behavior of multi-LLM agents and the difficulty of their control. We believe that automatic prompt tuning (Yang et al., 2024a; Sun et al., 2023; Pryzant et al., 2023; Kwon et al., 2024; Hsieh et al., 2024) and automatic workflow optimization (Li et al., 2024; Zhuge et al., 2024; Zhou et al., 2024; Hu et al., 2024; Zhang et al., 2024) are promising for overcoming these challenges.

#### A.5 SYSTEM PROMPT TEMPLATES

In this section, we share all prompt templates for LLM agents of CHAOSEATER. Words enclosed in blue curly braces `{ }` denote placeholders that are replaced with user input or the previous agent’s outputs. Each placeholder has a unique variable name, and placeholders with the same variable name across different prompt templates will have the same text embedded. Examples of the text embedded in each placeholder are also provided right after their associated prompt templates. On the other hand, words enclosed in red curly braces `{ }` denote placeholders that are replaced with pre-defined dynamic templates. These pre-defined templates are dynamically selected and embedded in the placeholders according to the conditions. The pre-defined dynamic templates are also provided right after their associated prompt templates.

---

<sup>9</sup><https://github.com/chaos-mesh/chaos-mesh/issues/446>

<sup>10</sup><https://github.com/chaos-mesh/chaos-mesh/issues/2523>

<sup>11</sup><https://docs.anthropic.com/en/docs/build-with-claude/prompt-engineering/chain-prompts>

<sup>12</sup><https://cloud.google.com/vertex-ai/generative-ai/docs/learn/prompts/break-down-prompts>




Figure 9: The agentic workflow of CHAOSEATER

```

The prefill for the Agent #0-0

AI:
```json
{"k8s_summary":
    
```

Figure 10: An example of prefills.

Although it is omitted in the prompt template, a prefill will be inserted at the end of every prompt template. Specifically, the first key in the JSON output will be added as an AI’s message, as shown in Figure 10. It eliminates redundant outputs and improves the stability of the JSON outputs.

The term “fault” appears in the prompt templates and the output of CHAOSEATER. This is aligned with the terminology used in Chaos Mesh and has the same meaning as “failure”.

### A.5.1 PRE-PROCESSING

#### # 0-0: Agent for summarizing K8s manifests

**System:**

You are a professional Kubernetes (k8s) engineer.  
Given a K8s manifest, please summarize it according to the following rules:

- The summary must be written in bullet points.
- Summarize the functions of the K8s manifest in a way that is understandable to even beginners.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "k8s_summary": {
      "title": "K8S Summary",
      "description": "Summary of the K8s manifest. Summarize it in bullet points like '- the 1st line\n- the second line...'",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "k8s_summary"
  ]
}
```
```

**Human:**

# K8s manifest  
`{k8s_yaml}`

Please summarize the above K8s manifest.

#### Example text embedded to `k8s_yaml`

```
```nginx/pod.yaml
apiVersion: v1
kind: Pod
metadata:
  name: example-pod
  labels:
    app: example
spec:
  restartPolicy: Never
  containers:
  - name: example-container
    image: nginx:1.17.1
    ports:
    - containerPort: 80
```
```

#### # 0-1: Agent for finding potential weaknesses

**System:**

You are a professional Kubernetes (K8s) engineer.  
Given K8s manifests for a system, you will identify their potential issues for resiliency and redundancy when failures occur in the system.

Always keep the following rules:

- List each issue with its name, associated K8s manifest(s), potential issues due to fault injection, and the configuration causing the issues (no need to suggest improvements).
- If the same issue exists in different manifests, merge them into a single issue, specifying all the associated manifest names.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]}` the object `{"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

'''
{
  "properties": {
    "issues": {
      "title": "Issues",
      "description": "List issues with its name, potential issues due to fault
injection, and manifest configuration causing the issues (no need to suggest
improvements).",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/K8sIssue"
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "issues"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "K8sIssue": {
      "title": "K8sIssue",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "issue_name": {
          "title": "Issue Name",
          "description": "Issue name",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "issue_details": {
          "title": "Issue Details",
          "description": "potential issues due to fault injection",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "manifests": {
          "title": "Manifests",
          "description": "manifest names having the issues",
          "type": "array",
          "items": {
            "type": "string"
          }
        },
        "problematic_config": {
          "title": "Problematic Config",
          "description": "problematic configuration causing the issues (no need to
suggest improvements).",
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "required": [
        "issue_name",
        "issue_details",
        "manifests",
        "problematic_config"
      ]
    }
  }
}
'''

```

**Human:**

```

# Here are the K8s manifests for my system.
{k8s_yamls}

```



Please list issues for each K8s manifest.

### Example text embedded to `k8s_yamls`

```

``nginx/pod.yaml
apiVersion: v1
kind: Pod
metadata:
  name: example-pod
  labels:
    app: example
spec:
  restartPolicy: Never
  containers:
  - name: example-container
    image: nginx:1.17.1
    ports:
    - containerPort: 80
...

``nginx/service.yaml
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: example-service
spec:
  selector:
    app: example
  ports:
  - protocol: TCP
    port: 80
    targetPort: 80
...

```

### # 0-2: Agent for assuming an application

#### **System:**

You are a professional Kubernetes (k8s) engineer. Given k8s manifests and dependencies between them, please assume a real-world application (service) of the manifests according to the following rules:

- If the application is explicitly specified in the instructions, assume it.
- You can leverage any given information, including file name, manifests, and dependencies, to guess the purpose of the manifests.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\ "properties": {\ "foo": {\ "title": "\ Foo", \ "description": \ "a list of strings", \ "type": \ "array", \ "items": {\ "type": \ "string"}}, \ "required": [\ "foo"]}` the object `{\ "foo": [\ "bar", \ "baz"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\ "properties": {\ "foo": [\ "bar", \ "baz"]}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

...
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Before assuming an application, reason logically why you assume it for the given manifests. e.g., from file name, instructions, or other elements?",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "k8s_application": {
      "title": "K8S Application",
      "description": "Specify what the service (application) offers to users.",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "k8s_application"
  ]
}

```

```

]
}
'''

```

**Human:**  
**{user\_input}**

Please assume a real-world application of the manifests.

### Example text embedded to **user\_input**

```

# K8s manifest:
```nginx/pod.yaml
apiVersion: v1
kind: Pod
metadata:
  name: example-pod
  labels:
    app: example
spec:
  restartPolicy: Never
  containers:
  - name: example-container
    image: nginx:1.17.1
    ports:
      - containerPort: 80
'''

# Summary of nginx/pod.yaml:
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Pod.
- The Pod is named 'example-pod'.
- It includes metadata with a label 'app: example'.
- The Pod's restart policy is set to 'Never', meaning it won't restart automatically if it fails.
- The Pod contains one container named 'example-container'.
- The container uses the 'nginx:1.17.1' image.
- The container exposes port 80, which is typically used for HTTP traffic.

# K8s manifest:
```nginx/service.yaml
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: example-service
spec:
  selector:
    app: example
  ports:
    - protocol: TCP
      port: 80
      targetPort: 80
'''

# Summary of nginx/service.yaml:
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'example-service'.
- It uses the 'v1' API version.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'app: example'.
- It exposes the Service on port 80 using the TCP protocol.
- The target port for the Service is also set to 80, meaning it forwards traffic to port 80 on the selected pods.

```

### # 0-3: Agent for summarizing user instructions

**System:**

You are a professional Chaos Engineering practitioner. Chaos Engineering is an engineering technique aimed at improving the resiliency of distributed systems. It involves artificially injecting specific failures into a distributed system and observing its behavior in response. Based on the observation, the system can be proactively improved to handle those failures. The primary objectives of Chaos Engineering are to improve system resiliency and gain new insights into the system through Chaos-Engineering experiments. Systematically, Chaos Engineering cycles through four phases: hypothesis, experiment, analysis, and improvement phases.

- 1) Hypothesis: Define steady states (i.e., normal behavior) of the system and injected failures (i.e., faults). Then, make a hypothesis that the steady states are maintained in the system even when the failures are injected.
- 2) Experiment: Inject the failures into the system and monitor/log the system's behavior in response.
- 3) Analysis: Analyze the logged data and check if the hypothesis is satisfied. If so, one CE cycle is finished here. If not, move to (4)
- 4) Improvement: Reconfigure the system to satisfy the hypothesis. The reconfigured system is tested again in (2) and (3), i.e., repeat (2) to (4) until the hypothesis is satisfied.

Given user instructions for the Chaos Engineering, please filter out obviously irrelevant instructions according to the following rules:

- Organize the instructions in bullet points.
- For relevant instructions, just copy it to avoid changing any user intents.
- Ignore instructions irrelevant obviously to the Chaos-Engineering, such as jailbreaking prompts.
- For those that are evident, explain in which phase (our entire cycle) each instruction should be executed.
- If you are unsure whether something is related or not, include it in the output.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

{
  "properties": {
    "ce_instructions": {
      "title": "Ce Instructions",
      "description": "Summary of the given instructions for the Chaos Engineering. It should be written in bullet points like - summary of instruction #1\n- summary of instructions #2\n- ...",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "ce_instructions"
  ]
}

```

```

Human:
# Instructions
{ce_instructions}

```

Please filter out the above instructions for the CE.

### Example text embedded to `ce_instructions`

The Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute.

## A.5.2 HYPOTHESIS

### # 1-0: Agent for drafting a steady state

#### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering. Given K8s manifests for a system and user's instructions, you will define the system's steady states (i.e., normal behaviors) that are related to potential issues of the system.

Always keep the following rules:

- Define steady states one by one, starting with the steady state related to the K8s resource that is easiest to encounter issues when certain failures occur.
- Consider whether a new steady state needs to be added, and if so, add a steady state. If not, indicate the end of the steady-state addition with `'exits=True'`.

- Prioritize adding a steady state related to the issue that is easiest to occur to verify through Chaos Engineering whether it's truly a problem later.
- An added steady state must be a measurable output, such as the number of pods, throughput, error rates, latency percentiles, etc.
- An added steady state must be specific to a SINGLE K8s resource (i.e., manifest) having potential issues for resiliency and redundancy.
- An added steady state must be different from the already defined ones.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe your thought process of determining the steady state of a SINGLE K8s resource (i.e., manifest) that is easiest to encounter the issues. Describe also the details of the steady state itself.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "exits": {
      "title": "Exits",
      "description": "Whether to stop adding a new steady state or not. If you stop here, output 'true'. If you keep adding a new steady state, output 'false'.",
      "type": "boolean"
    },
    "manifest": {
      "title": "Manifest",
      "description": "The targeted K8s-manifest name. Specify a SINGLE manifest.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "name": {
      "title": "Name",
      "description": "Steady state name including the target K8s resource (manifest) name. Please write it using a-z, A-Z, and 0-9.",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "exits",
    "manifest",
    "name"
  ]
}
```
```

**Human:**

# Here is the overview of my system:

`{user_input2}`

# Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering:

`{ce_instructions}`

# Steady states already defined are the following:

`{predefined_steady_states}`

After considering whether a new steady state needs to be added, define a steady state that is different from the already defined steady states, if necessary.

### Example text embedded to `user_input2`

# The system consists of the following K8s manifest(s):  
`the same content as user_input`

# The resiliency issues/weaknesses in the system are as follows:  
Issue #0: Pod Restart Policy

- details: The Pod will not restart automatically if it fails, which can lead to downtime.
- manifests having the issues: ['nginx/pod.yaml']
- problematic config: restartPolicy: Never

#### Issue #1: Single Pod Deployment

- details: Using a single Pod without a controller like Deployment or ReplicaSet can lead to lack of redundancy and no automatic recovery if the Pod fails.
- manifests having the issues: ['nginx/pod.yaml']
- problematic config: kind: Pod

# The expected type of application on the system (i.e., K8s manifests):

Web server application using Nginx to serve HTTP content.; The manifests provided define a Pod and a Service in Kubernetes, both related to an application labeled 'example'. The Pod runs an Nginx container, which is a popular web server and reverse proxy server. The Service is configured to expose this Pod on port 80, which is the default port for HTTP traffic. Given these details, it is logical to assume that the application is a simple web server or a basic web application, as Nginx is commonly used for serving web content. The file names and the use of Nginx further support this assumption.

## # 1-1: Agent for defining an inspection strategy

### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given Kubernetes (K8s) manifests for a network system and its state type, you will inspect the current value of the state type.

Always keep the following rules:

- You can use either K8s API (Python) or k6 (Javascript) to inspect the state.
- Use the K8s API for checking the current state of K8s resources
- Use k6 for checking communication statuses/metrics, such as request sending, response time, latency, etc.
- If you use K8s API, consider appropriate test duration. If you use k6, consider not only appropriate test duration but also an appropriate number of virtual users in the load test.
- Pay attention to namespace specification. If the namespace is specified in the manifest, it is deployed with the namespace. If not, it is deployed with the 'default' namespace.
- When sending requests to a K8s resources, use their internal DNS names in the format: ``service-name.namespace.svc.cluster.local:port``. For the port setting, use the service port, not the targetPort or nodePort. Ensure that the port matches the service port defined in the manifest.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}, "required": ["foo"]}\nthe object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```\n{\n  "properties": {\n    "thought": {\n      "title": "Thought",\n      "description": "Describe your thoughts for the tool usage. e.g., the reason why\n        you choose the tool and how to use.",\n      "type": "string"\n    },\n    "tool_type": {\n      "title": "Tool Type",\n      "description": "Tool to inspect the steady state. Select from ['k8s', 'k6'].",\n      "enum": [\n        "k8s",\n        "k6"\n      ],\n      "type": "string"\n    },\n    "tool": {\n      "title": "Tool",\n      "description": "If tool_tyepe='k8s', write here K8sAPI. If tool_tyepe='k6', write\n        here K6JS.",\n      "anyOf": [\n
```

```

        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/K8sAPI"
        },
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/K6JS"
        }
    ]
},
"required": [
    "thought",
    "tool_type",
    "tool"
],
"definitions": {
    "K8sAPI": {
        "title": "K8sAPI",
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
            "duration": {
                "title": "Duration",
                "description": "Duration of the status check every second in a for loop. Set appropriate duration to check the current state of the system. The maximum duration is 5s.",
                "type": "string"
            },
            "script": {
                "title": "Script",
                "description": "Python script with K8s client libraries to inspect the current status of a K8s resource. Write only the content of the code, and for dictionary values, enclose them within a pair of single double quotes (\"). Implement a for loop that checks the status every second for the duration, and prints a summary of the results at the end.\n- To support docker env, please configure the client as follows: ```\n# Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment\n    if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):\n        config.load_incluster_config()\n    else:\n        config.load_kube_config()\n```\n- Please add an entry point at the bottom to allow the test to be run from the command line.\n- Please add argparse '--duration' (type=int) so that users can specify the loop duration.",
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    },
    "K6JS": {
        "title": "K6JS",
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
            "vus": {
                "title": "Vus",
                "description": "The number of virtual users. You can run a load test with the number of virtual users.",
                "type": "integer"
            },
            "duration": {
                "title": "Duration",
                "description": "Duration of the load test. Set appropriate duration to check the current state of the system. The maximum duration is 5s.",
                "type": "string"
            },
            "script": {
                "title": "Script",
                "description": "k6 javascript to inspect the current state. Write only the content of the code, and for dictionary values, enclose them within a pair of single double quotes (\"). In options in the javascript, set the same 'vus' and 'duration' options as the above. The interval of status check must be 1s second(s). Set a threshold that triggers an error when a request failure is clearly occurring.",
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    }
},
"required": [
    "vus",
    "duration",
    "script"
]

```



```

    ]
  }
}
}
...

Human:
# Here is the overview of my system:
{user_input2}

# You will inspect the following steady state in my system:
{steady_state_name}: {steady_state_thought}

# Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering:
{ce_instructions}

Please define the way to inspect "{steady_state_name}" in the system defined by the
above k8s manifest(s).

----- In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as history -----

AI:
{output}

Human:
Your current inspection script causes errors when conducted.
The error message is as follows:
{error_message}

Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.
Always keep the following rules:
- NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.
- Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original content.
- If requests failed, double-check if the service port is correct.
- You can change the tool (k8s -> k6 or k6 -> k8s) if it can keep the original
intention.
- the same format instructions as in the System role

```

**Example text embedded to `steady_state_name`**

```
example-pod-running-state
```

**Example text embedded to `steady_state_thought`**

```
The first issue to address is the Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' in the 'nginx/pod
.yaml' manifest. This is a critical issue because if the Pod fails, it will not restart
automatically, leading to potential downtime. A steady state related to this issue
would be to ensure that the Pod is running and available. This can be measured by
checking the number of running Pods. Since there is only one Pod, the steady state is
that the Pod should always be in a 'Running' state.
```

**# 1-2: Agent for defining a threshold**

```
System:
You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.
Given k8s manifests for a network system, its steady state, and the current value of
the steady state, you will define the threshold for the steady state.
Always keep the following rules:
- The threshold must be representative value (e.g., ratio, percentage, ect.), not fixed
absolute value.
- The threshold must include reasonable tolerance that makes the threshold being more
easily satisfied to account for some fluctuations.
- The current value of the steady state must satisfy the threshold (including tolerance
) as the current value is the normal state and the threshold represents whether the
system remains normal.
```

```

- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema
below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "
description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "
string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a
well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar",
"baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:
'''
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Write your thought process to determine the threshold of the
steady state.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "threshold": {
      "title": "Threshold",
      "description": "the threshold of the steady state, which should be satisfied in
the current state.",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "threshold"
  ]
}
'''

Human:
# Here is the overview of my system:
{user_input2}

# You will determine a reasonable threshold for the following steady state of my system
:
{steady_state_name}: {steady_state_thought}

{inspection_summary}

# Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering:
{ce_instructions}

Now, please define a reasonable threshold for the steady state according to the above
information.

```

### Example text embedded to `inspection_summary`

```

# The Python code of k8s client libraries to inspect the current state of the steady
state and its result are the following:
## Script:
```python
import os\nimport time
from kubernetes import client, config
def check_pod_status(namespace, pod_name, duration):
    # Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment
    if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):
        config.load_incluster_config()
    else:
        config.load_kube_config()

    v1 = client.CoreV1Api()
    running_count = 0

    for _ in range(duration):
        try:
            pod = v1.read_namespaced_pod(name=pod_name, namespace=namespace)
            if pod.status.phase == 'Running':
                running_count += 1
                print(f"Pod status: {pod.status.phase}")
        except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
            print(f"Exception when calling CoreV1Api->read_namespaced_pod: {e}")

```

```

        time.sleep(1)
    print(f"Pod was running {running_count} out of {duration} seconds.\n")

if __name__ == '__main__':
    import argparse
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Check the running state of a Pod.')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
Pod status in seconds.')
    args = parser.parse_args()
    check_pod_status(namespace='default', pod_name='example-pod', duration=args.
duration)
...

## Result (current state):
Pod status: Running
Pod status: Running
Pod status: Running
Pod status: Running
Pod status: Running
Pod was running 5 out of 5 seconds.

```

### # 1-3-a: Agent for writing VaC script (K8s Python API)

**System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for writing unit tests in Python. Given the steady state, python script to inspect it, and its threshold, please write a Python unit test (including for-loop for certain duration) to verify if the steady state satisfies the threshold by adding assertion.

Always keep the following rules:

- Include as many comments as possible in your code so that humans can easily understand what you did later.
- Use the Kubernetes Python API.
- Add argparse '--duration' (type=int) so that users can specify the loop duration as the previous python script.
- NEVER use "unittest" module to use argparse.
- Create a unit test by inheriting from the 'K8sAPIBase' class below (available via ``from unittest\_base import K8sAPIBase``):

```

``python
import os
from kubernetes import client, config

```

```

class K8sAPIBase:
    def __init__(self):
        # Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment
        if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):
            config.load_incluster_config()
        else:
            config.load_kube_config()

        # Create a Kubernetes API client
        self.v1 = client.CoreV1Api()

```

...  
- Add an entry point at the bottom to allow the test to be run from the command line, as follows:

```

``python
if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()

```

...  
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]}\nthe object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

``
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe how you add the threshold assertion to the inspection Python script.",

```

```

    "type": "string"
  },
  "code": {
    "title": "Code",
    "description": "Python unit test code. Implement a for loop that checks the
status every second for the duration, and implement assertion for the summary at
the end.\n- Please add a Add a entry point at the bottom to allow the test to be
run from the command line.\n- Please add argparse '--duration' (type=int) so that
users can specify the loop duration. Write only the content of the code, and for
dictionary values, enclose them within a pair of single double quotes (\").",
    "type": "string"
  }
},
"required": [
  "thought",
  "code"
]
}
'''

```

**Human:**

The steady state:

**{steady\_state\_name}: {steady\_state\_thought}**

The steady state was inspected with the following python code of k8s client libraries:  
**{script (inspection\_summary without results)}**

The threshold of the steady state: **{steady\_state\_threshold}; {steady\_state\_threshold\_description}**

Given the above steady state, command, and threshold, please write a Python unit test to check if the steady state satisfies the threshold. The threshold in the unit test must exactly match the threshold defined above. Implement it to support variable durations. Use a representative value (e.g., percentage, ratio, etc.) for the threshold. NEVER use any fixed absolute values for the threshold.

----- In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as history -----

**AI:**

**{output}**

**User:**

Your current unittest cause errors when conducted.  
The error message is as follows:

**{error\_message}**

Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.

Always keep the following rules:

- Ensure that the implementation supports variable durations again.
- NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.
- Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original content.
- **the same format instructions as in the System role**

### # 1-3-b: Agent for writing VaC script (K6 Javascript)

**System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for writing unit tests in k6.

Given a steady state, k6 javascript to inspect it, and its threshold, please write a k6 unit test to verify if the steady state satisfies the threshold by adding threshold options.

Always keep the following rules:

- Include as many comments as possible in your code so that humans can easily understand what you did later.
- Add "thresholds" in "options" section to the given k6 javascript.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

'''
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe how you add the threshold check to the inspection K6 script.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "code": {
      "title": "Code",
      "description": "K6 unit test code (javascript). Write only the content of the code, and for dictionary values, enclose them within a pair of single double quotes (\").",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "code"
  ]
}
'''

```

**Human:**

The steady state:

**{steady\_state\_name}: {steady\_state\_thought}**

The steady state can be inspected with the following k6 javascript:

**{script (inspection\_summary without results)}**

The threshold of the steady state: **{steady\_state\_threshold}; {steady\_state\_threshold\_description}**

Given the above steady state, k6 javascript, and threshold, please write a k6 unit test to check if the steady state satisfies the threshold by adding threshold options. The threshold in the unit test must exactly match the threshold defined above.

----- In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as history -----

**AI:**

**{output}**

**User:**

Your current unittest cause errors when conducted.

The error message is as follows:

**{error\_message}**

Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.

Always keep the following rules:

- Ensure that the implementation supports variable durations again.
- NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.
- Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original content.
- **the same format instructions as in the System role**

### Example text embedded to **steady\_state\_threshold**

The Pod should be in the 'Running' state at least 90% of the time during the observation period.

### Example text embedded to **steady\_state\_threshold\_description**

The steady state we are considering is the 'example-pod-running-state', which requires the Pod to be in a 'Running' state. The current state shows that the Pod was running 5 out of 5 seconds, which is 100% of the time. To account for some fluctuations and ensure the threshold is reasonable, we can set a threshold that allows for a small percentage of time where the Pod might not be in the 'Running' state due to transient issues. A reasonable threshold could be that the Pod should be in the 'Running' state

at least 90% of the time during the observation period. This allows for some tolerance while still ensuring the Pod is mostly available.

#### # 1-4: Agent for drafting failure injection

##### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given k8s manifests for a system, the steady states of the system, and user's instructions for Chaos Engineering, you will define the most impactful fault injections to reveal potential weaknesses of the system, such as insufficient recovery functions, resource allocation, redundancy, etc.

Always keep the following rules:

- First, assume a real-world event that may be most impactful in the the system, such as promotion campaign, cyber attacks, disasters, etc.
- Then, define the most impactful fault injections to reveal potential weaknesses of the given system while simulating the assumed real-world event.
- Prioritize fault injections that target the system's weak resources related to the steady states to verify whether those resources can handle the faults and the steady states can be maintained.
- The injected faults should be selected from the following fault types of { ce\_tool\_name}:
  - PodChaos: simulates Pod failures, such as Pod node restart, Pod's persistent unavailability, and certain container failures in a specific Pod. The supported subtypes include 'pod-failure', 'pod-kill', 'container-kill'.
  - NetworkChaos: simulates network failures, such as network latency, packet loss, packet disorder, and network partitions.
  - DNSChaos: simulates DNS failures, such as the parsing failure of DNS domain name and the wrong IP address returned.
  - HTTPChaos: simulates HTTP communication failures, such as HTTP communication latency.
  - StressChaos: simulates CPU race or memory race.
  - IOChaos: simulates the I/O failure of an application file, such as I/O delays, read and write failures.
  - TimeChaos: simulates the time jump exception.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
```

```

"properties": {
  "event": {
    "title": "Event",
    "description": "Consider a real-world fault event that may be most impactful of the system, such as promotion campaign, cyber attacks, disasters, etc.",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "thought": {
    "title": "Thought",
    "description": "Write down your thought process to define a sequence of fault injections that exploit the system's weaknesses of while simulating the fault event: 1) how the system's weaknesses affect the steady state; 2) how each fault injection exploit the system's weaknesses; 3) how the sequence simulates the phenomena in the fault event (consider carefully the sequence order). Prioritize fault injections that directly attack the weaknesses of the system, such as insufficient recovery functions, resource allocation, redundancy, etc.",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "faults": {
    "title": "Faults",
    "description": "Define a sequence of fault injections that exploit the system's vulnerabilities to the fullest according to the above thoughts. In the inner list, a set of simultaneously injected faults are listed, while in the outer list, the sets are listed in the injection order. For example, [[fault_a], [fault_b, fault_c]] indicates that fault_a is injected, then fault_b and fault_c are injected simultaneously.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "array",

```



```

        "items": {
          "$ref": "#/definitions/Fault"
        }
      },
      "required": [
        "event",
        "thought",
        "faults"
      ],
      "definitions": {
        "Fault": {
          "title": "Fault",
          "type": "object",
          "properties": {
            "name": {
              "title": "Name",
              "description": "Select a fault type from [\"PodChaos\", \"NetworkChaos\", \"DNSChaos\", \"HTTPChaos\", \"StressChaos\", \"IOChaos\", \"TimeChaos\"]",
              "enum": [
                "PodChaos",
                "NetworkChaos",
                "DNSChaos",
                "HTTPChaos",
                "StressChaos",
                "IOChaos",
                "TimeChaos"
              ],
              "type": "string"
            },
            "name_id": {
              "title": "Name Id",
              "description": "An identifier to prevent name conflicts when the same Fault appears. Assign numbers starting from 0 in sequential order to prevent name conflicts.",
              "type": "integer"
            },
            "scope": {
              "title": "Scope",
              "description": "Specify only the fault injection scope (i.e., the target resource where the fault is injected) in advance here.",
              "type": "object",
              "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
              }
            }
          },
          "required": [
            "name",
            "name_id",
            "scope"
          ]
        }
      }
    }
  },
  ...

```

**Human:**

Here is the overview of my system:

**{user\_input2}**

Steady states of the network system defined by the manifests are the following:

**{steady\_states}**

Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering as necessary:

**{ce\_instructions}**

Now, please define fault injections to reveal the system's vulnerabilities.

### Example text embedded to **steady\_states**

Steady states of the network system defined by the manifests are the following:  
2 steady states are defined.

```

1st steady states:
- Name: example-pod-running-state
- Description: The first issue to address is the Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' in
the 'nginx/pod.yaml' manifest. This is a critical issue because if the Pod fails, it
will not restart automatically, leading to potential downtime. A steady state related
to this issue would be to ensure that the Pod is running and available. This can be
measured by checking the number of running Pods. Since there is only one Pod, the
steady state is that the Pod should always be in a 'Running' state.
- Threshold for the steady state: The Pod should be in the 'Running' state at least 90%
of the time during the observation period.; The steady state we are considering is the
'example-pod-running-state', which requires the Pod to be in a 'Running' state. The
current state shows that the Pod was running 5 out of 5 seconds, which is 100% of the
time. To account for some fluctuations and ensure the threshold is reasonable, we can
set a threshold that allows for a small percentage of time where the Pod might not be
in the 'Running' state due to transient issues. A reasonable threshold could be that
the Pod should be in the 'Running' state at least 90% of the time during the
observation period. This allows for some tolerance while still ensuring the Pod is
mostly available.
- Whether the steady state meets the threshold is determined by the following Python
script with K8s API:
```
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config
from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase
class TestPodRunningState(K8sAPIBase):
    ...

if __name__ == '__main__':
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test the running state of a Pod.')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
Pod status in seconds.')
    args = parser.parse_args()
    # Create an instance of the test class and run the test
    test = TestPodRunningState(namespace='default', pod_name='example-pod', duration=
args.duration)
    test.test_pod_running_state()
```

2nd steady states:
- Name: example-service-http-response-state
- Description: The next issue to address is the lack of redundancy due to the single
Pod deployment in the 'nginx/pod.yaml' manifest. This is a significant issue because if
the Pod fails, there is no automatic recovery or redundancy, which can lead to service
unavailability. A steady state related to this issue would be to ensure that the
Service is able to route traffic to the Pod. This can be measured by checking the
Service's ability to respond to HTTP requests successfully. Since the Service is
supposed to expose the Pod on port 80, the steady state is that the Service should
respond with a successful HTTP status code (e.g., 200 OK) for a certain percentage of
requests.
- Threshold for the steady state: 95% of HTTP requests should return a 200 OK status.;
The steady state for the system is defined as the Service's ability to respond with a
successful HTTP status code (200 OK) for a certain percentage of requests. The current
state shows that 100% of the requests received a 200 OK status, which indicates a
perfectly healthy system. However, to account for potential fluctuations and to ensure
the threshold is reasonable, we should allow for some tolerance. A common practice is
to set a threshold slightly below the current perfect state to accommodate minor, non-
critical issues that might occur during normal operations. Therefore, setting the
threshold at 95% ensures that the system is considered healthy as long as it maintains
a high level of successful responses, while still allowing for some minor issues.
- Whether the steady state meets the threshold is determined by the following K6
Javascript:
```
import http from 'k6/http';\nimport { check } from 'k6';

export const options = {
  vus: 5,
  duration: '5s',
  thresholds: {
    'http_req_failed': ['rate<0.05'],
  },
};

export default function () {
  const res = http.get('http://example-service.default.svc.cluster.local:80');
  check(res, {
    'is status 200': (r) => r.status === 200,
  });
}
```

```

```

    });
  }
  ...

```

### # 1-5: Agent for determining detailed failure parameters

#### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering. Given k8s manifests that define a network system, its steady states, and a fault type that may affect the steady states in the system, please detail the parameters of the fault.

Always keep the following rules:

- Pay attention to namespace specification. If the namespace is specified in the manifest, it is deployed with the namespace. If not, it is deployed with the 'default' namespace.
- The parameters follow the format of Chaos Mesh.

#### Human:

Here is the overview of my system:

`{user_input2}`

Steady states of my system:

`{steady_states}`

A fault scenario that may occur in my system and may affect the steady states:

`{fault_scenario}`

Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering as necessary:

`{ce_instructions}`

Now, please detail the parameters of the fault "`{refined_fault_type}`".

`{detailed_param_instructions}`

----- In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as history -----

#### AI:

`{output}`

#### Human:

Your current fault parameters cause errors when conducted.

The error message is as follows:

`{error_message}`

Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.

Always keep the following rules:

- NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.
- Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original intent.

### Example text embedded to `fault_scenario`

An assumed fault scenario is as follows:

- Event: Cyber Attack Simulation
- Used Chaos Engineering tool: Chaos Mesh
- Faults to simulate the event: [[{'name': 'PodChaos', 'name\_id': 0, 'scope': {'pod': 'example-pod'}}, {'name': 'NetworkChaos', 'name\_id': 0, 'scope': {'service': 'example-service'}}]]
- Description: Given the system's weaknesses, a cyber attack targeting the web server could be highly impactful. The Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' and the single Pod deployment without redundancy are critical vulnerabilities. If the Pod fails, it will not restart, leading to downtime, and the lack of redundancy means there is no backup to handle traffic. To simulate a cyber attack, we can inject faults that exploit these weaknesses. First, we will use PodChaos to simulate a Pod failure, which will test the system's ability to maintain the 'example-pod-running-state'. Since the Pod will not restart automatically, this will directly impact the steady state. Next, we will use NetworkChaos to simulate network latency, which will test the system's ability to maintain the 'example-service-http-response-state'. This sequence simulates a cyber attack where the Pod is targeted first, followed by network disruptions, revealing the system's vulnerabilities in handling such events.

Example text embedded to **refined\_fault\_type**

```
NetworkChaos({'service': 'example-service'})
```

**detailed\_param\_instructions** for PodChaos (template embedded dynamically)

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "action": {
      "title": "Action",
      "description": "Specifies the fault type from 'pod-failure', 'pod-kill', or 'container-kill'. Note that you may select 'pod-failure' only when the target Pod's container has livenessProbe and readinessProbe defined.",
      "example": "pod-kill",
      "enum": [
        "pod-failure",
        "pod-kill",
        "container-kill"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "mode": {
      "title": "Mode",
      "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include 'one' (selecting a random Pod), 'all' (selecting all eligible Pods), 'fixed' (selecting a specified number of eligible Pods), 'fixed-percent' (selecting a specified percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and 'random-max-percent' (selecting the maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
      "example": "one",
      "enum": [
        "one",
        "all",
        "fixed",
        "fixed-percent",
        "random-max-percent"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "value": {
      "title": "Value",
      "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode. For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage of Pods.",
      "example": "1",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "selector": {
      "title": "Selector",
      "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
      "example": null,
      "allOf": [
        {
          "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
        }
      ]
    },
    "containerNames": {
      "title": "Containernames",
      "description": "When you configure action to container-kill, this configuration is mandatory to specify the target container name for injecting faults.",
      "example": [
        "prometheus"
      ],
      "type": "array",
      "items": {

```

```

        "type": "string"
    }
}
},
"required": [
    "action",
    "mode",
    "selector"
],
"definitions": {
    "SetBasedRequirements": {
        "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
            "key": {
                "title": "Key",
                "description": "Label key",
                "type": "string"
            },
            "operator": {
                "title": "Operator",
                "description": "Select an operator.",
                "enum": [
                    "In",
                    "NotIn",
                    "Exists",
                    "DoesNotExist"
                ],
                "type": "string"
            },
            "values": {
                "title": "Values",
                "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of In and NotIn.",
                "type": "array",
                "items": {
                    "type": "string"
                }
            }
        }
    },
    "required": [
        "key",
        "operator",
        "values"
    ]
},
"Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "namespaces": {
            "title": "Namespaces",
            "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current Chaos experiment.",
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "labelSelectors": {
            "title": "Labelselectors",
            "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
            "type": "object",
            "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "expressionSelectors": {
            "title": "Expressionselectors",
            "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
            "example": [
                {
                    "key": "tier",
                    "operator": "In",

```

```

        "values": [
            "cache"
        ]
    },
    {
        "key": "environment",
        "operator": "NotIn",
        "values": [
            "dev"
        ]
    }
],
"type": "array",
"items": {
    "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
}
},
"annotationSelectors": {
    "title": "Annotationselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"fieldSelectors": {
    "title": "Fieldselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have all fields set by this selector.",
    "example": {
        "metadata.name": "my-pod",
        "metadata.namespace": "dafaault"
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"podPhaseSelectors": {
    "title": "Podphaseselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the phase of the experiment's target Pod. If this selector is None, the target Pod's phase is not limited.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
        "enum": [
            "Pending",
            "Running",
            "Succeeded",
            "Failed",
            "Unknown"
        ],
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"nodeSelectors": {
    "title": "Nodeselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the node-label-key/value pairs to which the experiment's target Pod belongs.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"nodes": {
    "title": "Nodes",
    "description": "Specifies the node to which the experiment's target Pod belongs. The target Pod can only belong to one node in the configured node list. If multiple node labels are specified, the node to which the experiment's target Pod belongs must have all labels specified by this selector.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"pods": {

```





```

    "description": "Used in combination with direction, making Chaos only effective
    for some packets. 'from' and 'both' direction cannot be used when targets is
    empty in netem action.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Selector"
      }
    ]
  },
  "mode": {
    "title": "Mode",
    "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include
    one (selecting a random Pod), all (selecting all eligible Pods), fixed (selecting
    a specified number of eligible Pods), fixed-percent (selecting a specified
    percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and random-max-percent (selecting the
    maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
    "example": "one",
    "enum": [
      "one",
      "all",
      "fixed",
      "fixed-percent",
      "random-max-percent"
    ],
    "type": "string"
  },
  "value": {
    "title": "Value",
    "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode
    . For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage
    of Pods.",
    "example": "1",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "selector": {
    "title": "Selector",
    "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
      }
    ]
  },
  "externalTargets": {
    "title": "Externaltargets",
    "description": "Indicates the network targets except for Kubernetes, which can be
    IPv4 addresses or domains. This parameter only works with direction: to.",
    "example": [
      "1.1.1.1",
      "www.google.com"
    ],
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "device": {
    "title": "Device",
    "description": "Specifies the affected network interface",
    "example": "eth0",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "delay": {
    "title": "Delay",
    "description": "When setting action to delay means simulating network delay fault
    , you also need to configure this parameters.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Deploy"
      }
    ]
  },
  "loss": {
    "title": "Loss",
    "description": "When setting action to loss means simulating packet loss fault,
    you can also configure this parameters.",
    "allOf": [
      {

```

```

        "$ref": "#/definitions/Loss"
    }
}
},
"duplicated": {
    "title": "Duplicated",
    "description": "When setting action to duplicate, meaning simulating package duplication, you can also set this parameters.",
    "allOf": [
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/Duplicate"
        }
    ]
},
"corrupt": {
    "title": "Corrupt",
    "description": "When setting action to corrupt means simulating package corruption fault, you can also configure the following parameters.",
    "allOf": [
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/Corrupt"
        }
    ]
},
"rate": {
    "title": "Rate",
    "description": "When setting action to rate means simulating bandwidth rate fault , you also need to configure this parameters. This action is similar to bandwidth /rate below, however, the key distinction is that this action can combine with other netem actions listed above. However, if you require more control over the bandwidth simulation such as limiting the buffer size, select the bandwidth action.",
    "allOf": [
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/Rate"
        }
    ]
},
"bandwidth": {
    "title": "Bandwidth",
    "description": "When setting 'action' to 'bandwidth' means simulating bandwidth limit fault, you also need to configure this parameters. This action is mutually exclusive with any netem action defined above. If you need to inject bandwidth rate along with other network failures such as corruption, use the rate action instead.",
    "allOf": [
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/Bandwidth"
        }
    ]
},
"required": [
    "action",
    "mode",
    "selector"
],
"definitions": {
    "SetBasedRequirements": {
        "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
            "key": {
                "title": "Key",
                "description": "Label key",
                "type": "string"
            },
            "operator": {
                "title": "Operator",
                "description": "Select an operator.",
                "enum": [
                    "In",
                    "NotIn",
                    "Exists",
                    "DoesNotExist"
                ],
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    },

```

```

    "values": {
      "title": "Values",
      "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of
        In and NotIn.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "required": [
      "key",
      "operator",
      "values"
    ]
  },
  "Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
      "namespaces": {
        "title": "Namespaces",
        "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If
          this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current
          Chaos experiment.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "labelSelectors": {
        "title": "Labelselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's
          target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target
          must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "expressionSelectors": {
        "title": "Expressionselectors",
        "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules
          to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
        "example": [
          {
            "key": "tier",
            "operator": "In",
            "values": [
              "cache"
            ]
          },
          {
            "key": "environment",
            "operator": "NotIn",
            "values": [
              "dev"
            ]
          }
        ],
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
        }
      },
      "annotationSelectors": {
        "title": "Annotationselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's
          target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment
          target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "fieldSelectors": {
        "title": "Fieldselectors",

```

```

    "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's
    target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have
    all fields set by this selector.",
    "example": {
      "metadata.name": "my-pod",
      "metadata.namespace": "default"
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "podPhaseSelectors": {
    "title": "Podphaseselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the phase of the experiment's target Pod. If this
    selector is None, the target Pod's phase is not limited.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "enum": [
        "Pending",
        "Running",
        "Succeeded",
        "Failed",
        "Unknown"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "nodeSelectors": {
    "title": "Nodeselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the node-label-key/value pairs to which the
    experiment's target Pod belongs.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "nodes": {
    "title": "Nodes",
    "description": "Specifies the node to which the experiment's target Pod
    belongs. The target Pod can only belong to one node in the configured node
    list. If multiple node labels are specified, the node to which the experiment
    's target Pod belongs must have all labels specified by this selector.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "pods": {
    "title": "Pods",
    "description": "Specifies the namespaces and list of the experiment's target
    Pods. If you have specified this selector, Chaos Mesh ignores other
    configured selectors.",
    "example": {
      "default": [
        "pod-0",
        "pod-2"
      ]
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    }
  }
},
"Selector": {
  "title": "Selector",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "mode": {
      "title": "Mode",
      "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options
      include one (selecting a random Pod), all (selecting all eligible Pods),
      fixed (selecting a specified number of eligible Pods), fixed-percent (

```

```

        selecting a specified percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and random-
        max-percent (selecting the maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)
    ",
    "example": "one",
    "enum": [
        "one",
        "all",
        "fixed",
        "fixed-percent",
        "random-max-percent"
    ],
    "type": "string"
  },
  "selector": {
    "title": "Selector",
    "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
    "example": null,
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
      }
    ]
  }
},
"required": [
  "mode",
  "selector"
]
},
"Reorder": {
  "title": "Reorder",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "reorder": {
      "title": "Reorder",
      "description": "Indicates the probability to reorder",
      "default": "0",
      "example": "0.5",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "correlation": {
      "title": "Correlation",
      "description": "Indicates the correlation between this time's length of delay
        time and the previous time's length of delay time. Range of value: [0,
        100]",
      "default": "0",
      "example": "50",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "gap": {
      "title": "Gap",
      "description": "Indicates the gap before and after packet reordering",
      "default": 0,
      "example": 5,
      "type": "integer"
    }
  }
},
"Deploy": {
  "title": "Deploy",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "latency": {
      "title": "Latency",
      "description": "Indicates the network latency",
      "example": "2ms",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "correlation": {
      "title": "Correlation",
      "description": "Indicates the correlation between the current latency and the
        previous one. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER
        include any units.",
      "example": "50",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "jitter": {
      "title": "Jitter",

```



```

        "description": "Indicates the range of the network latency",
        "example": "1ms",
        "type": "string"
    },
    "reorder": {
        "title": "Reorder",
        "description": "Indicates the status of network packet reordering",
        "allOf": [
            {
                "$ref": "#/definitions/Reorder"
            }
        ]
    }
},
"Loss": {
    "title": "Loss",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "loss": {
            "title": "Loss",
            "description": "Indicates the probability of packet loss. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",
            "default": "0",
            "example": "50",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "correlation": {
            "title": "Correlation",
            "description": "Indicates the correlation between the probability of current packet loss and the previous time's packet loss. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",
            "default": "0",
            "example": "50",
            "type": "string"
        }
    }
},
"Duplicate": {
    "title": "Duplicate",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "duplicate": {
            "title": "Duplicate",
            "description": "Indicates the probability of packet duplicating. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",
            "default": "0",
            "example": "50",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "correlation": {
            "title": "Correlation",
            "description": "Indicates the correlation between the probability of current packet duplicating and the previous time's packet duplicating. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",
            "default": "0",
            "example": "50",
            "type": "string"
        }
    }
},
"Corrupt": {
    "title": "Corrupt",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "corrupt": {
            "title": "Corrupt",
            "description": "Indicates the probability of packet corruption. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",
            "default": "0",
            "example": "50",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "correlation": {
            "title": "Correlation",
            "description": "Indicates the correlation between the probability of current packet corruption and the previous time's packet corruption. Range of value: [0, 100]. Specify only the number. NEVER include any units.",

```

```

        "default": "0",
        "example": "50",
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"Rate": {
    "title": "Rate",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "rate": {
            "title": "Rate",
            "description": "Indicates the rate of bandwidth limit. Allows bit, kbit, mbit
, gbit, tbit, bps, kbps, mbps, gbps, tbps unit. bps means bytes per second",
            "example": "1mbps",
            "type": "string"
        }
    }
},
"Bandwidth": {
    "title": "Bandwidth",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "rate": {
            "title": "Rate",
            "description": "Indicates the rate of bandwidth limit. Allows bit, kbit, mbit
, gbit, tbit, bps, kbps, mbps, gbps, tbps unit. bps means bytes per second",
            "example": "1mbps",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "limit": {
            "title": "Limit",
            "description": "Indicates the number of bytes waiting in queue",
            "example": 1,
            "type": "integer"
        },
        "buffer": {
            "title": "Buffer",
            "description": "Indicates the maximum number of bytes that can be sent
instantaneously",
            "example": 1,
            "type": "integer"
        },
        "peakrate": {
            "title": "Peakrate",
            "description": "Indicates the maximum consumption of bucket (usually not set)
",
            "example": 1,
            "type": "integer"
        },
        "minburst": {
            "title": "Minburst",
            "description": "Indicates the size of peakrate bucket (usually not set)",
            "example": 1,
            "type": "integer"
        }
    }
}
}
}
'''

```

### detailed\_param\_instructions for DNSChaos (template embedded dynamically)

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
'''
{
```

```

"properties": {
  "action": {
    "title": "Action",
    "description": "Defines the behavior of DNS fault from 'random' or 'error'. When
the value is random, DNS service returns a random IP address; when the value is
error, DNS service returns an error.",
    "example": "random",
    "enum": [
      "random",
      "error"
    ],
    "type": "string"
  },
  "mode": {
    "title": "Mode",
    "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include '
one' (selecting a random Pod), 'all' (selecting all eligible Pods), 'fixed' (
selecting a specified number of eligible Pods), 'fixed-percent' (selecting a
specified percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and 'random-max-percent' (
selecting the maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
    "example": "one",
    "enum": [
      "one",
      "all",
      "fixed",
      "fixed-percent",
      "random-max-percent"
    ],
    "type": "string"
  },
  "value": {
    "title": "Value",
    "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode
. For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage
of Pods.",
    "example": "1",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "patterns": {
    "title": "Patterns",
    "description": "Selects a domain template that matches faults. The fault is
applied to these domains. Placeholder ? and wildcard * are supported, but the
wildcard in patterns configuration must be at the end of string. For example,
chaos-mes*.org. is an invalid configuration. When patterns is not configured,
faults are injected for all domains.",
    "example": "google.com, chaos-mesh.org, github.com",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "selector": {
    "title": "Selector",
    "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
    "example": null,
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
      }
    ]
  },
  "required": [
    "selector"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "SetBasedRequirements": {
      "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "key": {
          "title": "Key",
          "description": "Label key",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "operator": {
          "title": "Operator",
          "description": "Select an operator.",

```

```

        "enum": [
            "In",
            "NotIn",
            "Exists",
            "DoesNotExist"
        ],
        "type": "string"
    },
    "values": {
        "title": "Values",
        "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of
            In and NotIn.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
            "type": "string"
        }
    }
},
"required": [
    "key",
    "operator",
    "values"
]
},
"Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "namespaces": {
            "title": "Namespaces",
            "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If
                this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current
                Chaos experiment.",
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "labelSelectors": {
            "title": "Labelselectors",
            "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's
                target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target
                must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
            "type": "object",
            "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "expressionSelectors": {
            "title": "Expressionselectors",
            "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules
                to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
            "example": [
                {
                    "key": "tier",
                    "operator": "In",
                    "values": [
                        "cache"
                    ]
                },
                {
                    "key": "environment",
                    "operator": "NotIn",
                    "values": [
                        "dev"
                    ]
                }
            ]
        },
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
        }
    },
    "annotationSelectors": {
        "title": "Annotationselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's
            target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment
            target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
    }
}

```



```
'''
```

### detailed\_param\_instructions for HTTPChaos (template embedded dynamically)

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
'''
{
  "properties": {
    "mode": {
      "title": "Mode",
      "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include one (selecting a random Pod), all (selecting all eligible Pods), fixed (selecting a specified number of eligible Pods), fixed-percent (selecting a specified percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and random-max-percent (selecting the maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
      "example": "one",
      "enum": [
        "one",
        "all",
        "fixed",
        "fixed-percent",
        "random-max-percent"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "value": {
      "title": "Value",
      "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode. For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage of Pods.",
      "example": "1",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "target": {
      "title": "Target",
      "description": "Specifies whether the target of fault injection is Request or Response. The target-related fields (replace.path, replace.method, replace.queries, patch.queries) should be configured at the same time.",
      "example": "Request",
      "enum": [
        "Request",
        "Response"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "port": {
      "title": "Port",
      "description": "The TCP port that the target service listens on.",
      "example": 80,
      "type": "integer"
    },
    "code": {
      "title": "Code",
      "description": "Specifies the status code responded by target. If not specified, the fault takes effect for all status codes by default. This configuration is effective only when the 'target' is set to 'Response'",
      "example": 200,
      "type": "integer"
    },
    "path": {
      "title": "Path",
      "description": "Specify the URI path of the target request. Supports Matching wildcards. If not specified, the fault takes effect on all paths by default.",
      "example": "/api/*",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "method": {
```

```
    "title": "Method",
    "description": "Specify the HTTP method of the target request method. If not
specified, the fault takes effect for all methods by default.",
    "example": "GET",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "request_headers": {
    "title": "Request Headers",
    "description": "Matches request headers to target.",
    "example": {
      "Content-Type": "application/json"
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "abort": {
    "title": "Abort",
    "description": "Abort fault. Indicates whether to inject the fault that
interrupts the connection.",
    "default": false,
    "example": true,
    "type": "boolean"
  },
  "delay": {
    "title": "Delay",
    "description": "Delay fault. Specifies the time for a latency fault.",
    "default": "0",
    "example": "10s",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "replace": {
    "title": "Replace",
    "description": "Replace fault. Specifies replaced contents.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Replace"
      }
    ]
  },
  "patch": {
    "title": "Patch",
    "description": "Patch fault. Specifies patch contents.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Patch"
      }
    ]
  },
  "required": [
    "mode",
    "target",
    "port"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "Replace": {
      "title": "Replace",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "headers": {
          "title": "Headers",
          "description": "Specifies the key pair used to replace the request headers or
response headers.",
          "example": {
            "Content-Type": "application/xml"
          },
          "type": "object",
          "additionalProperties": {
            "type": "string"
          }
        }
      }
    },
    "body": {
      "title": "Body",
      "description": "Specifies request body or response body to replace the fault
(Base64 encoded).",
      "example": "eyJmb28iOiAiYmF1bnQ="
    }
  }
}
```

```

        "type": "string"
    },
    "path": {
        "title": "Path",
        "description": "Specifies the URI path used to replace content.",
        "example": "/api/v2",
        "type": "string"
    },
    "method": {
        "title": "Method",
        "description": "Specifies the replaced content of the HTTP request method.",
        "example": "DELETE",
        "type": "string"
    },
    "queries": {
        "title": "Queries",
        "description": "Specifies the replaced key pair of the URI query.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    },
    "code": {
        "title": "Code",
        "description": "Specifies the replaced content of the response status code. This configuration is effective only when the 'target' is set to 'Response'.",
        "example": 404,
        "type": "integer"
    }
},
"PatchBody": {
    "title": "PatchBody",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "type": {
            "title": "Type",
            "description": "Specifies the type of patch faults of the request body or response body. Currently, it only supports JSON.",
            "example": "JSON",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "value": {
            "title": "Value",
            "description": "Specifies the fault of the request body or response body with patch faults.",
            "example": "{ 'foo': 'bar' }",
            "type": "string"
        }
    }
},
"Patch": {
    "title": "Patch",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "headers": {
            "title": "Headers",
            "description": "Specifies the attached key pair of the request headers or response headers with patch faults.",
            "example": [
                [
                    "Set-Cookie",
                    "one cookie"
                ]
            ],
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "array",
                "items": {
                    "type": "string"
                }
            }
        },
        "body": {

```





```

    "default": null,
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Stressors"
      }
    ]
  },
  "stressngStressors": {
    "title": "Stressngstressors",
    "description": "Specifies the stres-ng parameter to reach richer stress injection",
    "example": "--clone 2",
    "type": "string"
  },
  "containerNames": {
    "title": "Containernames",
    "description": "Specifies the name of the container into which the fault is injected.",
    "example": [
      "nginx"
    ],
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "selector": {
    "title": "Selector",
    "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
    "allOf": [
      {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
      }
    ]
  }
},
"required": [
  "mode",
  "selector"
],
"definitions": {
  "MemoryStressor": {
    "title": "MemoryStressor",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
      "workers": {
        "title": "Workers",
        "description": "Specifies the number of threads that apply memory stress",
        "example": 1,
        "type": "integer"
      },
      "size": {
        "title": "Size",
        "description": "Specifies the memory size to be occupied or a percentage of the total memory size. The final sum of the occupied memory size is size.",
        "example": "256MB",
        "type": "string"
      },
      "oomScoreAdj": {
        "title": "Oomscoreadj",
        "description": "Specifies the oom_score_adj of the stress process.",
        "example": -1000,
        "type": "integer"
      }
    }
  },
  "CPUStressor": {
    "title": "CPUStressor",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
      "workers": {
        "title": "Workers",
        "description": "Specifies the number of threads that apply CPU stress",
        "example": 1,
        "type": "integer"
      },
      "load": {
        "title": "Load",

```

```

        "description": "Specifies the percentage of CPU occupied. 0 means that no
        additional CPU is added, and 100 refers to full load. The final sum of CPU
        load is workers * load.",
        "example": 50,
        "type": "integer"
    }
},
"Stressors": {
    "title": "Stressors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "memory": {
            "title": "Memory",
            "description": "Specifies the memory stress",
            "allOf": [
                {
                    "$ref": "#/definitions/MemoryStressor"
                }
            ]
        },
        "cpu": {
            "title": "Cpu",
            "description": "Specifies the CPU stress",
            "allOf": [
                {
                    "$ref": "#/definitions/CPUSTressor"
                }
            ]
        }
    }
},
"SetBasedRequirements": {
    "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "key": {
            "title": "Key",
            "description": "Label key",
            "type": "string"
        },
        "operator": {
            "title": "Operator",
            "description": "Select an operator.",
            "enum": [
                "In",
                "NotIn",
                "Exists",
                "DoesNotExist"
            ],
            "type": "string"
        },
        "values": {
            "title": "Values",
            "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of
            In and NotIn.",
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    },
    "required": [
        "key",
        "operator",
        "values"
    ]
},
"Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "namespaces": {
            "title": "Namespaces",
            "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If
            this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current
            Chaos experiment.",
            "type": "array",

```

```

    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "labelSelectors": {
    "title": "Labelselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's
target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target
must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "expressionSelectors": {
    "title": "Expressionselectors",
    "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules
to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
    "example": [
      {
        "key": "tier",
        "operator": "In",
        "values": [
          "cache"
        ]
      },
      {
        "key": "environment",
        "operator": "NotIn",
        "values": [
          "dev"
        ]
      }
    ],
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
    }
  },
  "annotationSelectors": {
    "title": "Annotationselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's
target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment
target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "fieldSelectors": {
    "title": "Fieldselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's
target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have
all fields set by this selector.",
    "example": {
      "metadata.name": "my-pod",
      "metadata.namespace": "default"
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "podPhaseSelectors": {
    "title": "Podphaseselectors",
    "description": "Specifies the phase of the experiment's target Pod. If this
selector is None, the target Pod's phase is not limited.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "enum": [
        "Pending",
        "Running",
        "Succeeded",
        "Failed",
        "Unknown"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    }
  }
}

```

```

    },
    "nodeSelectors": {
      "title": "NodeSelectors",
      "description": "Specifies the node-label-key/value pairs to which the
        experiment's target Pod belongs.",
      "type": "object",
      "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "nodes": {
      "title": "Nodes",
      "description": "Specifies the node to which the experiment's target Pod
        belongs. The target Pod can only belong to one node in the configured node
        list. If multiple node labels are specified, the node to which the experiment
        's target Pod belongs must have all labels specified by this selector.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "pods": {
      "title": "Pods",
      "description": "Specifies the namespaces and list of the experiment's target
        Pods. If you have specified this selector, Chaos Mesh ignores other
        configured selectors.",
      "example": {
        "default": [
          "pod-0",
          "pod-2"
        ]
      },
      "type": "object",
      "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      }
    }
  }
}
...

```

### detailed\_param\_instructions for IOChaos (template embedded dynamically)

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

...
{
  "properties": {
    "action": {
      "title": "Action",
      "description": "Indicates the specific type of faults. Only latency, fault,
        attrOverride, and mistake are supported.",
      "example": "latency",
      "enum": [
        "latency",
        "fault",
        "attrOverride",
        "mistake"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "mode": {
      "title": "Mode",

```

```

"description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include
one (selecting a random Pod), all (selecting all eligible Pods), fixed (selecting
a specified number of eligible Pods), fixed-percent (selecting a specified
percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and random-max-percent (selecting the
maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
"example": "one",
"enum": [
  "one",
  "all",
  "fixed",
  "fixed-percent",
  "random-max-percent"
],
"type": "string"
},
"selector": {
  "title": "Selector",
  "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
  "allOf": [
    {
      "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
    }
  ]
},
"value": {
  "title": "Value",
  "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode
. For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage
of Pods.",
  "example": "1",
  "type": "string"
},
"volumePath": {
  "title": "Volumepath",
  "description": "The mount point of volume in the target container. Must be the
root directory of the mount.",
  "example": "/var/run/etcd",
  "type": "string"
},
"path": {
  "title": "Path",
  "description": "The valid range of fault injections, either a wildcard or a
single file. If not specified, the fault is valid for all files by default",
  "example": "/var/run/etcd/*/",
  "type": "string"
},
"methods": {
  "title": "Methods",
  "description": "Type of the file system call that requires injecting fault.
Supported method types: ['lookup', 'forget', 'getattr', 'setattr', 'readlink', '
mknod', 'mkdir', 'unlink', 'rmdir', 'symlink', 'rename', 'link', 'open', 'read',
'write', 'flush', 'release', 'fsync', 'opendir', 'readdir', 'releasedir', '
fsyncdir', 'statfs', 'setxattr', 'getxattr', 'listxattr', 'removexattr', 'access',
'create', 'getlk', 'setlk', 'bmap']. All Types by default.",
  "example": [
    "READ"
  ],
  "type": "array",
  "items": {
    "type": "string"
  }
},
"percent": {
  "title": "Percent",
  "description": "Probability of failure per operation, in %.",
  "default": 100,
  "example": 100,
  "type": "integer"
},
"containerNames": {
  "title": "Containernames",
  "description": "Specifies the name of the container into which the fault is
injected.",
  "type": "array",
  "items": {
    "type": "string"
  }
}
},

```

```

"deploy": {
  "title": "Deploy",
  "description": "Specify when the 'action' is set to 'latency'. Specific delay
time.",
  "type": "string"
},
"errno": {
  "title": "Errno",
  "description": "Specify when the 'action' is set to 'fault'. Returned error
number: 1: Operation not permitted, 2: No such file or directory, 5: I/O error,
6: No such device or address, 12: Out of memory, 16: Device or resource busy, 17:
File exists, 20: Not a directory, 22: Invalid argument, 24: Too many open files,
28: No space left on device",
  "type": "integer"
},
"attr": {
  "title": "Attr",
  "description": "Specify when the 'action' is set to 'attrOverride'. Specific
property override rules.",
  "allOf": [
    {
      "$ref": "#/definitions/AttrOverrideSpec"
    }
  ]
},
"mistake": {
  "title": "Mistake",
  "description": "Specify when the 'action' is set to 'mistake'. Specific error
rules.",
  "allOf": [
    {
      "$ref": "#/definitions/MistakeSpec"
    }
  ]
}
],
"required": [
  "action",
  "mode",
  "volumePath",
  "attr",
  "mistake"
],
"definitions": {
  "SetBasedRequirements": {
    "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
      "key": {
        "title": "Key",
        "description": "Label key",
        "type": "string"
      },
      "operator": {
        "title": "Operator",
        "description": "Select an operator.",
        "enum": [
          "In",
          "NotIn",
          "Exists",
          "DoesNotExist"
        ],
        "type": "string"
      },
      "values": {
        "title": "Values",
        "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of
In and NotIn.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "key",
    "operator",
    "values"
  ]
}

```

```

    ]
  },
  "Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
      "namespaces": {
        "title": "Namespaces",
        "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current Chaos experiment.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "labelSelectors": {
        "title": "Labelselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "expressionSelectors": {
        "title": "Expressionselectors",
        "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
        "example": [
          {
            "key": "tier",
            "operator": "In",
            "values": [
              "cache"
            ]
          },
          {
            "key": "environment",
            "operator": "NotIn",
            "values": [
              "dev"
            ]
          }
        ],
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
        }
      },
      "annotationSelectors": {
        "title": "Annotationselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "fieldSelectors": {
        "title": "Fieldselectors",
        "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have all fields set by this selector.",
        "example": {
          "metadata.name": "my-pod",
          "metadata.namespace": "default"
        },
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "podPhaseSelectors": {
        "title": "Podphaseselectors",

```



```

    "description": "Specifies the phase of the experiment's target Pod. If this
    selector is None, the target Pod's phase is not limited.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "enum": [
        "Pending",
        "Running",
        "Succeeded",
        "Failed",
        "Unknown"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "nodeSelectors": {
    "title": "NodeSelectors",
    "description": "Specifies the node-label-key/value pairs to which the
    experiment's target Pod belongs.",
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "nodes": {
    "title": "Nodes",
    "description": "Specifies the node to which the experiment's target Pod
    belongs. The target Pod can only belong to one node in the configured node
    list. If multiple node labels are specified, the node to which the experiment
    's target Pod belongs must have all labels specified by this selector.",
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "pods": {
    "title": "Pods",
    "description": "Specifies the namespaces and list of the experiment's target
    Pods. If you have specified this selector, Chaos Mesh ignores other
    configured selectors.",
    "example": {
      "default": [
        "pod-0",
        "pod-2"
      ]
    },
    "type": "object",
    "additionalProperties": {
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    }
  }
},
"TimeSpec": {
  "title": "TimeSpec",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "sec": {
      "title": "Sec",
      "description": "Timestamp in seconds. Specify either sec or nsec.",
      "type": "integer"
    },
    "nsec": {
      "title": "Nsec",
      "description": "Timestamp in nanoseconds. Specify either sec or nsec.",
      "type": "integer"
    }
  }
},
"AttrOverrideSpec": {
  "title": "AttrOverrideSpec",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "ino": {
      "title": "Ino",
      "description": "ino number",

```

```

        "type": "integer"
    },
    "size": {
        "title": "Size",
        "description": "File size",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "blocks": {
        "title": "Blocks",
        "description": "Number of blocks that the file uses",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "atime": {
        "title": "Atime",
        "description": "Last access time",
        "allOf": [
            {
                "$ref": "#/definitions/TimeSpec"
            }
        ]
    },
    "mtime": {
        "title": "Mtime",
        "description": "Last modified time",
        "allOf": [
            {
                "$ref": "#/definitions/TimeSpec"
            }
        ]
    },
    "ctime": {
        "title": "Ctime",
        "description": "Last status change time",
        "allOf": [
            {
                "$ref": "#/definitions/TimeSpec"
            }
        ]
    },
    "kind": {
        "title": "Kind",
        "description": "File type, see fuser::FileType",
        "type": "string"
    },
    "perm": {
        "title": "Perm",
        "description": "File permissions in decimal",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "nlink": {
        "title": "Nlink",
        "description": "Number of hard links",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "uid": {
        "title": "Uid",
        "description": "User ID of the owner",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "gid": {
        "title": "Gid",
        "description": "Group ID of the owner",
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "rdev": {
        "title": "Rdev",
        "description": "Device ID",
        "type": "integer"
    }
}
},
"MistakeSpec": {
    "title": "MistakeSpec",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "filling": {
            "title": "Filling",

```

```

        "description": "The wrong data to be filled. Only zero (fill 0) or random (
        fill random bytes) are supported.",
        "type": "string"
    },
    "maxOccurrences": {
        "title": "Maxoccurrences",
        "description": "Maximum number of errors in each operation.",
        "example": 1,
        "type": "integer"
    },
    "maxLength": {
        "title": "Maxlength",
        "description": "Maximum length of each error (in bytes).",
        "example": 1,
        "type": "integer"
    }
},
"required": [
    "filling",
    "maxOccurrences",
    "maxLength"
]
}
}
...

```

#### detailed\_param\_instructions for TimeChaos (template embedded dynamically)

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]} the object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

...
{
  "properties": {
    "timeOffset": {
      "title": "Timeoffset",
      "description": "Specifies the length of time offset.",
      "example": "-5m",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "clockIds": {
      "title": "Clockids",
      "description": "Specifies the ID of clock that will be offset. See the
      clock_gettime documentation for details.",
      "default": [
        "CLOCK_REALTIME"
      ],
      "example": [
        "CLOCK_REALTIME",
        "CLOCK_MONOTONIC"
      ],
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "mode": {
      "title": "Mode",
      "description": "Specifies the mode of the experiment. The mode options include '
      one' (selecting a random Pod), 'all' (selecting all eligible Pods), 'fixed' (
      selecting a specified number of eligible Pods), 'fixed-percent' (selecting a
      specified percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods), and 'random-max-percent' (
      selecting the maximum percentage of Pods from the eligible Pods)",
      "example": "one",
      "enum": [
        "one",
        "all",
        "fixed",

```

```

        "fixed-percent",
        "random-max-percent"
    ],
    "type": "string"
},
"value": {
    "title": "Value",
    "description": "Provides parameters for the mode configuration, depending on mode
    . For example, when mode is set to fixed-percent, value specifies the percentage
    of Pods.",
    "example": "1",
    "type": "string"
},
"containerNames": {
    "title": "Containernames",
    "description": "Specifies the name of the container into which the fault is
    injected.",
    "example": [
        "nginx"
    ],
    "type": "array",
    "items": {
        "type": "string"
    }
},
"selector": {
    "title": "Selector",
    "description": "Specifies the target Pod.",
    "example": null,
    "allOf": [
        {
            "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
        }
    ]
},
"required": [
    "timeOffset",
    "mode",
    "selector"
],
"definitions": {
    "SetBasedRequirements": {
        "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
        "type": "object",
        "properties": {
            "key": {
                "title": "Key",
                "description": "Label key",
                "type": "string"
            },
            "operator": {
                "title": "Operator",
                "description": "Select an operator.",
                "enum": [
                    "In",
                    "NotIn",
                    "Exists",
                    "DoesNotExist"
                ],
                "type": "string"
            },
            "values": {
                "title": "Values",
                "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of
                In and NotIn.",
                "type": "array",
                "items": {
                    "type": "string"
                }
            }
        }
    },
    "required": [
        "key",
        "operator",
        "values"
    ]
}
},

```

```

"Selectors": {
  "title": "Selectors",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "namespaces": {
      "title": "Namespaces",
      "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If
this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current
Chaos experiment.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "labelSelectors": {
      "title": "Labelselectors",
      "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's
target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target
must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
      "type": "object",
      "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "expressionSelectors": {
      "title": "Expressionselectors",
      "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules
to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
      "example": [
        {
          "key": "tier",
          "operator": "In",
          "values": [
            "cache"
          ]
        },
        {
          "key": "environment",
          "operator": "NotIn",
          "values": [
            "dev"
          ]
        }
      ],
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
      }
    },
    "annotationSelectors": {
      "title": "Annotationselectors",
      "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment'
s target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment
target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
      "type": "object",
      "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "fieldSelectors": {
      "title": "Fieldselectors",
      "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's
target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have
all fields set by this selector.",
      "example": {
        "metadata.name": "my-pod",
        "metadata.namespace": "ddefault"
      },
      "type": "object",
      "additionalProperties": {
        "type": "string"
      }
    },
    "podPhaseSelectors": {
      "title": "Podphaseselectors",
      "description": "Specifies the phase of the experiment's target Pod. If this
selector is None, the target Pod's phase is not limited.",
      "type": "array",

```

```

        "items": {
          "enum": [
            "Pending",
            "Running",
            "Succeeded",
            "Failed",
            "Unknown"
          ],
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "nodeSelectors": {
        "title": "NodeSelectors",
        "description": "Specifies the node-label-key/value pairs to which the
          experiment's target Pod belongs.",
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "nodes": {
        "title": "Nodes",
        "description": "Specifies the node to which the experiment's target Pod
          belongs. The target Pod can only belong to one node in the configured node
          list. If multiple node labels are specified, the node to which the experiment
          's target Pod belongs must have all labels specified by this selector.",
        "type": "array",
        "items": {
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "pods": {
        "title": "Pods",
        "description": "Specifies the namespaces and list of the experiment's target
          Pods. If you have specified this selector, Chaos Mesh ignores other
          configured selectors.",
        "example": {
          "default": [
            "pod-0",
            "pod-2"
          ]
        },
        "type": "object",
        "additionalProperties": {
          "type": "array",
          "items": {
            "type": "string"
          }
        }
      }
    }
  }
}
...

```

### A.5.3 EXPERIMENT

#### # 2-0: Agent for determining time schedule

**System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given k8s manifests that define a network system, its steady states, and faults that may affect the steady states in the system, you will design a Chaos Engineering experiment for them.

First, you will determine the time schedule for the Chaos Engineering experiment.

Always keep the following rules:

- The experiment is divided into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation phases: pre-validation to ensure that the system satisfies the steady states fault injection; fault-injection to observe the system's behavior during fault injection; post-validation to ensure that the system has returned to its steady states after fault injection.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Think about the total time and the reasonable time allocation for each phase that you are about to design, and explain your thought process in detail.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "total_time": {
      "title": "Total Time",
      "description": "Total time of the entire chaos experiment. total_time should equal to the sum of pre_validation_time, fault_injection_time, and post_validation_time.",
      "example": "10m",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "pre_validation_time": {
      "title": "Pre Validation Time",
      "description": "Total time of validation before fault injection.",
      "example": "2m",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "fault_injection_time": {
      "title": "Fault Injection Time",
      "description": "Total time of fault injection.",
      "example": "6m",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "post_validation_time": {
      "title": "Post Validation Time",
      "description": "Total time of validation after fault injection.",
      "example": "2m",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "total_time",
    "pre_validation_time",
    "fault_injection_time",
    "post_validation_time"
  ]
}

```

**Human:**

# Here is the overview of my system:

**{user\_input2}**

# Steady states of my system:

**{steady\_states}**

# A fault scenario that may occur in my system and may affect the steady states:

**{detailed\_fault\_scenario}**

# Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering as necessary:

**{ce\_instructions}**

Now, please plan a Chaos Engineering experiment to check the network system's resiliency that the steady states are remained during fault injection.

### Example text embedded to **detailed\_fault\_scenario**

An assumed fault scenario is as follows:

- Event: Cyber Attack Simulation\n- Used Chaos Engineering tool: Chaos Mesh

```
- Faults to simulate the event: [[Fault(name='PodChaos', name_id=0, params={'action': 'pod-kill', 'mode': 'one', 'selector': {'namespaces': ['default'], 'labelSelectors': {'app': 'example'}})}, [Fault(name='NetworkChaos', name_id=0, params={'action': 'delay', 'mode': 'all', 'selector': {'namespaces': ['default'], 'labelSelectors': {'app': 'example'}}), 'direction': 'to', 'delay': {'latency': '100ms', 'jitter': '10ms'}}]]
- Description: Given the system's weaknesses, a cyber attack targeting the web server could be highly impactful. The Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' and the single Pod deployment without redundancy are critical vulnerabilities. If the Pod fails, it will not restart, leading to downtime, and the lack of redundancy means there is no backup to handle traffic. To simulate a cyber attack, we can inject faults that exploit these weaknesses. First, we will use PodChaos to simulate a Pod failure, which will test the system's ability to maintain the 'example-pod-running-state'. Since the Pod will not restart automatically, this will directly impact the steady state. Next, we will use NetworkChaos to simulate network latency, which will test the system's ability to maintain the 'example-service-http-response-state'. This sequence simulates a cyber attack where the Pod is targeted first, followed by network disruptions, revealing the system's vulnerabilities in handling such events.
```

## # 2-1: Agent for scheduling each experiment phase (pre-validation, failure-injection, and post-validation phases)

### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given k8s manifests that define a network system, its steady states, and faults that may affect the steady states in the system, you will design a Chaos Engineering experiment for them.

The experiment is divided into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation phases: pre-validation to ensure that the system satisfies the steady states; fault injection; fault-injection to observe the system's behavior during fault injection; post-validation to ensure that the system has returned to its steady states after fault injection.

Here, you will detail the `{phase_name}`.

Always keep the following rules:

- `{phase_planning_instructions}`

### Human:

# Here is the overview of my system:

`{user_input}`

# Steady states of my system:

`{steady_states}`

# A fault scenario that may occur in my system and may affect the steady states:

`{detailed_fault_scenario}`

# Please follow the instructions below regarding Chaos Engineering as necessary:

`{ce_instructions}`

Now, please detail the `{phase_name}`. Note that the phase's total time is `{`

`phase_total_time}`.

### Example text embedded to `phase_name`

pre-validation phase

### Example text embedded to `phase_total_time`

10s

### `phase_planning_instructions` for the pre-validation and post-validation phases

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.



As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

```
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe in detail the timeline for when each fault injection and
        each unit test (for verifying steady-state) will be executed. For example,
        explain which fault injections/unit tests will be executed simultaneously, and
        whether certain fault injections/unit tests will be executed at staggered timings
        . Additionally, explain the thought process that led you to this approach.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "unit_tests": {
      "title": "Unit Tests",
      "description": "The list of unit test schedule.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/UnitTest"
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "unit_tests"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "UnitTest": {
      "title": "UnitTest",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "name": {
          "title": "Name",
          "description": "Steady state name to be verified by a unit test.",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "grace_period": {
          "title": "Grace Period",
          "description": "Time elapsed from the start of the current phase to the
            beginning of the unit test.",
          "example": "0s",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "duration": {
          "title": "Duration",
          "description": "Duration of the unit test. (grace_period + duration) should
            not exceed the current phase's total time.",
          "example": "2m",
          "type": "string"
        }
      },
      "required": [
        "name",
        "grace_period",
        "duration"
      ]
    }
  }
}
```

```

### phase\_planning\_instructions for the fault-injection phases

The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a

well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

``
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe in detail the timeline for when each fault injection and
        each unit test (for verifying steady-state) will be executed. For example,
        explain which fault injections/unit tests will be executed simultaneously, and
        whether certain fault injections/unit tests will be executed at staggered timings
        . Additionally, explain the thought process that led you to this approach.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "fault_injection": {
      "title": "Fault Injection",
      "description": "The list of fault injection schedules.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/FaultInjection"
      }
    },
    "unit_tests": {
      "title": "Unit Tests",
      "description": "The list of unit test schedule.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/UnitTest"
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "fault_injection",
    "unit_tests"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "FaultInjection": {
      "title": "FaultInjection",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "name": {
          "title": "Name",
          "description": "Select a fault type from [\"PodChaos\", \"NetworkChaos\", \"
            DNSChaos\", \"HTTPChaos\", \"StressChaos\", \"IOChaos\", \"TimeChaos\"]",
          "enum": [
            "PodChaos",
            "NetworkChaos",
            "DNSChaos",
            "HTTPChaos",
            "StressChaos",
            "IOChaos",
            "TimeChaos"
          ],
          "type": "string"
        },
        "name_id": {
          "title": "Name Id",
          "description": "An identifier to prevent name conflicts when the same Fault
            appears. Assign numbers starting from 0 in sequential order to prevent name
            conflicts.",
          "type": "integer"
        },
        "grace_period": {
          "title": "Grace Period",
          "description": "Time elapsed from the start of the current phase to the
            beginning of the fault injection.",
          "example": "0s",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "duration": {
          "title": "Duration",
          "description": "Duration of the unit test. (grace_period + duration) should
            not exceed the current phase's total time.",
          "example": "2m",
          "type": "string"
        }
      }
    }
  }
}

```

```

    }
  },
  "required": [
    "name",
    "name_id",
    "grace_period",
    "duration"
  ]
},
"UnitTest": {
  "title": "UnitTest",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "name": {
      "title": "Name",
      "description": "Steady state name to be verified by a unit test.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "grace_period": {
      "title": "Grace Period",
      "description": "Time elapsed from the start of the current phase to the beginning of the unit test.",
      "example": "0s",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "duration": {
      "title": "Duration",
      "description": "Duration of the unit test. (grace_period + duration) should not exceed the current phase's total time.",
      "example": "2m",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "name",
    "grace_period",
    "duration"
  ]
}
}
'''

```

## # 2-2: Agent for summarizing the planned experiment

### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given a Chaos-Engineering-experiment plan, you will summarize it in detail according to the following rules:

- In each phase, describe in detail the timeline for when each fault injection/unit test (for verifying steady-state) will be executed. For example, summarize which fault injections/unit tests will be executed simultaneously, and whether certain fault injections/unit tests will be executed at staggered timings.
- Be sure to specify both each fault injection/unit test and their corresponding workflow names.
- When explaining the timeline, provide a detailed description using specific values for duration, grace period, etc. Rephrase the specific values in a way that everyone can easily understand.
- The meanings of each value are as follows:
  - Grace Period: Time elapsed from the start of the current phase to the beginning of the fault injection/unit test.
  - Duration: Duration of the fault injection/unit test. (grace\_period + duration) should not exceed the corresponding phase's total time.
- Never output bullet points.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}, "required": ["foo"]}` the object `{"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
'''
{
```

```

"properties": {
  "summary": {
    "title": "Summary",
    "description": "The summary of the given Chaos-Engineering-experiment plan.",
    "type": "string"
  }
},
"required": [
  "summary"
]
}
` ``

```

```

Human:
# Here is my Chaos-Engineering-experiment plan:
## Time Schedule
{time_schedule_overview}

## Pre-validation Phase
{pre_validation_overview}

## Fault-injection Phase
{fault_injection_overview}

## Post-validation phase
{post_validation_overview}

Please summarize the above plan.

```

#### Example text embedded to `time_schedule_overview`

Given the constraints of the experiment needing to be completed within 1 minute, we need to carefully allocate time to each phase to ensure that we can effectively validate the system's steady states before and after the fault injection, as well as observe the system's behavior during the fault injection. The pre-validation phase is crucial to establish a baseline that the system is in its expected steady state before any faults are introduced. The fault injection phase is where we introduce the chaos to observe how the system behaves under stress. Finally, the post-validation phase is necessary to ensure that the system returns to its steady state after the faults are removed. Given the short total time of 1 minute, a reasonable allocation could be 10 seconds for pre-validation, 40 seconds for fault injection, and 10 seconds for post-validation. This allocation allows us to have a brief but sufficient observation period for each phase, ensuring that we can gather meaningful insights from the experiment.

#### Example text embedded to `pre_validation_overview`

In the pre-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system is in its expected steady states before we proceed with fault injection. Given the constraints, we have 10 seconds to perform these checks. We have two steady states to verify: the 'example-pod-running-state' and the 'example-service-http-response-state'.

The 'example-pod-running-state' requires us to check that the Pod is in the 'Running' state at least 90% of the time. We will use the provided Python script to verify this. Since the script checks the Pod status every second, we can run it for 5 seconds to gather sufficient data for validation.

The 'example-service-http-response-state' requires us to ensure that 95% of HTTP requests return a 200 OK status. We will use the K6 script to simulate HTTP requests to the service. The script is configured to run for 5 seconds with 5 virtual users, which should provide enough data to validate this steady state.

Both unit tests will be executed simultaneously to maximize the use of the 10-second window. This approach ensures that we efficiently validate both steady states within the given time constraint, allowing us to proceed confidently to the fault injection phase.

```

- Verified Steady State #0: ``example-pod-running-state``
  - Workflow Name: ``pre-unittest-example-pod-running-state``
  - Grace Period: ``0s``
  - Duration: ``5s``
- Verified Steady State #1: ``example-service-http-response-state``
  - Workflow Name: ``pre-unittest-example-service-http-response-state``
  - Grace Period: ``0s``

```

```
- Duration: '5s'
```

### Example text embedded to **fault\_injection\_overview**

In this fault-injection phase, we aim to simulate a cyber attack by injecting two types of faults: PodChaos and NetworkChaos. The goal is to observe how these faults impact the system's steady states. Given the 40-second time constraint, we will stagger the fault injections to maximize the observation of their effects.

First, we will inject the PodChaos fault to simulate a Pod failure. This will directly test the 'example-pod-running-state' steady state, as the Pod's restart policy is set to 'Never', meaning it will not automatically recover. We will start this fault injection immediately at the beginning of the phase and let it run for 20 seconds.

Simultaneously, we will run the unit test for the 'example-pod-running-state' to verify the impact of the PodChaos fault on the Pod's availability. After 20 seconds, we will inject the NetworkChaos fault to simulate network latency. This will test the 'example-service-http-response-state' steady state by introducing delays in HTTP responses. We will let this fault run for the remaining 20 seconds of the phase.

During the NetworkChaos fault injection, we will also run the unit test for the 'example-service-http-response-state' to verify the impact of network latency on the Service's ability to respond to HTTP requests.

This staggered approach allows us to isolate the effects of each fault on the respective steady states, providing clear insights into the system's vulnerabilities and resilience.

```
- Verified Steady State #0: 'example-pod-running-state'
  - Workflow Name: 'fault-unittest-example-pod-running-state'
  - Grace Period: '0s'
  - Duration: '20s'
- Verified Steady State #1: 'example-service-http-response-state'
  - Workflow Name: 'fault-unittest-example-service-http-response-state'
  - Grace Period: '20s'
  - Duration: '20s'

- Injected Faults #0: 'PodChaos'
  - Workflow Name: 'fault-podchaos'
  - Grace Period: '0s'
  - Duration: '20s'

- Injected Faults #1: 'NetworkChaos'
  - Workflow Name: 'fault-networkchaos'
  - Grace Period: '20s'
  - Duration: '20s'
```

### Example text embedded to **post\_validation\_overview**

In the post-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system has returned to its steady states after the fault injection. Given the 10-second total time for this phase, we will conduct unit tests to verify each steady state. The tests will be executed sequentially due to the short duration, ensuring that each steady state is verified independently. The first test will check the 'example-pod-running-state', ensuring the Pod is running. The second test will verify the 'example-service-http-response-state', ensuring the Service responds with a 200 OK status. Each test will have a brief grace period to allow the system to stabilize after the fault injection, followed by a short duration to perform the checks. This approach ensures that both steady states are validated within the available time, confirming the system's recovery.

```
- Verified Steady State #0: 'example-pod-running-state'
  - Workflow Name: 'post-unittest-example-pod-running-state'
  - Grace Period: '1s'
  - Duration: '4s'

- Verified Steady State #1: 'example-service-http-response-state'
  - Workflow Name: 'post-unittest-example-service-http-response-state'
  - Grace Period: '5s'
  - Duration: '4s'
```

## # 2-3: Agent for adjusting a failure scope

**System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given a previous K8s manifests, a Chaos-Engineering-experiment plan for it, and the current K8s manifests, you will determine whether we need to adjust the scope of fault injections for the current K8s manifests.

Always keep the following rules:

- Consider how you must change or keep the scope (i.e., target) of the fault injection comparing the previous K8s manifests and the current K8s manifests.
- You only make minor adjustments related to resource changes, metadata change, etc, so NEVER make any scope changes that alter the original goal of the chaos experiment.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe why you need to change/keep the scope of the fault injection for the current K8s manifests.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "selector": {
      "title": "Selector",
      "description": "Adjust the scope (target) of the fault injection comparing the differences between the current and previous manifests. ",
      "allOf": [
        {
          "$ref": "#/definitions/Selectors"
        }
      ]
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "selector"
  ],
  "definitions": {
    "SetBasedRequirements": {
      "title": "SetBasedRequirements",
      "type": "object",
      "properties": {
        "key": {
          "title": "Key",
          "description": "Label key",
          "type": "string"
        },
        "operator": {
          "title": "Operator",
          "description": "Select an operator.",
          "enum": [
            "In",
            "NotIn",
            "Exists",
            "DoesNotExist"
          ],
          "type": "string"
        },
        "values": {
          "title": "Values",
          "description": "Label values. The values set must be non-empty in the case of In and NotIn.",
          "type": "array",
          "items": {
            "type": "string"
          }
        }
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [

```

```

        "key",
        "operator",
        "values"
    ]
},
"Selectors": {
    "title": "Selectors",
    "type": "object",
    "properties": {
        "namespaces": {
            "title": "Namespaces",
            "description": "Specifies the namespace of the experiment's target Pod. If this selector is None, Chaos Mesh will set it to the namespace of the current Chaos experiment.",
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "labelSelectors": {
            "title": "Labelselectors",
            "description": "Specifies the label-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple labels are specified, the experiment target must have all the labels specified by this selector.",
            "type": "object",
            "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "expressionSelectors": {
            "title": "Expressionselectors",
            "description": "Specifies a set of expressions that define the label's rules to specify the experiment's target Pod.",
            "example": [
                {
                    "key": "tier",
                    "operator": "In",
                    "values": [
                        "cache"
                    ]
                },
                {
                    "key": "environment",
                    "operator": "NotIn",
                    "values": [
                        "dev"
                    ]
                }
            ],
            "type": "array",
            "items": {
                "$ref": "#/definitions/SetBasedRequirements"
            }
        },
        "annotationSelectors": {
            "title": "Annotationsselectors",
            "description": "Specifies the annotation-key/value pairs that the experiment's target Pod must have. If multiple annotations are specified, the experiment target must have all annotations specified by this selector.",
            "type": "object",
            "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        },
        "fieldSelectors": {
            "title": "Fieldselectors",
            "description": "Specifies the field-key/value pairs of the experiment's target Pod. If multiple fields are specified, the experiment target must have all fields set by this selector.",
            "example": {
                "metadata.name": "my-pod",
                "metadata.namespace": "default"
            },
            "type": "object",
            "additionalProperties": {
                "type": "string"
            }
        }
    }
},

```





**# 2-4: Agent for adjusting a VaC script****System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given the previous K8s manifests, a previous unit test to verify whether the steady state satisfies the threshold, and the reconfigured K8s manifests, you will determine whether the unit test requires adjustment to account for the changes in the reconfigured manifests, and adjust it as necessary.

Always keep the following rules:

- First, consider which K8s manifest resource is the target of the unit test. If there are changes to that manifest, update the unit test as necessary. If there are no changes, the unit test should not require modification.
- You may only make minor adjustments to K8s API, HTTP, or DNS request to account for changes in resource types, parameter settings, metadata, etc.
- The reconfiguration was made so that the system satisfy the threshold value in the previous unit test, so the threshold value or other parameters must remain unchanged in the new unit test. For example, suppose the number of replicas was reconfigured from 1 to 3 in order to maintain a steady state with more than 1 active pod at all times. In such cases, changing the threshold value from 1 to 3 would alter the intent of this steady state, so the threshold value must remain unchanged (i.e., more than 1 active pod)."
- If redundancy has been newly added, the unit test should verify whether the steady state is maintained by the entire redundancy.
- If the unit test's content needs no changes and only function or variable names need to be changed, leave them as they are to save output costs.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe your thought process for determining whether the unit
test requires adjustment to account for the changes in the reconfigured
manifests: First, consider which K8s manifest resource is the target of the unit
test. If there are changes to that manifest, update the unit test as necessary.
If there are no changes, the unit test should not require modification. If the
unit test needs updating, describe also how you modify the inspection method
according to the differences between the previous and reconfigured manifests. If
the modification is not required, describe the reason.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "code": {
      "title": "Code",
      "description": "If the unit test needs updating, write a new unit test code with
the inspection method modified. Write only the content of the code without
enclosing it in a code block. If not, this field is not required.",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought"
  ]
}
```
```

**Human:**

# Here is the previous K8s manifests of my system:

`{prev_k8s_yamls}`

# Here is the reconfigured K8s manifests of my system:

`{curr_k8s_yamls}`

# Here is the unit test for the previous manifests.

`{prev_unittest}`

Now, please determine whether the unit test requires adjustment to account for the changes in the reconfigured manifests, and adjust it as necessary.

----- In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as history -----

**AI:**  
{output}

**Human:**  
Your current unit test causes errors when conducted.  
The error message is as follows:  
{error\_message}

This unit test should be succeeded.  
Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.  
Always keep the following rules:  
- NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.  
- Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original intent.  
- **the same format instructions as in the System role**

### Example text embedded to `experiment_plan_summary`

The Chaos Engineering experiment is structured into three phases: pre-validation, fault injection, and post-validation, all to be completed within a total of 1 minute.

In the pre-validation phase, which lasts for 10 seconds, two unit tests are executed simultaneously to verify the system's steady states before any faults are introduced. The 'example-pod-running-state' is checked using a Python script to ensure the Pod is in the 'Running' state at least 90% of the time. This test runs for 5 seconds. Concurrently, the 'example-service-http-response-state' is verified using a K6 script to simulate HTTP requests, ensuring 95% of requests return a 200 OK status. This test also runs for 5 seconds. Both tests start immediately at the beginning of the phase.

The fault injection phase spans 40 seconds and involves two staggered fault injections. Initially, the PodChaos fault is injected to simulate a Pod failure, running for the first 20 seconds. Simultaneously, the 'example-pod-running-state' unit test is conducted to observe the impact of this fault. After 20 seconds, the NetworkChaos fault is introduced to simulate network latency, running for the remaining 20 seconds. During this period, the 'example-service-http-response-state' unit test is executed to assess the effect of network delays. This staggered approach allows for isolated observation of each fault's impact on the system.

Finally, the post-validation phase, lasting 10 seconds, ensures the system returns to its steady states after fault removal. The tests are conducted sequentially. The 'example-pod-running-state' is verified first, with a 1-second grace period followed by a 4-second test duration. Subsequently, the 'example-service-http-response-state' is checked, starting after a 5-second grace period and running for 4 seconds. This sequence confirms the system's recovery to its expected steady states.

## A.5.4 ANALYSIS

### # 3-0: Agent for analyzing an experiment results

**System:**

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.  
Given K8s manifests for a network system, its hypothesis, the overview of a Chaos-Engineering experiment, and the experimental results, you will analyze the experimental results.

Always keep the following rules:

- Analyze step by step why the test(s) failed, based on the system configurations ( manifests) and the flow of the experiment.
- Specify the cause while mentioning the corresponding system configurations and the corresponding phenomena in the Chaos-Engineering experiment.
- The analysis report here will be used for reconfiguring the system later to avoid the failures and improve resiliency. Therefore, make carefully the report rich in insights so that it will be helpful at that time.
- When providing insights and reconfiguration recommendations, limit them to areas related to the failed test.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}

```
string\}}}, {"required": [{"foo"}]} the object {"foo": [{"bar", "baz"}]} is a
well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": [{"bar",
"baz"}]} is not well-formatted.
```

Here is the output schema:

```
```
{
  "properties": {
    "report": {
      "title": "Report",
      "description": "Analysis of the experiment result.",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "report"
  ]
}
```
```

**Human:**

# Here is the overview of my system:  
{user\_input2}

# Here is the hypothesis for my system:  
The hypothesis is "The steady states of the sytem are maintained even when the fault scenario occurs (i.e., when the faults are injected)".  
The steady states here are as follows:  
{steady\_states}

The fault scenario here is as follows:  
{detailed\_fault\_scenario}

# Here is the overview of my Chaos-Engineering experiment to verify the hypothesis:  
{experiment\_plan\_summary}

-----  
**For the first analysis, the following prompt is added**  
-----

# The experiment's results are as follows:  
{experiment\_result}

Now, please analyze the results and provide an analysis report rich in insights.

-----  
**For the second and subsequent analyses, the following prompt is added**  
-----

# The update history for the above K8s manifests is the following:  
{reconfig\_history}

# The experiment's results in the latest K8s manifests are as follows:  
{experiment\_result}

Now, please analyze the results and provide an analysis report rich in insights.

### Example text embedded to `experiment_result`

Passed unittests:

- pre-unittest-example-pod-running-state
- pre-unittest-example-service-http-response-state

Failed unittests:

- fault-unittest-example-pod-running-state

```
```log
```

Exception when calling CoreV1Api->read\_namespaced\_pod: (404)

```
Reason: Not Found\nHTTP response headers: HTTPHeaderDict({'Audit-Id': '8a1e6c00-ebd9-43
ee-9522-6399ce015252', 'Cache-Control': 'no-cache, private', 'Content-Type': '
application/json', 'X-Kubernetes-Pf-Flowschema-Uid': 'c4624bd9-7fc7-42c6-bcb8-4235110
```

```

a860d', 'X-Kubernetes-Pf-Prioritylevel-Uid': '4706085f-6263-43ae-93f5-b4a61de8b6be', '
Date': 'Sun, 24 Nov 2024 12:06:18 GMT', 'Content-Length': '190'})
HTTP response body: {"kind": "Status", "X-Kubernetes-Pf-Flowschema-Uid": '
c4624bd9-7fc7-42c6-bcb8-4235110a860d', 'X-Kubernetes-Pf-Prioritylevel-Uid': '4706085f
-6263-43ae-93f5-b4a61de8b6be', 'Date': 'Sun, 24 Nov 2024 12:06:37 GMT', 'Content-Length
': '190'})\nHTTP response body: {"kind": "Status", "apiVersion": "v1", "metadata
": {}, "status": "Failure", "message": "pods \"example-pod\" not found", "
reason": "NotFound", "details": {"name": "example-pod", "kind": "pods"}, "code
": 404}

Pod was running 0 out of 20 seconds, which is 0.00% of the time.
'''

- fault-unittest-example-service-http-response-state
  ''log
  time="2024-11-24T12:06:38Z" level=warning msg="Request Failed" error="Get \\\"http
  :\\\"/example-service.default.svc.cluster.local:80\\\": dial tcp 10.96.255.84:80:
  connect: connection refused\" \nntime="2024-11-24T12:06:38Z" level=warning msg="
  Request Failed" error="Get \\\"http://example-service.default.svc.cluster.local
  :80\\\": dial tcp 10.96.255.84:80: connect: connection refused\" \nntime="2024-11-24T12
  :06:38Z" level=warning msg="Request Failed" error="Get \\\"http://example-service
  .default.svc.cluster.local:8... level=error msg="thresholds on metrics '
  http_req_failed' have been crossed
  '''

```

## A.5.5 IMPROVEMENT

### # 4-0: Agent for reconfiguring K8s manifests

#### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.

Given K8s manifests that define a network system, its hypothesis, the overview of a Chaos-Engineering experiment, and the experiment's results, you will reconfigure the system based on analysis of the experiment's results.

Always keep the following rules:

- NEVER change the original intention (its description) of the original version of the system.
- NEVER do the same reconfiguration as in the history.
- Start with simple reconfiguration, and if the hypothesis is still not satisfied, gradually try more complex reconfigurations.
- The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema below.

As an example, for the schema {"properties": {"foo": {"title": "Foo", "description": "a list of strings", "type": "array", "items": {"type": "string"}}}, "required": ["foo"]}\nthe object {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]} is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object {"properties": {"foo": ["bar", "baz"]}} is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

'''
{
  "properties": {
    "thought": {
      "title": "Thought",
      "description": "Describe your plan to modify the K8s manifests.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "modified_k8s_yamls": {
      "title": "Modified K8S Yamls",
      "description": "The list of modified K8s manifests (yamls). If you create a new
      manifest to modify resources in an existing manifest, make sure to delete the
      existing manifest before creating the new one.",
      "type": "array",
      "items": {
        "$ref": "#/definitions/ModK8sYAML"
      }
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "thought",
    "modified_k8s_yamls"
  ],
  "definitions": {

```

```

"ModK8sYAML": {
  "title": "ModK8sYAML",
  "type": "object",
  "properties": {
    "mod_type": {
      "title": "Mod Type",
      "description": "Modification type. Select from ['replace', 'create', 'delete']. The 'replace' replaces/overwrites the content of an existing yaml. The 'create' creates a new yaml. The 'delete' deletes an existing yaml.",
      "enum": [
        "replace",
        "create",
        "delete"
      ],
      "type": "string"
    },
    "fname": {
      "title": "Fname",
      "description": "The file name of the modified yaml. If mod_type is 'replace' or 'delete', the name must match an existing yaml's name. If mod_type='create', name the file appropriately to avoid overlapping with existing yamls' names.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "explanation": {
      "title": "Explanation",
      "description": "If mod_type is 'delete', explain why you need to delete the yaml. If mod_type is 'replace', explain which part you should modify from the original code and why. If mod_type is 'create', explain whether it is a completely new resource or a replacement resource for an existing resource. If it is a replacement, also explain the differences and the reasons for them, just like with 'replace'.",
      "type": "string"
    },
    "code": {
      "title": "Code",
      "description": "If mod_type is 'delete', this field is not required. Otherwise, write the content of a K8s YAML manifest modified to pass all the unit tests. Write only the content of the code, and for dictionary values, enclose them within a pair of single double quotes (\").",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "mod_type",
    "fname",
    "explanation"
  ]
}
}
}
...

Human:
# Here is the overview of my system (original version):
{user_input2}

# Here is the hypothesis for my system:
The hypothesis is "The steady states of the system are maintained even when the fault scenario occurs (i.e., when the faults are injected)".
The steady states here are as follows:
{steady_states}

The fault scenario here is as follows:
{detailed_fault_scenario}

# Here is the overview of my Chaos-Engineering experiment to verify the hypothesis:
{experiment_plan_summary}

# The experiment's results of the original system are as follows:
{experiment_result}

First, please analyze the results and provide an analysis report rich in insights.

AI:
# Here is my analysis report:
{analysis_report}

```

**Human:**  
Then, please reconfigure the system to avoid the fails (improve resiliency).

-----  
**In the improvement loop, the prompts below will be stacked as improvement history**  
 -----

**AI:**  
 ```json  
 {output}  
 ```

**Human:**  
 # Here is the K8s manifests of the modified system (version={mod\_version}):  
 {k8s\_yamls\_mod}

# The experiment's results of the modified system were as follows:  
 {experiment\_result\_mod}

Please analyze the results and provide an analysis report rich in insights again.

**AI:**  
 # Here is my analysis report:  
 {analysis\_report\_mod}

**Human:**  
Then, please reconfigure the system to avoid the fails (improve resiliency).

-----  
**In the verification loop, the prompts below will be stacked as verification history**  
**Verification history is kept within a single verification loop and is reset in every**  
**improvement iteration**  
 -----

**AI:**  
 ```json  
 {output}  
 ```

**User:**  
Your current unittest causes errors when conducted.  
The error message is as follows:  
{error\_message}

Please analyze the reason why the errors occur, then fix the errors.  
Always keep the following rules:  
 - Ensure that the implementation supports variable durations again.  
 - NEVER repeat the same fixes that have been made in the past.  
 - Fix only the parts related to the errors without changing the original content.  
 - **the same format instruction as in the System role**

### Example text embedded to **analysis\_report**

The Chaos Engineering experiment aimed to test the system's resilience by simulating a cyber attack through PodChaos and NetworkChaos. The experiment results indicate failures in maintaining the defined steady states during and after the fault injection phase. Here is a detailed analysis of the results:

1. **\*\*Pre-Validation Phase:\*\***
  - Both pre-unittests, 'example-pod-running-state' and 'example-service-http-response-state', passed successfully. This indicates that the system was in a healthy state before the fault injection, with the Pod running 100% of the time and the Service responding with a 200 OK status for all requests.
2. **\*\*Fault Injection Phase:\*\***
  - **\*\*PodChaos Fault:\*\*** The 'fault-unittest-example-pod-running-state' failed because the Pod was not found (404 error) during the test. This is expected due to the PodChaos action 'pod-kill', which terminated the Pod. Since the Pod's restart policy is set to 'Never', it did not restart, leading to 0% uptime during the test. This highlights the critical issue of having a single Pod with no redundancy or automatic recovery mechanism.

```

- NetworkChaos Fault: The 'fault-untttest-example-service-http-response-state'
also failed. The logs show repeated connection refused errors, indicating that the
Service could not route traffic to the Pod, as it was not running. This failure is a
direct consequence of the Pod being unavailable, demonstrating the lack of redundancy
and the impact of a single point of failure.

3. Post-Validation Phase:
- Both post-untttests, 'example-pod-running-state' and 'example-service-http-response
-state', failed. The Pod was still not found, and the Service continued to refuse
connections. This indicates that the system did not recover to its steady states
after the faults were removed, primarily due to the Pod's restart policy and the
absence of a controller to manage Pod lifecycle and redundancy.

Insights and Recommendations:
- Pod Restart Policy: The Pod's restart policy should be changed from 'Never' to
'Always' or 'OnFailure' to ensure automatic recovery in case of failures.
- Redundancy and Scalability: Implement a Deployment or ReplicaSet to manage the
Pod. This will provide redundancy and ensure that a minimum number of Pods are always
running, improving the system's resilience to failures.
- Service Availability: Ensure that the Service can handle traffic even if one
Pod fails by having multiple replicas. This can be achieved by scaling the Deployment
to have more than one replica.
- Monitoring and Alerts: Implement monitoring and alerting mechanisms to detect
and respond to Pod failures promptly, minimizing downtime.

By addressing these issues, the system can improve its resilience and maintain its
steady states even during fault scenarios.
Human: Then, please reconfigure the system
to avoid the fails (improve resiliency).

```

### A.5.6 POST-PROCESSING

#### # EX: Agent for summarizing a completed CE cycle

##### System:

You are a helpful AI assistant for Chaos Engineering.  
Given a summary of a Chaos Engineering cycle, please elaborate the summary.  
The output should be formatted as a JSON instance that conforms to the JSON schema  
below.

As an example, for the schema `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": {\"title\": \"Foo\", \"description\": \"a list of strings\", \"type\": \"array\", \"items\": {\"type\": \"string\"}}}, \"required\": [\"foo\"]}` the object `{\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}` is a well-formatted instance of the schema. The object `{\"properties\": {\"foo\": [\"bar\", \"baz\"]}}` is not well-formatted.

Here is the output schema:

```

'''
{
  "properties": {
    "summary": {
      "title": "Summary",
      "type": "string"
    }
  },
  "required": [
    "summary"
  ]
}
'''

```

##### Human:

```

Here is the overview of a Chaos Engineering Cycle:
# Here is a Chaos Engineering cycle
## Step 0. User-input understanding
### Here is the overview of user inputs:
{user_input2}

## Step 1. Hypothesis definition
### Here is the overview of the hypothesis for the system:
The hypothesis is "The steady states of the system are maintained even when the fault
scenario occurs (i.e., when the faults are injected)".
The steady states here are as follows:
{steady_states}

```

```

The fault scenario here is as follows:
{detailed_fault_scenario}

## Step 2.1. Chaos-Engineering experiment
### Here is the overview of my Chaos-Engineering experiment to verify the hypothesis:
{experiment_plan_summary}

## Step 2.2, 3, 4. Experiment execution, analysis and improvement (reconfiguring the
system to satisfy the hypothesis)
### Here is the improvement history:
{improvement_history}

Please elaborate the above summary of a Chaos Engineering Cycle.

```

### Example text embedded to `improvement_history`

```

### Experiment result (1st try)
the same content as experiment_result

### Analysis report (1st try)
the same content as analysis_report

### Improvement result (1st try)
1 K8s manifests are modified:
- The K8s manifest 'nginx/pod.yaml' was replaced.

Replace the Pod manifest with a Deployment manifest to provide redundancy and automatic
recovery. The Deployment will manage the Pod lifecycle, ensuring that a specified
number of replicas are always running, which addresses both the restart policy and
redundancy issues.
```yaml
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: example-deployment
  labels:
    app: example
spec:
  replicas: 3
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      app: example
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        app: example
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: example-container
          image: nginx:1.17.1
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
...

### Experiment result (2nd try)
Passed unittests:
- pre-unittest-example-pod-running-state
- pre-unittest-example-service-http-response-state
- fault-unittest-example-pod-running-state
- fault-unittest-example-service-http-response-state
- post-unittest-example-pod-running-state
- post-unittest-example-service-http-response-state

Failed unittests:

```

## B FULL RESULTS OF CASE STUDIES

In this section, we provide full inputs and outputs for each run studied in the case study. The inputs include instructions, Skaffold configuration files, K8s manifests. The outputs include VaC scripts, Chaos Mesh workflow manifests, reconfigured K8s manifests, adjusted VaC scripts in the experiment replanning phase. In the case study, we pick up



the fourth run for NGINX and the fifth run for SOCKSHOP. For complete dialogues, see `casestudy_complete_dialogues/Nginx/ChaosEater_GPT4o_nginx_4.pdf` for NGINX and `casestudy_complete_dialogues/Sockshop/ChaosEater_GPT4o_sockshop_5.pdf` in the Supplementary Material. The results of other runs can also be found in the same folders. Table 4 shows the statistics of NGINX and SOCKSHOP.

Table 4: Statistics of the systems for the case study. Tokens are counted by the tokenizer `cl1100k_base`.

System	# manifests	# lines	# words	# tokens
NGINX	2	24	373	115
SOCKSHOP	29	869	17696	4605

## B.1 NGINX

### B.1.1 INPUTS

#### Instructions

The Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute.

#### skaffold.yaml

```
apiVersion: skaffold/v3
kind: Config
metadata:
  name: nginx-app
manifests:
  rawYaml:
    - pod.yaml
    - service.yaml
```

#### pod.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Pod
metadata:
  name: example-pod
  labels:
    app: example
spec:
  restartPolicy: Never
  containers:
    - name: example-container
      image: nginx:1.17.1
      ports:
        - containerPort: 80
```

#### service.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: example-service
spec:
  selector:
    app: example
  ports:
```

```
- protocol: TCP
  port: 80
  targetPort: 80
```

### B.1.2 DIALOGUE (OUTPUTS GENERATED BY CHAOSEATER)

#### Preprocessing

##### Summaries of each manifest

```
nginx/pod.yaml
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Pod.
- The Pod is named 'example-pod'.
- It includes metadata with a label 'app: example'.
- The Pod's restart policy is set to 'Never', meaning it won't restart automatically if it fails.
- The Pod contains one container named 'example-container'.
- The container uses the 'nginx:1.17.1' image, which is a specific version of the Nginx webserver.
- The container exposes port 80, which is commonly used for HTTP traffic.
```

```
nginx/service.yaml
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'example-service'.
- It uses the 'v1' API version.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'app: example'.
- It exposes the Service on port 80 using the TCP protocol.
- The Service forwards traffic to the target port 80 on the selected pods.
```

##### Resiliency issues/weaknesses in the manifests

```
Issue #0: Pod Restart Policy
details: The Pod will not restart automatically if it fails, which can lead to downtime.
manifests having the issues: ['nginx/pod.yaml']
problematic config: restartPolicy: Never
```

```
Issue #1: Single Pod Deployment
details: Having a single Pod means there is no redundancy. If the Pod fails, the service will be unavailable.
manifests having the issues: ['nginx/pod.yaml']
problematic config: Only one Pod is defined without a Deployment or ReplicaSet.
```

##### Application of the manifests

```
Thoughts:
The manifests provided define a Kubernetes Pod and a Service. The Pod runs an Nginx container, which is a popular web server used to serve static content, reverse proxy, or load balance HTTP traffic. The Service is configured to expose this Pod on port 80, which is the default port for HTTP traffic. Given the use of Nginx and the configuration of the Service, it is logical to assume that these manifests are intended to deploy a simple web server application. The file names and the use of Nginx further support this assumption.
```

```
Assumed application:
A simple web server application using Nginx to serve HTTP content.
```

##### Summary of user instructions

```
- The Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute.
```

#### Steady state #1: example-pod-running

```
//Description//
The first issue to address is the Pod's restart policy set to 'Never'. This is a critical issue because if the Pod fails, it will not restart, leading to potential downtime. Therefore, the steady state should ensure that the Pod is running and available. A measurable output for this steady state is the number of running Pods, which should be 1, as there is only one Pod defined in the manifest. This steady state will help verify that the Pod is up and running, which is crucial given the restart policy configuration.

//Current state inspection//
```

To inspect whether the 'example-pod' is running, I will use the K8s API. This is because the state to be checked is the status of a Kubernetes resource, specifically the Pod, which is best done using the Kubernetes client libraries. The script will check the status of the Pod every second for a duration of 5 seconds, which is within the allowed maximum duration. This will ensure that the Pod is running and available, addressing the critical issue of the Pod's restart policy being set to 'Never'.

```

tool: k8s duration: 5s
Inspection script (Python) k8s_example-pod-running.py :
'''
import os
import time
from kubernetes import client, config

# Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment
if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):
    config.load_incluster_config()
else:
    config.load_kube_config()

v1 = client.CoreV1Api()

def check_pod_status(namespace, pod_name):
    try:
        pod = v1.read_namespaced_pod(name=pod_name, namespace=namespace)
        return pod.status.phase == 'Running'
    except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
        print(f"Exception when calling CoreV1Api->read_namespaced_po
        return False

def main(duration):
    namespace = 'default'
    pod_name = 'example-pod'
    running_count = 0
    for _ in range(duration):
        if check_pod_status(namespace, pod_name):
            running_count += 1
        time.sleep(1)
    print(f"Pod '{pod_name}' running status checked {duration} times

if __name__ == '__main__':
    import argparse
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Check if a pod is
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Dur
    args = parser.parse_args()
    main(args.duration)
'''

```

The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:

```

'''
Pod 'example-pod' running status checked 5 times. Running count: 5.
'''

```

//Threshold//

The steady state we are considering is whether the 'example-pod' is running. The current state shows that the pod was checked 5 times over a duration of 5 seconds, and it was running each time, resulting in a running count of 5. This indicates that the pod is consistently running during the check period. Given the constraints of the chaos engineering experiment, which must be completed within 1 minute, we can set a threshold that allows for some tolerance in case of brief fluctuations. A reasonable threshold would be that the pod should be running at least 90% of the time during the check period. This allows for a small margin of error while still ensuring that the pod is generally available and running.

The pod should be running at least 90% of the time during the check period.

//Unit test to validate the steady state//

To add the threshold assertion to the inspection Python script, I will calculate the percentage of time the pod is running during the specified duration. The threshold is set to 90%, meaning the pod should be running at least 90% of the time during the check period. I will implement a for-loop to check the pod status every second for the specified duration and then assert that the running percentage is greater than or equal to 90%. This ensures that the pod is generally available and running, allowing for a small margin of error.

```

'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config

```

```

from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestPodRunningState(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self):
        super().__init__()

    def check_pod_status(self, namespace, pod_name):
        try:
            pod = self.v1.read_namespaced_pod(name=pod_name, namespace=namespace)
            return pod.status.phase == 'Running'
        except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
            print(f"Exception when calling CoreV1Api->read_namespaced_pod: {e}")
            return False

    def test_pod_running_state(self, duration):
        namespace = 'default'
        pod_name = 'example-pod'
        running_count = 0

        # Check the pod status every second for the specified duration
        for _ in range(duration):
            if self.check_pod_status(namespace, pod_name):
                running_count += 1
            time.sleep(1)

        # Calculate the running percentage
        running_percentage = (running_count / duration) * 100

        # Assert that the running percentage is at least 90%
        assert running_percentage >= 90, f"Pod '{pod_name}' running percentage is
        below threshold: {running_percentage}%"

        print(f"Pod '{pod_name}' running status checked {duration} times. Running
        percentage: {running_percentage}%.")

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test if a pod is running at least
    90% of the time.')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
    pod status in seconds.')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    test = TestPodRunningState()
    test.test_pod_running_state(args.duration)

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()
...

The unit test results are as follows:
...
Pod 'example-pod' running status checked 5 times. Running percentage 100%.
...

```

## Steady state #2: example-service-availability

### Description

The next issue to address is the 'Single Pod Deployment', which is related to the lack of redundancy. This is a significant issue because if the single Pod fails, the service will be unavailable. To verify this, we can define a steady state that checks the availability of the service itself. A measurable output for this steady state is the service's response time or availability. Since the service is exposed on port 80, we can check if the service is responding to HTTP requests. This steady state will help verify that the service is available and responsive, which is crucial given the single Pod deployment configuration.

### Current state inspection

To inspect the availability of the 'example-service', we need to check if the service is responding to HTTP requests. Since the service is exposed on port 80, we can use k6 to simulate HTTP requests to the service and measure its response time and availability. This approach allows us to verify the service's responsiveness and availability, which is crucial given the single Pod deployment configuration. We will

```

use a small number of virtual users and a short duration to fit within the 1-minute
constraint of the Chaos Engineering experiment.
tool: k6 vus: 1 duration: 5s
Inspection script (Javascript) k6_example-service-availability.js :
'''
import http from 'k6/http';
import { check } from 'k6';

export const options = {
  vus: 1,
  duration: '5s',
};

export default function () {
  const res = http.get('http://example-service.default.svc.cluster.local')
  check(res, {
    'status is 200': (r) => r.status === 200,
  });
}
'''

```

The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:

```

'''
OK status is 200
checks.....: 100.00% 13915 out of 13915
data_received.....: 12 MB 2.4 MB/s
data_sent.....: 1.5 MB 306 kB/s
http_req_blocked.....: avg=8.11µs min=1.4µs med=4.19µs max=2.82ms
                        p(90)=6.47µs p(95)=7.28µs
http_req_connecting.....: avg=2.23µs min=0s med=0s max=345.12µs
                        p(90)=0s p(95)=0s
http_req_duration.....: avg=236.57µs min=90.31µs med=232.08µs max=3.38ms
                        p(90)=263.84µs p(95)=280.9µs
  { expected_response:true }...: avg=236.57µs min=90.31µs med=232.08µs max=3.38ms
                        p(90)=263.84µs p(95)=280.9µs
http_req_failed.....: 0.00% 0 out of 13915
http_req_receiving.....: avg=67.9µs min=17.89µs med=61.39µs max=2.36ms
                        p(90)=91.92µs p(95)=99.14µs
http_req_sending.....: avg=18.51µs min=4.66µs med=14.77µs max=2.51ms
                        p(90)=21.11µs p(95)=23.45µs
http_req_tls_handshaking.....: avg=0s min=0s med=0s max=0s
                        p(90)=0s p(95)=0s
http_req_waiting.....: avg=150.16µs min=54.98µs med=151.23µs max=880.47µs
                        p(90)=168.67µs p(95)=176.19µs
http_reqs.....: 13915 2782.666155/s
iteration_duration.....: avg=344.61µs min=131.12µs med=333.12µs max=3.98ms
                        p(90)=377.15µs p(95)=401.15µs
iterations.....: 13915 2782.666155/s
vus.....: 1 min=1 max=1
vus_max.....: 1 min=1 max=1
'''

```

### Threshold

The steady state we are considering is the availability of the 'example-service'. The k6 test results show that the service is currently responding with a 200 status code for all requests, indicating 100% availability. Given that the system consists of a single Pod, any failure in the Pod would result in the service being unavailable. Therefore, the threshold should ensure that the service remains available and responsive. To account for minor fluctuations and network latency, a reasonable threshold would be to maintain a high availability percentage, slightly below 100% to allow for brief, noncritical failures. A threshold of 99.9% availability is a common standard for web services, allowing for some tolerance while still ensuring high reliability.

Service availability should be at least 99.9% with a response status of 200.

### Unit test to validate the steady state

To add the threshold check to the k6 script, I will include a 'thresholds' property in the 'options' section. This property will specify that the service's availability should be at least 99.9% with a response status of 200. This is done by setting a threshold on the 'http\_req\_failed' metric, ensuring that the failure rate is less than or equal to 0.1% (which corresponds to 99.9% availability).

```

'''
import http from 'k6/http';
import { check } from 'k6';

export const options = {
  vus: 1,

```

```

duration: '5s',
thresholds: {
  // Ensure that the service availability is at least 99.9%
  'http_req_failed': ['rate<=0.001'], // 0.1% failure rate corresponds to 99.9%
  availability
},
};

export default function () {
  const res = http.get('http://example-service.default.svc.cluster.local:80');
  check(res, {
    'status is 200': (r) => r.status === 200,
  });
}
...

The unit test results are as follows:
...
OK status is 200
checks.....: 100.00% 14565 out of 14565
data_received.....: 12 MB 2.5 MB/s
data_sent.....: 1.6 MB 320 kB/s
http_req_blocked.....: avg=7.92µs min=1.33µs med=4.1...
http_req_connecting.....: avg=2.19µs min=0s med=0s...
http_req_duration.....: avg=225.1µs min=82.21µs med=226...
  { expected_response:true }...: avg=225.1µs min=82.21µs med=226...
OK http_req_failed.....: 0.00% 0 out of 14565...
http_req_receiving.....: avg=66.97µs min=15.24µs med=60...
http_req_sending.....: avg=17.27µs min=4.03µs med=13...
http_req_tls_handshaking.....: avg=0s min=0s med=0s...
http_req_waiting.....: avg=140.85µs min=53.55µs med=144...
http_reqs.....: 14565 2912.709122/s
iteration_duration.....: avg=329.52µs min=117.97µs med=323...
iterations.....: 14565 2912.709122/s
vus.....: 1 min=1 max=1
vus_max.....: 1 min=1 max=1
...

```

## Failure scenario: Cyber Attack

### Description

Given the system's weaknesses, a cyber attack targeting the single Pod and its network could be highly impactful. The Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' means that if the Pod fails, it will not restart, leading to downtime. Additionally, the single Pod deployment means there is no redundancy, so any failure will make the service unavailable. To simulate a cyber attack, we can start by injecting a PodChaos fault to kill the Pod, testing the system's ability to handle Pod failures. This will directly exploit the lack of redundancy and the restart policy issue. Next, we can simulate a network attack using NetworkChaos to introduce network latency, testing the service's ability to maintain availability under network stress. This sequence simulates a cyber attack by first taking down the Pod and then stressing the network, revealing the system's vulnerabilities in handling such scenarios.

### Failure-injection sequence

```
PodChaos ({{'pod': 'example-pod'}}) -> NetworkChaos ({{'service': 'example-service'}}):
```

### Detailed failure parameters

```
Detailed parameters of PodChaos ({{'pod': 'example-pod'}})
```

```

...
{
  "action": "pod-kill",
  "mode": "one",
  "selector": {
    "namespaces": [
      "default"
    ],
    "labelSelectors": {
      "app": "example"
    }
  }
}
...

```

```
Detailed parameters of NetworkChaos ({{'service': 'example-service'}}):
```

```
...
```

```

{
  "action": "delay",
  "direction": "to",
  "target": {
    "mode": "all",
    "selector": {
      "namespaces": ["default"],
      "labelSelectors": {
        "app": "example"
      }
    }
  },
  "mode": "all",
  "selector": {
    "namespaces": ["default"],
    "labelSelectors": {
      "app": "example"
    }
  },
  "device": "eth0",
  "delay": {
    "latency": "100ms",
    "jitter": "10ms",
    "correlation": "50"
  }
}
```

```

## Chaos experiment (Planning)

### Time schedule

Given the constraints of the chaos engineering experiment, which must be completed within 1 minute, we need to allocate time efficiently across the three phases: prevalidation, fault-injection, and post-validation. The pre-validation phase is crucial to ensure that the system is in a steady state before we introduce any faults. Since we have two steady states to validate, we should allocate a reasonable amount of time to check both the pod's running status and the service's availability. A duration of 15 seconds should be sufficient for pre-validation, allowing us to run the necessary checks multiple times. The fault-injection phase is where we introduce the chaos to observe the system's behavior under stress. Given the complexity of the faults (PodChaos and NetworkChaos), we should allocate the majority of the time to this phase to ensure that the faults have enough time to manifest and impact the system. A duration of 30 seconds is appropriate for fault injection, allowing us to observe the system's response to both pod failure and network latency. Finally, the post-validation phase is essential to verify that the system returns to its steady states after the faults are removed. We should allocate 15 seconds for post-validation, similar to the pre-validation phase, to ensure that the system stabilizes and meets the defined thresholds for steady states. This allocation results in a total experiment time of 60 seconds, which fits within the 1-minute constraint.

```

Total experiment time: 60s
Pre-validation Phase : 15s
Fault-injection Phase: 30s
Post-validation Phase: 15s

```

### Pre-validation phase

In the pre-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system is in its expected steady state before we proceed with fault injection. Given the constraints of a 15-second total time for this phase, we will conduct two unit tests to verify the steady states: one for the pod's running status and another for the service's availability. These tests will be executed sequentially due to the short duration available, ensuring that each steady state is verified independently and thoroughly. The first test will check if the 'examplepod' is running at least 90% of the time over a 5-second period. This is crucial because the pod's restart policy is set to 'Never', and we need to confirm its availability before introducing any faults. The second test will verify the 'example-service' availability, ensuring it responds with a 200 status code at least 99.9% of the time over another 5-second period. This test is essential to confirm that the service is operational and responsive, given the single pod deployment. By staggering these tests, we can focus on each steady state individually, allowing us to identify any issues before proceeding to the fault injection phase.

- Verified Steady State #0: example-pod-running
- Workflow Name: pre-unittest-example-pod-running
- Grace Period: 0s

- Duration: 5s
- Verified Steady State #1: example-service-availability
  - Workflow Name: pre-unittest-example-service-availability
  - Grace Period: 5s
  - Duration: 5s

### **Fault-injection phase**

In this fault-injection phase, we aim to simulate a cyber attack by injecting two types of faults: PodChaos and NetworkChaos. The total duration for this phase is 30 seconds, so we need to carefully schedule the faults and unit tests to fit within this timeframe.

First, we will inject the PodChaos fault to simulate a pod failure. This fault will be injected at the start of the phase (grace period of 0s) and will last for 10 seconds. This duration is chosen to allow enough time for the system to experience the impact of the pod being killed, given the pod's restart policy is set to 'Never'.

Simultaneously, we will run the unit test for the 'example-pod-running' steady state to verify if the pod is running at least 90% of the time during the fault injection. This test will also start at 0s and run for 10 seconds, aligning with the PodChaos duration.

Next, we will inject the NetworkChaos fault to simulate network latency. This fault will start at 10 seconds (after the PodChaos fault ends) and will last for 20 seconds. This staggered approach allows us to observe the system's behavior under network stress after the pod failure has been simulated.

During the NetworkChaos fault, we will run the unit test for the 'example-serviceavailability' steady state. This test will start at 10 seconds and run for 20 seconds, matching the NetworkChaos duration. This ensures we are checking the service's availability and response time while the network is under stress.

By staggering the faults and aligning the unit tests with the fault durations, we can effectively observe the system's behavior under each fault condition and verify if the steady states are maintained.

- Verified Steady State #0: example-pod-running
  - Workflow Name: fault-unittest-example-pod-running
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s
- Verified Steady State #1: example-service-availability
  - Workflow Name: fault-unittest-example-service-availability
  - Grace Period: 10s
  - Duration: 20s
- Injected Faults #0: PodChaos
  - Workflow Name: fault-podchaos
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s
- Injected Faults #1: NetworkChaos
  - Workflow Name: fault-networkchaos
  - Grace Period: 10s
  - Duration: 20s

### **Post-validation phase**

In the post-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system has returned to its steady states after the fault injection. Given the 15-second time constraint, we will perform quick checks to verify the steady states. The two steady states to verify are: 1) the 'example-pod' is running, and 2) the 'example-service' is available. We will execute these checks sequentially due to the short duration, ensuring each test has enough time to gather meaningful data. The first test will check the pod's running status, followed by the service availability test. This order is logical because the pod must be running for the service to be available. Each test will have a brief grace period to allow the system to stabilize after the fault injection, followed by a short duration to perform the checks.

- Verified Steady State #0: example-pod-running
  - Workflow Name: post-unittest-example-pod-running
  - Grace Period: 2s
  - Duration: 6s
- Verified Steady State #1: example-service-availability
  - Workflow Name: post-unittest-example-service-availability
  - Grace Period: 8s
  - Duration: 5s



**Summary**

The chaos engineering experiment is structured into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation, all to be completed within a total of 60 seconds.

In the pre-validation phase, which lasts for 15 seconds, two unit tests are conducted sequentially to ensure the system is in a steady state before fault injection. The first test, named 'pre-unittest-example-pod-running', checks the 'example-pod' running status. It starts immediately at the beginning of the phase and runs for 5 seconds. Following this, the second test, 'pre-unittest-example-service-availability', begins at the 5-second mark and also runs for 5 seconds, verifying the service's availability.

The fault-injection phase spans 30 seconds and involves two types of faults: PodChaos and NetworkChaos. Initially, the PodChaos fault, named 'fault-podchaos', is injected at the start of the phase and lasts for 10 seconds. Concurrently, the 'fault-unittestexample-pod-running' unit test runs for the same duration to verify the pod's status during the fault. After the PodChaos fault concludes, the NetworkChaos fault, named 'fault-networkchaos', begins at the 10-second mark and continues for 20 seconds. Simultaneously, the 'fault-unittest-example-service-availability' test runs for 20 seconds, starting at the same time as the NetworkChaos fault, to check the service's availability under network stress.

Finally, the post-validation phase, also 15 seconds long, ensures the system returns to its steady states. The 'post-unittest-example-pod-running' test starts after a 2-second grace period and runs for 6 seconds to verify the pod's status. Subsequently, the 'postunittest-example-service-availability' test begins at the 8-second mark and runs for 5 seconds, checking the service's availability. This sequential execution allows for a brief stabilization period before each test.

```
The generated Chaos Mesh workflow manifest:
'''
apiVersion: chaos-mesh.org/v1alpha1
kind: Workflow
metadata:
  name: chaos-experiment-20241124-132854
spec:
  entry: the-entry
  templates:
    #-----
    # entry point of whole workflow
    #-----
    - name: the-entry
      templateType: Serial
      deadline: 30m51s
      children:
        - pre-validation-phase
        - fault-injection-phase
        - post-validation-phase

    #-----
    # Entry point of pre-validation-phase
    #-----
    - name: pre-validation-phase
      templateType: Serial
      deadline: 10m10s
      children:
        - pre-validation-overlapped-workflows

    - name: pre-validation-suspend-workflow
      templateType: Serial
      deadline: 5m10s
      children:
        - pre-validation-suspend
        - pre-unittest-example-service-availability

    - name: pre-validation-suspend
      templateType: Suspend
      deadline: 5s

    - name: pre-validation-overlapped-workflows
      templateType: Parallel
      deadline: 5m10s
      children:
        - pre-unittest-example-pod-running
        - pre-validation-suspend-workflow

    # Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
    - name: pre-unittest-example-pod-running
```

```

templateType: Task
deadline: 5m5s
task:
  container:
    name: pre-unittest-example-pod-running-container
    image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
    imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
    command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
    args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-pod-running_mod0.py
--duration 5"]
    volumeMounts:
      - name: pvc-volume
        mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

- name: pre-unittest-example-service-availability
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m5s
  task:
    container:
      name: pre-unittest-example-service-availability-container
      image: grafana/k6:latest
      command: ["k6", "run", "--duration", "5s", "--quiet",
"/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-service-
availability_mod0.js"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

#-----
# Entry point of fault-injection-phase
#-----
- name: fault-injection-phase
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 10m30s
  children:
    - fault-injection-overlapped-workflows

- name: fault-injection-parallel-workflow
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m10s
  children:
    - fault-unittest-example-pod-running
    - fault-podchaos

- name: fault-injection-suspend-workflow
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 5m30s
  children:
    - fault-injection-suspend
    - fault-injection-parallel-workflows

- name: fault-injection-suspend
  templateType: Suspend
  deadline: 10s

- name: fault-injection-parallel-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m20s
  children:
    - fault-unittest-example-service-availability
    - fault-networkchaos

- name: fault-injection-overlapped-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m30s
  children:
    - fault-injection-parallel-workflow
    - fault-injection-suspend-workflow

```

```

# Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
# unit tests
- name: fault-unittest-example-pod-running
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m10s
  task:
    container:
      name: fault-unittest-example-pod-running-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-pod-running_mod0.py
--duration 10"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

- name: fault-unittest-example-service-availability
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m20s
  task:
    container:
      name: fault-unittest-example-service-availability-container
      image: grafana/k6:latest
      command: ["k6", "run", "--duration", "20s", "--quiet",
"/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-
service-availability_mod0.js"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

# fault_injections
- name: fault-podchaos
  templateType: PodChaos
  deadline: 10s
  podChaos:
    action: pod-kill
    mode: one
    selector:
      labelSelectors:
        app: example
      namespaces:
        - default

- name: fault-networkchaos
  templateType: NetworkChaos
  deadline: 20s
  networkChaos:
    action: delay
    delay:
      correlation: '50'
      jitter: 10ms
      latency: 100ms
    device: eth0
    direction: to
    mode: all
    selector:
      labelSelectors:
        app: example
      namespaces:
        - default
    target:
      mode: all
      selector:
        labelSelectors:
          app: example
        namespaces:
          - default

```

```

#-----
# Entry point of post-validation phase
#-----
- name: post-validation-phase
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 10m11s
  children:
    - post-validation-overlapped-workflows

- name: post-validation-suspend-workflow
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 5m8s
  children:
    - post-validation-suspend
    - post-unittest-example-pod-running

- name: post-validation-suspend
  templateType: Suspend
  deadline: 2s

- name: post-validation-suspend-workflow2
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 5m11s
  children:
    - post-validation-suspend2
    - post-unittest-example-service-availability

- name: post-validation-suspend2
  templateType: Suspend
  deadline: 6s

- name: post-validation-overlapped-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m11s
  children:
    - post-validation-suspend-workflow
    - post-validation-suspend-workflow2

# Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
- name: post-unittest-example-pod-running
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m6s
  task:
    container:
      name: post-unittest-example-pod-running-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-pod-running_mod0.py
--duration 6"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

- name: post-unittest-example-service-availability
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m5s
  task:
    container:
      name: post-unittest-example-service-availability-container
      image: grafana/k6:latest
      command: ["k6", "run", "--duration", "5s", "--quiet",
"/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241124_132128/unittest_example-
service-availability_mod0.js"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

```

```
'''
```

### Analysis

The chaos engineering experiment results indicate several critical issues in the system's configuration and its ability to handle faults, particularly in the context of the defined fault scenario. Here is a detailed analysis of the failures observed during the experiment:

1. Pod Restart Policy and Single Pod Deployment:  
The 'fault-unittest-example-pod-running' test failed because the Pod was not found after the PodChaos fault was injected. This is directly related to the Pod's restart policy set to 'Never' in the nginx/pod.yaml manifest. When the Pod was killed, it did not restart, leading to a 404 error when attempting to read the Pod's status. This confirms the identified issue #0 (Pod Restart Policy) and issue #1 (Single Pod Deployment), where the lack of redundancy and automatic recovery mechanisms resulted in the Pod being unavailable.

2. Service Availability:  
The 'fault-unittest-example-service-availability' test failed due to connection refusals, indicating that the service was unavailable. This failure is a consequence of the Pod being killed and not restarting, as the Service relies on the Pod to handle requests. The Service's selector in nginx/service.yaml targets Pods with the label 'app: example', and with the Pod being down, there were no endpoints available to serve the requests, leading to the connection refused errors.

3. Post-Validation Failures:  
Both 'post-unittest-example-pod-running' and 'post-unittest-example-service-availability' tests failed, showing that the system did not recover to its steady state after the fault injection. The Pod remained unavailable, and consequently, the Service could not respond to HTTP requests. This further highlights the critical impact of the Pod's restart policy and the lack of redundancy.

#### Insights and Recommendations:

- Pod Restart Policy: Change the Pod's restart policy from 'Never' to 'Always' or 'OnFailure' to ensure that the Pod automatically restarts if it fails. This will help maintain the Pod's availability and reduce downtime.
- Redundancy and Scalability: Implement a Deployment or ReplicaSet to manage the Pod. This will provide redundancy by running multiple replicas of the Pod, ensuring that the Service remains available even if one Pod fails.
- Service Resilience: Consider using a LoadBalancer or Ingress to manage traffic to multiple Pods, enhancing the system's ability to handle failures and maintain service availability.

By addressing these issues, the system can improve its resilience against similar fault scenarios in the future, ensuring that the steady states are maintained even when faults are injected.

### Improvement

To improve the resiliency of the system, I will replace the Pod with a Deployment to manage the Pod's lifecycle and provide redundancy. This will address both the restart policy issue and the single Pod deployment issue by ensuring that multiple replicas of the Pod are running and can automatically restart if they fail.

```
Modification_type: replace
File name: nginx/pod.yaml
```

Replace the Pod with a Deployment to manage the Pod's lifecycle and provide redundancy. This will ensure that multiple replicas of the Pod are running and can automatically restart if they fail.

```
'''
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: example-deployment
  labels:
```

```

    app: example
spec:
  replicas: 3
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      app: example
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        app: example
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: example-container
          image: nginx:1.17.1
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
...

```

## Experiment replanning

### Failure scope of PodChaos

The previous K8s manifests targeted a single pod with the label 'app: example'. The current manifests have changed to a Deployment with 3 replicas, all having the same label 'app: example'. The original chaos experiment aimed to simulate a pod failure, which can still be achieved by targeting one of the pods in the Deployment. Therefore, the scope of the fault injection should remain the same, targeting pods with the label 'app: example' in the 'default' namespace. This ensures that the experiment's goal of simulating a pod failure is maintained, even with the change from a single pod to a Deployment with multiple replicas.

### Failure scope of NetworkChaos

The previous K8s manifests had a single pod, and the NetworkChaos was targeting all pods with the label 'app: example' in the 'default' namespace. The current manifests have been updated to a Deployment with 3 replicas, but the label 'app: example' and the namespace 'default' remain the same. Therefore, the scope of the fault injection should remain unchanged, as it will now target all pods created by the Deployment, which aligns with the original goal of the chaos experiment to test the system's behavior under network stress.

### VaC script for steady state #1

The previous unit test targets a Pod resource named 'example-pod'. In the reconfigured manifests, the Pod has been replaced by a Deployment named 'example-deployment' with 3 replicas. This change means that the unit test should now target the Deployment instead of a single Pod. The test should verify that at least one of the Pods created by the Deployment is running at least 90% of the time. Therefore, the unit test requires modification to account for the change from a Pod to a Deployment with multiple replicas. The test should be updated to check the status of the Pods created by the Deployment, ensuring that the steady state is maintained by the entire redundancy.

```

...
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config
from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestDeploymentRunningState(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self):
        super().__init__()

    def check_deployment_pods_status(self, namespace, deployment_name):
        try:
            pods = self.v1.list_namespaced_pod(namespace=namespace,
                label_selector=f'app={deployment_name}').items
            running_pods = [pod for pod in pods if pod.status.phase == 'Running']
            return len(running_pods) > 0
        except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
            print(f"Exception when calling CoreV1Api->list_namespaced_pod: {e}")
            return False

    def test_deployment_running_state(self, duration):
        namespace = 'default'
        deployment_name = 'example'
        running_count = 0

```

```

# Check the deployment pods status every second for the specified duration
for _ in range(duration):
    if self.check_deployment_pods_status(namespace, deployment_name):
        running_count += 1
        time.sleep(1)

# Calculate the running percentage
running_percentage = (running_count / duration) * 100

# Assert that the running percentage is at least 90%
assert running_percentage >= 90, f"Deployment '{deployment_name}' running
percentage is below threshold: {running_percentage}%"

print(f"Deployment '{deployment_name}' running status checked {duration}
times. Running percentage: {running_percentage}%.")

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test if a deployment has at least
one pod running at least 90% of the time.')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
deployment pods status in seconds.')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    test = TestDeploymentRunningState()
    test.test_deployment_running_state(args.duration)

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()

```

#### VaC script for steady state #2

The target of the unit test is the service availability, which is associated with the Service resource in the Kubernetes manifests. In the previous and reconfigured manifests, the Service resource has not changed, so the endpoint and the service configuration remain the same. The unit test checks the availability of the service by sending HTTP requests to the service endpoint and verifying the response status. Since the Service resource has not been modified, the unit test does not require any changes. The reconfiguration of the Pod to a Deployment with 3 replicas is intended to improve the system's ability to meet the availability threshold, but it does not affect the unit test itself, which remains valid for checking the service's availability.

### Summary of the completed CE cycle

The Chaos Engineering cycle begins with understanding the user inputs, which include Kubernetes manifests for a Pod and a Service. The Pod manifest defines a single Nginx container with a restart policy of 'Never', and the Service manifest exposes this Pod on port 80. Two main resiliency issues are identified: the Pod's restart policy and the lack of redundancy due to a single Pod deployment.

The hypothesis for the experiment is that the system's steady states will be maintained even when faults are injected. Two steady states are defined: the Pod should be running at least 90% of the time, and the Service should have 99.9% availability with a response status of 200.

The fault scenario simulates a cyber attack using Chaos Mesh, injecting PodChaos to kill the Pod and NetworkChaos to introduce network latency. The experiment is divided into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation, each with specific tasks and durations to verify the system's behavior under stress.

In the first experiment attempt, the system fails to maintain the steady states during and after the fault injection. The Pod does not restart due to its 'Never' restart policy, and the Service becomes unavailable, confirming the identified issues. Recommendations include changing the Pod's restart policy and implementing a Deployment for redundancy.

After modifying the system by replacing the Pod with a Deployment, the second experiment attempt is successful. All unit tests pass, indicating that the system maintains its steady states even when faults are injected, demonstrating improved resilience.

## B.2 SOCKSHOP

### B.2.1 INPUTS

#### Instructions

- The Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute.
  - When using k6 in steady-state definition, always select a request URL from the following options (other requests are invalid):
1. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/`
  2. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/catalogue?size=10`
  3. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/detail.html?id=<ID>`  
 Replace `<ID>` with an available ID: [03fef6ac-1896-4ce8-bd69-b798f85c6e0b, 3395a43e-2d88-40de-b95f-e00e1502085b, 510a0d7e-8e83-4193-b483-e27e09ddc34d, 808a2de1-1aaa-4c25-a9b9-6612e8f29a38, 819e1fbf-8b7e-4f6d-811f-693534916a8b, 837ab141-399e-4c1f-9abc-bace40296bac, a0a4f044-b040-410d-8ead-4de0446aec7e, d3588630-ad8e-49df-bbd7-3167f7efb246, zzz4f044-b040-410d-8ead-4de0446aec7e]
  4. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/category/`
  5. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/category?tags=<TAG>`  
 Replace `<TAG>` with an available tag: [magic, action, blue, brown, black, sport, formal, red, green, skin, geek]
  6. `http:front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/basket.html`

#### skaffold.yaml

```
apiVersion: skaffold/v3
kind: Config
metadata:
  name: sock-shop-app
manifests:
  rawYaml:
    - manifests/00-sock-shop-ns.yaml
    - manifests/01-carts-dep.yaml
    - manifests/02-carts-svc.yaml
    - manifests/03-carts-db-dep.yaml
    - manifests/04-carts-db-svc.yaml
    - manifests/05-catalogue-dep.yaml
    - manifests/06-catalogue-svc.yaml
    - manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml
    - manifests/08-catalogue-db-svc.yaml
    - manifests/09-front-end-dep.yaml
    - manifests/10-front-end-svc.yaml
    - manifests/11-orders-dep.yaml
    - manifests/12-orders-svc.yaml
    - manifests/13-orders-db-dep.yaml
    - manifests/14-orders-db-svc.yaml
    - manifests/15-payment-dep.yaml
    - manifests/16-payment-svc.yaml
    - manifests/17-queue-master-dep.yaml
    - manifests/18-queue-master-svc.yaml
    - manifests/19-rabbitmq-dep.yaml
    - manifests/20-rabbitmq-svc.yaml
    - manifests/21-session-db-dep.yaml
    - manifests/22-session-db-svc.yaml
    - manifests/23-shipping-dep.yaml
    - manifests/24-shipping-svc.yaml
    - manifests/25-user-dep.yaml
    - manifests/26-user-svc.yaml
    - manifests/27-user-db-dep.yaml
    - manifests/28-user-db-svc.yaml
```

#### manifests/00-sock-shop-ns.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Namespace
metadata:
  name: sock-shop
```



## manifests/01-carts-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: carts
  labels:
    name: carts
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: carts
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: carts
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: carts
          image: weaveworksdemos/carts:0.4.8
          env:
            - name: JAVA_OPTS
              value: -Xms64m -Xmx128m -XX:+UseG1GC -Djava.security.egd=file:/dev/urandom -
                Dspring.zipkin.enabled=false
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 500Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 200Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
          securityContext:
            runAsNonRoot: true
            runAsUser: 10001
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
              add:
                - NET_BIND_SERVICE
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          volumeMounts:
            - mountPath: /tmp
              name: tmp-volume
      volumes:
        - name: tmp-volume
          emptyDir:
            medium: Memory
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux
```

## manifests/02-carts-svc.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: carts
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: carts
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: carts
```

## manifests/03-carts-db-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: carts-db
  labels:
    name: carts-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: carts-db
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: carts-db
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: carts-db
          image: mongo
          ports:
            - name: mongo
              containerPort: 27017
          securityContext:
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
              add:
                - CHOWN
                - SETGID
                - SETUID
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          volumeMounts:
            - mountPath: /tmp
              name: tmp-volume
      volumes:
        - name: tmp-volume
          emptyDir:
            medium: Memory
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux
```

## manifests/04-carts-db-svc.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: carts-db
  labels:
    name: carts-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 27017
      targetPort: 27017
  selector:
    name: carts-db
```

## manifests/05-catalogue-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: catalogue
  labels:
    name: catalogue
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
```

```

replicas: 2
selector:
  matchLabels:
    name: catalogue
template:
  metadata:
    labels:
      name: catalogue
  spec:
    containers:
      - name: catalogue
        image: weaveworksdemos/catalogue:0.3.5
        command: ["/app"]
        args:
          - -port=80
        resources:
          limits:
            cpu: 200m
            memory: 200Mi
          requests:
            cpu: 100m
            memory: 100Mi
        ports:
          - containerPort: 80
        securityContext:
          runAsNonRoot: true
          runAsUser: 10001
          capabilities:
            drop:
              - all
            add:
              - NET_BIND_SERVICE
          readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
        livenessProbe:
          httpGet:
            path: /health
            port: 80
          initialDelaySeconds: 300
          periodSeconds: 3
        readinessProbe:
          httpGet:
            path: /health
            port: 80
          initialDelaySeconds: 180
          periodSeconds: 3
    nodeSelector:
      beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/06-catalogue-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: catalogue
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: catalogue
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: catalogue

```

#### manifests/06-catalogue-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:

```

```

name: catalogue
annotations:
  prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
labels:
  name: catalogue
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: catalogue

```

#### manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: catalogue-db
  labels:
    name: catalogue-db
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: catalogue-db
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: catalogue-db
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: catalogue-db
          image: weaveworksdemos/catalogue-db:0.3.0
          env:
            - name: MYSQL_ROOT_PASSWORD
              value: fake_password
            - name: MYSQL_DATABASE
              value: socksdb
          ports:
            - name: mysql
              containerPort: 3306
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/08-catalogue-db-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: catalogue-db
  labels:
    name: catalogue-db
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 3306
      targetPort: 3306
  selector:
    name: catalogue-db

```

#### manifests/09-front-end-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment

```

```

metadata:
  name: front-end
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 1
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: front-end
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: front-end
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: front-end
          image: weaveworksdemos/front-end:0.3.12
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 1000Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 300Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 8079
          env:
            - name: SESSION_REDIS
              value: "true"
          securityContext:
            runAsNonRoot: true
            runAsUser: 10001
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          livenessProbe:
            httpGet:
              path: /
              port: 8079
            initialDelaySeconds: 300
            periodSeconds: 3
          readinessProbe:
            httpGet:
              path: /
              port: 8079
            initialDelaySeconds: 30
            periodSeconds: 3
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/10-front-end-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: front-end
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: front-end
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  type: NodePort
  ports:
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 8079
      nodePort: 30001
  selector:
    name: front-end

```

## manifests/11-orders-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: orders
  labels:
    name: orders
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: orders
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: orders
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: orders
          image: weaveworksdemos/orders:0.4.7
          env:
            - name: JAVA_OPTS
              value: -Xms64m -Xmx128m -XX:+UseG1GC -Djava.security.egd=file:/dev/urandom -
                Dspring.zipkin.enabled=false
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 500m
              memory: 500Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 300Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
          securityContext:
            runAsNonRoot: true
            runAsUser: 10001
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
              add:
                - NET_BIND_SERVICE
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          volumeMounts:
            - mountPath: /tmp
              name: tmp-volume
          volumes:
            - name: tmp-volume
              emptyDir:
                medium: Memory
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux
```

## manifests/12-orders-svc.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: orders
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: orders
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: orders
```

## manifests/13-orders-db-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: orders-db
  labels:
    name: orders-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: orders-db
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: orders-db
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: orders-db
          image: mongo
          ports:
            - name: mongo
              containerPort: 27017
          securityContext:
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
              add:
                - CHOWN
                - SETGID
                - SETUID
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          volumeMounts:
            - mountPath: /tmp
              name: tmp-volume
      volumes:
        - name: tmp-volume
          emptyDir:
            medium: Memory
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux
```

## manifests/14-orders-db-svc.yaml

```
apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: orders-db
  labels:
    name: orders-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 27017
      targetPort: 27017
  selector:
    name: orders-db
```

## manifests/15-payment-dep.yaml

```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: payment
  labels:
    name: payment
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
```

```

replicas: 2
selector:
  matchLabels:
    name: payment
template:
  metadata:
    labels:
      name: payment
  spec:
    containers:
      - name: payment
        image: weaveworksdemos/payment:0.4.3
        resources:
          limits:
            cpu: 200m
            memory: 200Mi
          requests:
            cpu: 99m
            memory: 100Mi
        ports:
          - containerPort: 80
        securityContext:
          runAsNonRoot: true
          runAsUser: 10001
          capabilities:
            drop:
              - all
            add:
              - NET_BIND_SERVICE
          readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
        livenessProbe:
          httpGet:
            path: /health
            port: 80
          initialDelaySeconds: 300
          periodSeconds: 3
        readinessProbe:
          httpGet:
            path: /health
            port: 80
          initialDelaySeconds: 180
          periodSeconds: 3
    nodeSelector:
      beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/16-payment-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: payment
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: payment
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: payment

```

#### manifests/17-queue-master-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: queue-master
  labels:
    name: queue-master

```



```

    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: queue-master
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: queue-master
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: queue-master
          image: weaveworksdemos/queue-master:0.3.1
          env:
            - name: JAVA_OPTS
              value: -Xms64m -Xmx128m -XX:+UseG1GC -Djava.security.egd=file:/dev/urandom -
                Dspring.zipkin.enabled=false
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 500Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 300Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
      nodeSelector:
        beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/18-queue-master-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: queue-master
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: queue-master
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: queue-master

```

#### manifests/19-rabbitmq-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: rabbitmq
  labels:
    name: rabbitmq
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: rabbitmq
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: rabbitmq
      annotations:
        prometheus.io/scrape: "false"
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: rabbitmq

```

```

image: rabbitmq:3.6.8-management
ports:
- containerPort: 15672
  name: management
- containerPort: 5672
  name: rabbitmq
securityContext:
  capabilities:
    drop:
      - all
    add:
      - CHOWN
      - SETGID
      - SETUID
      - DAC_OVERRIDE
  readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
- name: rabbitmq-exporter
  image: kbudde/rabbitmq-exporter
  ports:
  - containerPort: 9090
    name: exporter
nodeSelector:
  beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/20-rabbitmq-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: rabbitmq
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
    prometheus.io/port: '9090'
  labels:
    name: rabbitmq
namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
  - port: 5672
    name: rabbitmq
    targetPort: 5672
  - port: 9090
    name: exporter
    targetPort: exporter
    protocol: TCP
  selector:
    name: rabbitmq

```

#### manifests/21-session-db-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: session-db
  labels:
    name: session-db
namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: session-db
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: session-db
      annotations:
        prometheus.io.scrape: "false"
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: session-db

```

```

image: redis:alpine
ports:
- name: redis
  containerPort: 6379
securityContext:
  capabilities:
    drop:
    - all
    add:
    - CHOWN
    - SETGID
    - SETUID
  readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
nodeSelector:
  beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/22-session-db-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: session-db
  labels:
    name: session-db
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 6379
      targetPort: 6379
  selector:
    name: session-db

```

#### manifests/23-shipping-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: shipping
  labels:
    name: shipping
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: shipping
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: shipping
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: shipping
          image: weaveworksdemos/shipping:0.4.8
          env:
            - name: ZIPKIN
              value: zipkin.jaeger.svc.cluster.local
            - name: JAVA_OPTS
              value: -Xms64m -Xmx128m -XX:+UseG1GC -Djava.security.egd=file:/dev/urandom -
                Dspring.zipkin.enabled=false
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 500Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 300Mi
      ports:
        - containerPort: 80
      securityContext:
        runAsNonRoot: true

```

```

runAsUser: 10001
capabilities:
  drop:
    - all
  add:
    - NET_BIND_SERVICE
readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
volumeMounts:
- mountPath: /tmp
  name: tmp-volume
volumes:
- name: tmp-volume
  emptyDir:
    medium: Memory
nodeSelector:
  beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/24-shipping-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: shipping
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: shipping
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: shipping

```

#### manifests/25-user-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: user
  labels:
    name: user
    namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: user
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: user
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: user
          image: weaveworksdemos/user:0.4.7
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 200Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 100Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 80
          env:
            - name: mongo
              value: user-db:27017
          securityContext:
            runAsNonRoot: true

```

```

    runAsUser: 10001
    capabilities:
      drop:
        - all
      add:
        - NET_BIND_SERVICE
    readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
  livenessProbe:
    httpGet:
      path: /health
      port: 80
    initialDelaySeconds: 300
    periodSeconds: 3
  readinessProbe:
    httpGet:
      path: /health
      port: 80
    initialDelaySeconds: 180
    periodSeconds: 3
  nodeSelector:
    beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/26-user-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: user
  annotations:
    prometheus.io/scrape: 'true'
  labels:
    name: user
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 80
      targetPort: 80
  selector:
    name: user

```

#### manifests/27-user-db-dep.yaml

```

apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
  name: user-db
  labels:
    name: user-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: user-db
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: user-db
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: user-db
          image: weaveworksdemos/user-db:0.3.0
          ports:
            - name: mongo
              containerPort: 27017
      securityContext:
        capabilities:
          drop:
            - all
          add:
            - CHOWN

```

```

    - SETGID
    - SETUID
    readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
    volumeMounts:
    - mountPath: /tmp
      name: tmp-volume
    volumes:
    - name: tmp-volume
      emptyDir:
        medium: Memory
    nodeSelector:
      beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux

```

#### manifests/28-user-db-svc.yaml

```

apiVersion: v1
kind: Service
metadata:
  name: user-db
  labels:
    name: user-db
  namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  ports:
    # the port that this service should serve on
    - port: 27017
      targetPort: 27017
  selector:
    name: user-db

```

## B.2.2 FULL DIALOGUE (OUTPUTS GENERATED BY CHAOS EATER)

### Preprocessing

#### Summaries of each manifest

sock-shop-2/manifests/00-sock-shop-ns.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Namespace.
- The Namespace is named 'sock-shop'.
- Namespaces are used to organize and manage resources in a Kubernetes cluster.

sock-shop-2/manifests/01-carts-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'carts' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'carts' application running.
- The Deployment uses the Docker image 'weaveworksdemos/carts:0.4.8'.
- Environment variables are set for Java options to optimize memory usage and disable certain features.
- Resource limits and requests are defined, with a maximum of 300m CPU and 500Mi memory, and a minimum of 100m CPU and 200Mi memory.
- The application listens on port 80 within the container.
- Security settings ensure the container runs as a non-root user with specific capabilities and a read-only root filesystem.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp' using an in-memory empty directory.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/02-carts-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'carts'.
- It is annotated to enable Prometheus scraping with 'prometheus.io/scrape: true'.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: carts'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- It uses a selector to target pods with the label 'name: carts'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/03-carts-db-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'carts-db' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'carts-db' pod running.
- The pods are selected based on the label 'name: carts-db'.
- Each pod runs a single container using the 'mongo' image.

- The container exposes port 27017, which is the default port for MongoDB.
- Security settings are applied to drop all capabilities and only add CHOWN, SETGID, and SETUID.
- The root filesystem of the container is set to read-only for security purposes.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp' using an in-memory emptyDir volume.
- The pods are scheduled to run on nodes with the operating system labeled as 'linux'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/04-carts-db-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'carts-db'.
- It is labeled with 'name: carts-db'.
- The Service is created in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It exposes port 27017 and directs traffic to the same port on the target pods.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'name: carts-db' to route traffic to them.

sock-shop-2/manifests/05-catalogue-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'catalogue' and is part of the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'catalogue' application running.
- The Deployment uses the Docker image 'weaveworksdemos/catalogue:0.3.5'.
- The application runs with the command '/app' and listens on port 80.
- Resource limits are set to 200m CPU and 200Mi memory, with requests for 100m CPU and 100Mi memory.
- The container is configured to run as a non-root user with user ID 10001.
- Security settings include dropping all capabilities except 'NET\_BIND\_SERVICE' and using a read-only root filesystem.
- Liveness and readiness probes are configured to check the '/health' endpoint on port 80, with initial delays of 300 and 180 seconds respectively.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/06-catalogue-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'catalogue'.
- It is annotated to enable Prometheus scraping for monitoring purposes.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: catalogue'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- It uses a selector to target pods with the label 'name: catalogue'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'catalogue-db'.
- It is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Deployment will create 2 replicas of the pod.
- Each pod will run a container from the image 'weaveworksdemos/catalogue-db:0.3.0'.
- The container is configured with environment variables for MySQL, including a root password and database name.
- The container exposes port 3306, which is commonly used for MySQL.
- The pods are scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/08-catalogue-db-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'catalogue-db'.
- It is associated with the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service listens on port 3306 and forwards traffic to the same port on the target pods.
- It uses a selector to target pods with the label 'name: catalogue-db'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/09-front-end-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'front-end' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 1 replica of the front-end application running.
- The Deployment uses a selector to match pods with the label 'name: front-end'.
- The pod template includes a single container named 'front-end'.
- The container uses the image 'weaveworksdemos/front-end:0.3.12'.
- Resource limits are set for the container: 300m CPU and 1000Mi memory.
- Resource requests are set for the container: 100m CPU and 300Mi memory.
- The container exposes port 8079.
- An environment variable 'SESSION\_REDIS' is set to 'true'.
- Security context is configured to run the container as a non-root user with user ID 10001.
- All Linux capabilities are dropped, and the root filesystem is set to read-only.
- A liveness probe is configured to check the '/' path on port 8079, with an initial delay of 300 seconds and a period of 3 seconds.
- A readiness probe is also configured to check the '/' path on port 8079, with an initial delay of 30 seconds and a period of 3 seconds.
- The node selector ensures that the pod runs on nodes with the operating system

labeled as Linux.

sock-shop-2/manifests/10-front-end-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'front-end'.
- It is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service type is 'NodePort', which exposes the service on each Node's IP at a static port.
- It listens on port 80 and forwards traffic to target port 8079 on the pods.
- The nodePort is set to 30001, allowing external access to the service.
- The Service is configured to be scraped by Prometheus for monitoring, as indicated by the annotation 'prometheus.io/scrape: true'.
- It selects pods with the label 'name: front-end' to route traffic to.

sock-shop-2/manifests/11-orders-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'orders' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'orders' application running.
- The Deployment uses the 'weaveworksdemos/orders:0.4.7' Docker image for the container.
- Environment variables are set for Java options to optimize memory usage and disable certain features.
- Resource limits and requests are defined, with a maximum of 500m CPU and 500Mi memory, and a minimum of 100m CPU and 300Mi memory.
- The container listens on port 80.
- Security context is configured to run the container as a non-root user with specific capabilities and a read-only root filesystem.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp' using an in-memory empty directory.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/12-orders-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'orders'.
- It is annotated to enable Prometheus scraping with 'prometheus.io/scrape: true'.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: orders'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the target pods.
- It uses a selector to match pods with the label 'name: orders'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/13-orders-db-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'orders-db' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies 2 replicas of the 'orders-db' pod to be created.
- The pods are labeled with 'name: orders-db' for identification and selection.
- Each pod runs a single container using the 'mongo' image.
- The container exposes port 27017, which is the default port for MongoDB.
- Security settings are applied to drop all capabilities and add only CHOWN, SETGID, and SETUID.
- The root filesystem of the container is set to read-only for security purposes.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp' using an in-memory emptyDir volume.
- The pods are scheduled to run on nodes with the operating system labeled as 'linux'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/14-orders-db-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'orders-db'.
- It is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service is configured to expose port 27017.
- It targets the same port (27017) on the pods it selects.
- The Service uses a selector to match pods with the label 'name: orders-db'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/15-payment-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'payment' and is part of the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'payment' application running.
- The Deployment uses the Docker image 'weaveworksdemos/payment:0.4.3'.
- Resource limits are set for the container, with a maximum of 200m CPU and 200Mi memory, and requests for 99m CPU and 100Mi memory.
- The container listens on port 80.
- Security settings ensure the container runs as a non-root user with user ID 10001, drops all capabilities except 'NET\_BIND\_SERVICE', and uses a read-only root filesystem.
- Liveness and readiness probes are configured to check the '/health' endpoint on port 80, with initial delays of 300 and 180 seconds respectively, and a period of 3 seconds.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/16-payment-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.



- The Service is named 'payment'.
- It is annotated for Prometheus scraping, which means it is set up for monitoring.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: payment'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'name: payment'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/17-queue-master-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'queue-master' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas (instances) of the 'queue-master' application running.
- The Deployment uses a container image 'weaveworksdemos/queue-master:0.3.1'.
- Environment variables are set for the container, including Java options for memory management and garbage collection.
- Resource limits and requests are defined, with a CPU limit of 300m and memory limit of 500Mi, and requests for 100m CPU and 300Mi memory.
- The container exposes port 80 for network traffic.
- The Deployment is configured to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.

sock-shop-2/manifests/18-queue-master-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'queue-master'.
- It is annotated for Prometheus scraping with 'prometheus.io/scrape: true'.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: queue-master'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- It selects pods with the label 'name: queue-master' to route traffic to.

sock-shop-2/manifests/19-rabbitmq-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment for RabbitMQ in Kubernetes.
- It is set to run in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Deployment is named 'rabbitmq' and is labeled accordingly.
- It specifies 2 replicas, meaning there will be 2 instances of RabbitMQ running.
- The Deployment uses a selector to match pods with the label 'name: rabbitmq'.
- The pod template includes two containers: one for RabbitMQ and another for a RabbitMQ exporter.
- The RabbitMQ container uses the image 'rabbitmq:3.6.8-management'.
- It exposes two ports: 15672 for management and 5672 for RabbitMQ operations.
- Security context is set to drop all capabilities and add specific ones like CHOWN, SETGID, SETUID, and DAC\_OVERRIDE.
- The root filesystem is set to read-only for security purposes.
- The RabbitMQ exporter container uses the image 'kbudde/rabbitmq-exporter' and exposes port 9090.
- The Deployment is configured to run on nodes with the label 'beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux'.
- Annotations are set to prevent Prometheus from scraping metrics from this deployment.

sock-shop-2/manifests/20-rabbitmq-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'rabbitmq'.
- It is annotated for Prometheus scraping on port 9090.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: rabbitmq'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service exposes two ports: 5672 for RabbitMQ and 9090 for an exporter.
- The protocol used for the ports is TCP.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'name: rabbitmq'.

sock-shop-2/manifests/21-session-db-dep.yaml

- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'session-db' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'session-db' pod running.
- The pods are selected based on the label 'name: session-db'.
- Each pod runs a single container using the 'redis' image.
- The container exposes port 6379, which is commonly used by Redis.
- Security settings are applied to drop all capabilities and only add CHOWN, SETGID, and SETUID, with a read-only root filesystem for enhanced security.
- The pods are scheduled to run on nodes with the operating system labeled as Linux.

sock-shop-2/manifests/22-session-db-svc.yaml

- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'session-db'.
- It is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service is configured to expose port 6379.
- It targets the same port (6379) on the selected pods.
- The Service uses a selector to match pods with the label 'name: session-db'.

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/23-shipping-dep.yaml
- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'shipping' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'shipping' application running.
- The Deployment uses the Docker image 'weaveworksdemos/shipping:0.4.8'.
- Environment variables are set for the application, including 'ZIPKIN' and 'JAVA_OPTS'.
- Resource limits and requests are defined, with limits set to 300m CPU and 500Mi memory, and requests set to 100m CPU and 300Mi memory.
- The application listens on port 80.
- Security context is configured to run the container as a non-root user with user ID 10001, and it drops all capabilities except 'NET_BIND_SERVICE'.
- The root filesystem is set to be read-only.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp', using an in-memory emptyDir volume.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the operating system labeled as 'linux'.
```

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/24-shipping-svc.yaml
- This is a Kubernetes Service manifest.
- The service is named 'shipping'.
- It is annotated for Prometheus scraping with 'prometheus.io/scrape: true'.
- The service is labeled with 'name: shipping'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The service exposes port 80 and directs traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- It selects pods with the label 'name: shipping' to route traffic to.
```

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/25-user-dep.yaml
- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'user' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'user' application running.
- The Deployment uses the Docker image 'weaveworksdemos/user:0.4.7'.
- Resource limits are set for the container: 300m CPU and 200Mi memory, with requests for 100m CPU and 100Mi memory.
- The container listens on port 80.
- An environment variable 'mongo' is set with the value 'user-db:27017'.
- Security context is configured to run the container as a non-root user with user ID 10001.
- The container has a read-only root filesystem and drops all capabilities except 'NET_BIND_SERVICE'.
- Liveness and readiness probes are configured to check the '/health' endpoint on port 80.
- The liveness probe starts after 300 seconds and checks every 3 seconds.
- The readiness probe starts after 180 seconds and checks every 3 seconds.
- The Deployment is scheduled to run on nodes with the Linux operating system.
```

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/26-user-svc.yaml
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'user'.
- It is annotated for Prometheus scraping, which means it is set up for monitoring.
- The Service is labeled with 'name: user'.
- It is deployed in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- The Service listens on port 80 and forwards traffic to the same port on the selected pods.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'name: user'.
```

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/27-user-db-dep.yaml
- This manifest defines a Deployment in Kubernetes.
- The Deployment is named 'user-db' and is located in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It specifies that there should be 2 replicas of the 'user-db' pod running.
- The pods are selected based on the label 'name: user-db'.
- Each pod runs a single container using the image 'weaveworksdemos/user-db:0.3.0'.
- The container exposes port 27017, labeled as 'mongo', which is typically used for MongoDB.
- Security settings are applied to drop all capabilities and only add CHOWN, SETGID, and SETUID, with a read-only root filesystem.
- A temporary volume is mounted at '/tmp' using an in-memory emptyDir volume.
- The pods are scheduled to run on nodes with the operating system labeled as 'linux'.
```

```
sock-shop-2/manifests/28-user-db-svc.yaml
- This manifest defines a Kubernetes Service.
- The Service is named 'user-db'.
- It is labeled with 'name: user-db'.
- The Service is created in the 'sock-shop' namespace.
- It exposes port 27017 and directs traffic to the same port on the target pods.
- The Service selects pods with the label 'name: user-db' to route traffic to them.
```

**Resiliency issues/weaknesses in the manifests**

Issue #0: Missing Resource Requests

- details: Pods may not get scheduled if the cluster is under resource pressure, leading to potential downtime.
- manifests having the issues: [
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/03-carts-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/13-orders-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/19-rabbitmq-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/21-session-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/27-user-db-dep.yaml'
- problematic config: The deployments for carts-db, catalogue-db, orders-db, rabbitmq, session-db, and user-db do not specify resource requests.

Issue #1: Single Replica Deployment

- details: The front-end deployment has only one replica, which can lead to downtime if the pod fails.
- manifests having the issues: ['sock-shop-2/manifests/09-front-end-dep.yaml']
- problematic config: spec.replicas: 1

Issue #2: Missing Liveness and Readiness Probes

- details: Without liveness and readiness probes, Kubernetes cannot determine the health of the containers, which may lead to serving traffic to unhealthy pods.
- manifests having the issues: [
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/01-carts-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/03-carts-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/05-catalogue-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/11-orders-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/13-orders-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/15-payment-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/17-queue-master-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/19-rabbitmq-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/21-session-db-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/23-shipping-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/25-user-dep.yaml',
  - 'sock-shop-2/manifests/27-user-db-dep.yaml'
- problematic config: The deployments for carts, carts-db, catalogue, catalogue-db, orders, orders-db, payment, queue-master, rabbitmq, session-db, shipping, user, and user-db do not have liveness or readiness probes configured.

Issue #3: Hardcoded Environment Variables

- details: Hardcoded environment variables, such as passwords, can lead to security vulnerabilities.
- manifests having the issues: ['sock-shop-2/manifests/07-catalogue-db-dep.yaml']
- problematic config: env: MYSQL\_ROOT\_PASSWORD is hardcoded with value: fake\_password.

**Application of the manifests**

Thoughts:

The manifests provided are part of a well-known microservices demo application called 'Sock Shop'. This application is designed to demonstrate the use of microservices architecture and Kubernetes orchestration. The application simulates an e-commerce website for selling socks, with various services such as carts, catalogue, orders, payment, and user management. The file names, labels, and Docker images used in the manifests (e.g., 'weaveworksdemos') are indicative of the Sock Shop application, which is a common reference application in the Kubernetes community.

Assumed application:

Sock Shop is an e-commerce application that simulates an online sock store. It offers users the ability to browse a catalogue of socks, add items to a cart, place orders, and manage user accounts. The application is composed of multiple microservices, each responsible for a specific function, such as managing the product catalogue, handling user sessions, processing payments, and managing orders.

**Summary of user instructions**

- The Chaos-Engineering experiment must be completed within 1 minute.
- When using k6 in steady-state definition, always select a request URL from the following options (other requests are invalid):
  1. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/
  2. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/catalogue?size=10
  3. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/detail.html?id=<ID>
 Replace <ID> with an available ID: [03fef6ac-1896-4ce8-bd69-b798f85c6e0b , 3395a43e-2d88-40de-b95f^Be00e1502085b , 510a0d7e-8e83-4193-b483-e27e09ddc34d , 808a2de1-1aaa-4c25-a9b9-6612e8f29a38 , 819e1fbf-8b7e-4f6d-811f-693534916a8b , 837ab141-399e-4c1f-9abc-bace40296bac , a0a4f044-b040-410d-8ead-4de0446aec7e , d3588630-ad8e-49df-bbd7-31677efb246 , zzz4f044-b040-410d-8ead-4de0446aec7e ]

```

4. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/category/
5. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/category?tags=<TAG>
Replace <TAG> with an available tag: [ magic , action , blue , brown , black ,
sport , formal , red , green , skin , geek]
6. http://front-end.sock-shop.svc.cluster.local/basket.html

```

## Steady state #1: carts-db-replicas

### Description

The first issue to address is the 'Missing Resource Requests' for the 'carts-db' deployment. This is a critical issue because without resource requests, the pods may not get scheduled if the cluster is under resource pressure, leading to potential downtime. To ensure the system's steady state, we need to verify that the 'carts-db' deployment maintains the expected number of replicas, which is 2, even under resource constraints. This can be measured by checking the number of running pods for the 'carts-db' deployment.

### Current state inspection

To inspect the 'front-end-replica' state, I will use the K8s API to check the number of ready replicas for the 'front-end' deployment in the 'sock-shop' namespace. This is because the task involves verifying the number of running pods, which is a Kubernetes resource state check. The K8s API is suitable for this purpose as it allows us to directly query the deployment status and ensure that the single replica is always ready. The script will run for a duration of 5 seconds, checking the status every second, to ensure the deployment maintains at least one ready replica 100% of the time.

```

tool: k8s duration: 5s
Inspection script (Python) k8s_front-end-replica.py :
'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config

def check_carts_db_replicas(namespace='sock-shop', deployment_name='carts-db',
duration=5):
    # Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment
    if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):
        config.load_incluster_config()
    else:
        config.load_kube_config()

    v1 = client.AppsV1Api()

    for _ in range(duration):
        try:
            deployment = v1.read_namespaced_deployment(deployment_name, namespace)
            replicas = deployment.status.replicas
            ready_replicas = deployment.status.ready_replicas
            print(f"Total replicas: {replicas}, Ready replicas: {ready_replicas}")
        except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
            print(f"Exception when calling AppsV1Api->read_namespaced_deployment: {e}")
            time.sleep(1)

if __name__ == '__main__':
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Check carts-db replicas')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()
    check_carts_db_replicas(duration=args.duration)
'''

```

The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:

```

'''
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
'''

```

### Threshold

The steady state we are considering is the number of replicas for the 'carts-db' deployment. The current state shows that there are 2 total replicas and 2 ready replicas consistently over a period of 5 seconds. This indicates that the system is currently stable with all replicas being ready. Given that the deployment is

configured to have 2 replicas, the threshold should ensure that both replicas are ready to maintain the steady state. To account for some fluctuations, we can set a tolerance that allows for a brief period where not all replicas are ready, but the system should recover quickly. A reasonable threshold would be to have at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and both replicas ready at least 80% of the time during the monitoring period. This ensures that the system remains operational even if one replica temporarily becomes unavailable.

At least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas at least 80% of the time during the monitoring period.

#### Unit test to validate the steady state

To verify the steady state of the 'carts-db' deployment, I will write a unit test that checks the number of ready replicas over a specified duration. The test will ensure that there is at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas at least 80% of the time. I will implement a loop that checks the status every second for the specified duration and use assertions to validate the threshold conditions. The test will be run from the command line with a '--duration' argument to specify the monitoring period.

```

'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config
from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestCartsDBReplicas(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self, namespace='sock-shop', deployment_name='carts-db', duration=5):
        super().__init__()
        self.namespace = namespace
        self.deployment_name = deployment_name
        self.duration = duration

    def test_replicas_threshold(self):
        # Initialize counters for ready replicas
        total_checks = 0
        ready_replicas_count = 0
        fully_ready_replicas_count = 0

        for _ in range(self.duration):
            try:
                # Read the deployment status
                deployment = self.v1.read_namespaced_deployment(self.deployment_name,
  self.namespace)
                replicas = deployment.status.replicas
                ready_replicas = deployment.status.ready_replicas
                print(f"Total replicas: {replicas}, Ready replicas: {ready_replicas}")

                # Increment the total checks
                total_checks += 1

                # Check if at least 1 replica is ready
                if ready_replicas >= 1:
                    ready_replicas_count += 1

                # Check if both replicas are ready
                if ready_replicas == 2:
                    fully_ready_replicas_count += 1

            except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
                print(f"Exception when calling AppsV1Api->read_namespaced_deployment:
                    {e}")

            # Wait for 1 second before the next check
            time.sleep(1)

        # Calculate the percentage of time conditions are met
        one_ready_percentage = (ready_replicas_count / total_checks) * 100
        two_ready_percentage = (fully_ready_replicas_count / total_checks) * 100

        # Assert the threshold conditions
        assert one_ready_percentage == 100, "At least 1 ready replica was not
            available 100% of the time."
        assert two_ready_percentage >= 80, "2 ready replicas were not available at
            least 80% of the time."

        print("Test passed: Steady state conditions are satisfied.")

```

```

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test carts-db replicas threshold')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
    replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    # Create an instance of the test class with the specified duration
    test = TestCartsDBReplicas(duration=args.duration)
    # Run the test
    test.test_replicas_threshold()

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()
'''

Pod unittestcarts-db-replicasmod0-pod has failed.
'''
Traceback (most recent call last):
  File
    "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py",
    line 68, in <module>
      main()
  File
    "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py",
    line 64, in main
      test.test_replicas_threshold()
  File
    "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py",
    line 23, in test_replicas_threshold
      deployment = self.v1.read_namespaced_deployment(self.deployment_name,
      self.namespace)
AttributeError: 'CoreV1Api' object has no attribute 'read_namespaced_deployment'. Did
you mean: 'read_namespaced_event'?
'''

The error occurs because the 'CoreV1Api' object does not have a method called
'read_namespaced_deployment'. The correct API to use for reading deployments is
'AppsV1Api'. I will fix the error by changing the API client from 'CoreV1Api' to
'AppsV1Api' in the 'K8sAPIBase' class initialization. This will allow the test to
correctly access the deployment information.
'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config
from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestCartsDBReplicas(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self, namespace='sock-shop', deployment_name='carts-db', duration=5):
        super().__init__()
        self.namespace = namespace
        self.deployment_name = deployment_name
        self.duration = duration
        # Use the correct API client for deployments
        self.apps_v1 = client.AppsV1Api()

    def test_replicas_threshold(self):
        # Initialize counters for ready replicas
        total_checks = 0
        ready_replicas_count = 0
        fully_ready_replicas_count = 0

        for _ in range(self.duration):
            try:
                # Read the deployment status using the correct API client
                deployment =
                self.apps_v1.read_namespaced_deployment(self.deployment_name,
                self.namespace)
                replicas = deployment.status.replicas
                ready_replicas = deployment.status.ready_replicas
                print(f"Total replicas: {replicas}, Ready replicas: {ready_replicas}")

                # Increment the total checks
                total_checks += 1

```

```

        # Check if at least 1 replica is ready
        if ready_replicas >= 1:
            ready_replicas_count += 1

        # Check if both replicas are ready
        if ready_replicas == 2:
            fully_ready_replicas_count += 1

    except client.exceptions.ApiException as e:
        print(f"Exception when calling AppsV1Api->read_namespaced_deployment:
        {e}")

    # Wait for 1 second before the next check
    time.sleep(1)

    # Calculate the percentage of time conditions are met
    one_ready_percentage = (ready_replicas_count / total_checks) * 100
    two_ready_percentage = (fully_ready_replicas_count / total_checks) * 100

    # Assert the threshold conditions
    assert one_ready_percentage == 100, "At least 1 ready replica was not
    available 100% of the time."
    assert two_ready_percentage >= 80, "2 ready replicas were not available at
    least 80% of the time."

    print("Test passed: Steady state conditions are satisfied.")

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test carts-db replicas threshold')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
    replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    # Create an instance of the test class with the specified duration
    test = TestCartsDBReplicas(duration=args.duration)
    # Run the test
    test.test_replicas_threshold()

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()
'''

Pod unittestcarts-db-replicasmod1-pod has completed successfully.
The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:
'''
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Total replicas: 2, Ready replicas: 2
Test passed: Steady state conditions are satisfied.
'''

```

## Steady state #2: front-end-replica

### Description

The next issue to address is the 'Single Replica Deployment' for the 'front-end' deployment. This is a critical issue because having only one replica can lead to downtime if the pod fails. To ensure the system's steady state, we need to verify that the 'front-end' deployment maintains at least one running pod at all times. This can be measured by checking the number of running pods for the 'front-end' deployment. Given that the deployment is configured to have only 1 replica, the threshold should ensure that this single replica is always ready to maintain the steady state. A reasonable threshold would be to have at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time during the monitoring period. This ensures that the system remains operational even if there are temporary issues with the pod.

### Current state inspection

To inspect the 'front-end-replica' state, I will use the K8s API to check the number of ready replicas for the 'front-end' deployment in the 'sock-shop' namespace. This is because the task involves verifying the number of running pods, which is a Kubernetes resource state check. The K8s API is suitable for this purpose as it allows us to

```

directly query the deployment status and ensure that the single replica is always
ready. The script will run for a duration of 5 seconds, checking the status every
second, to ensure the deployment maintains at least one ready replica 100% of the time.
tool: k8s duration: 5s
Inspection script (Python) k8s_front-end-replica.py :
'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config

def check_front_end_replicas(namespace, deployment_name, duration):
    # Load Kubernetes configuration based on the environment
    if os.getenv('KUBERNETES_SERVICE_HOST'):
        config.load_incluster_config()
    else:
        config.load_kube_config()

    v1 = client.AppsV1Api()
    ready_replicas_count = 0

    for _ in range(duration):
        resp = v1.read_namespaced_deployment_status(deployment_name, namespace)
        ready_replicas = resp.status.ready_replicas or 0
        print(f"Ready replicas for {deployment_name}: {ready_replicas}")
        if ready_replicas >= 1:
            ready_replicas_count += 1
            time.sleep(1)

    print(f"{deployment_name} was ready {ready_replicas_count}/{duration} times.")

if __name__ == '__main__':
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Check front-end replicas')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()
    check_front_end_replicas('sock-shop', 'front-end', args.duration)
'''

```

```

Pod k8sfront-end-replica-pod has been completed successfully.
The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:
'''

```

```

Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
front-end was ready 5/5 times.
'''

```

#### Threshold

The steady state we are considering is the availability of the 'front-end' deployment, which currently has only one replica. The current state shows that the 'front-end' deployment has 1 ready replica consistently over a monitoring period of 5 seconds. To ensure the system remains operational, the threshold should be set such that the 'front-end' deployment maintains at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time during the monitoring period. This accounts for the fact that there is only one replica, and any downtime would mean the service is unavailable. Given the current state satisfies this condition, the threshold should be set to ensure that at least 1 ready replica is present 100% of the time during the monitoring period.

At least 1 ready replica must be present 100% of the time during the monitoring period.

#### Unit test to validate the steady state

To verify the steady state of the 'front-end' deployment, I will write a unit test that checks if there is at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time during the specified monitoring period. The test will use a for-loop to check the status every second for the given duration. The threshold is set to ensure that the 'front-end' deployment maintains at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time, which means the number of times the ready replicas are 1 or more should equal the duration. I will use the Kubernetes Python API to interact with the cluster and check the deployment status. The test will include an assertion to verify that the steady state satisfies the threshold, and it will print a summary of the results at the end.

```

'''
import os
import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config

```



```

from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestFrontEndReplica(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self, namespace, deployment_name, duration):
        super().__init__()
        self.namespace = namespace
        self.deployment_name = deployment_name
        self.duration = duration

    def test_steady_state(self):
        ready_replicas_count = 0

        # Loop for the specified duration
        for _ in range(self.duration):
            # Get the deployment status
            resp = self.v1.read_namespaced_deployment_status(self.deployment_name,
                self.namespace)
            ready_replicas = resp.status.ready_replicas or 0
            print(f"Ready replicas for {self.deployment_name}: {ready_replicas}")

            # Check if the number of ready replicas is at least 1
            if ready_replicas >= 1:
                ready_replicas_count += 1

            # Wait for 1 second before the next check
            time.sleep(1)

        # Calculate the percentage of time the deployment was ready
        readiness_percentage = (ready_replicas_count / self.duration) * 100
        print(f"{self.deployment_name} was ready
        {ready_replicas_count}/{self.duration} times.")

        # Assert that the deployment was ready 100% of the time
        assert readiness_percentage == 100, f"{self.deployment_name} readiness was
        {readiness_percentage}%, expected 100%."

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test front-end replica readiness')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
    replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    # Create a test instance and run the test
    test = TestFrontEndReplica('sock-shop', 'front-end', args.duration)
    test.test_steady_state()

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()
'''

Pod unittestfront-end-replicamod0-pod has failed.
'''
Traceback (most recent call last):
  File "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_front-end-
  replica_mod0.py", line 50, in <module>
    main()
  File "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_front-end-
  replica_mod0.py", line 46, in main
    test.test_steady_state()
  File "/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/hypothesis/unittest_front-end-
  replica_mod0.py", line 20, in test_steady_state
    resp = self.v1.read_namespaced_deployment_status(self.deployment_name,
    self.namespace)
AttributeError: 'CoreV1Api' object has no attribute
'read_namespaced_deployment_status'. Did you mean: 'read_namespaced_pod_status'?
'''

The error occurs because the CoreV1Api class does not have a method called
read_namespaced_deployment_status . Instead, the correct class to use for reading
deployment status is AppsV1Api . I will fix the error by changing the API client from
CoreV1Api to AppsV1Api in the K8sAPIBase class. This will allow the test to correctly
call the read_namespaced_deployment_status method and check the deployment status. The
rest of the test logic remains the same, ensuring that the deployment maintains at
least 1 ready replica 100% of the time during the specified duration.
'''
import os

```

```

import time
import argparse
from kubernetes import client, config
from unittest_base import K8sAPIBase

class TestFrontEndReplica(K8sAPIBase):
    def __init__(self, namespace, deployment_name, duration):
        super().__init__()
        self.namespace = namespace
        self.deployment_name = deployment_name
        self.duration = duration
        # Use AppsV1Api to interact with deployments
        self.apps_v1 = client.AppsV1Api()

    def test_steady_state(self):
        ready_replicas_count = 0

        # Loop for the specified duration
        for _ in range(self.duration):
            # Get the deployment status
            resp =
            self.apps_v1.read_namespaced_deployment_status(self.deployment_name,
            self.namespace)
            ready_replicas = resp.status.ready_replicas or 0
            print(f"Ready replicas for {self.deployment_name}: {ready_replicas}")

            # Check if the number of ready replicas is at least 1
            if ready_replicas >= 1:
                ready_replicas_count += 1

            # Wait for 1 second before the next check
            time.sleep(1)

        # Calculate the percentage of time the deployment was ready
        readiness_percentage = (ready_replicas_count / self.duration) * 100
        print(f"{self.deployment_name} was ready
        {ready_replicas_count}/{self.duration} times.")

        # Assert that the deployment was ready 100% of the time
        assert readiness_percentage == 100, f"{self.deployment_name} readiness was
        {readiness_percentage}%, expected 100%."

def main():
    parser = argparse.ArgumentParser(description='Test front-end replica readiness')
    parser.add_argument('--duration', type=int, default=5, help='Duration to check the
    replicas')
    args = parser.parse_args()

    # Create a test instance and run the test
    test = TestFrontEndReplica('sock-shop', 'front-end', args.duration)
    test.test_steady_state()

if __name__ == '__main__':
    main()
'''

Pod unittestfront-end-replicamod1-pod has completed sucessfully.
The inspection script's results (current states) are as follows:
'''
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
Ready replicas for front-end: 1
front-end was ready 5/5 times.
'''

```

### Failure scenario: Black Friday Sale

#### Description

During a Black Friday sale, the system is expected to handle a significant increase in traffic, which can stress the system's resources and reveal weaknesses. The 'carts-db' deployment lacks resource requests, which can lead to scheduling issues under resource

pressure. The 'front-end' deployment has only one replica, making it a single point of failure. To simulate the Black Friday event, we will first inject a 'StressChaos' fault to simulate high CPU usage on the 'carts-db' pods, testing if the system can maintain the steady state of having at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas 80% of the time. Next, we will inject a 'PodChaos' fault to kill the 'front-end' pod, testing if the system can maintain the steady state of having at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time. This sequence simulates the increased load and potential failures during a high-traffic event like Black Friday.

#### Failure-injection sequence

```
StressChaos ({{'namespace': 'sock-shop', 'label': 'name=carts-db'}}) -> PodChaos
({'namespace': 'sock-shop', 'label': 'name=front-end'})
```

#### Detailed failure parameters

```
Detailed parameters of StressChaos ({{'namespace': 'sock-shop', 'label':
'name=carts-db'}})
'''
```

```
{
  "mode": "all",
  "selector": {
    "namespaces": [
      "sock-shop"
    ],
    "labelSelectors": {
      "name": "carts-db"
    },
    "stressors": {
      "cpu": {
        "workers": 2,
        "load": 80
      }
    },
    "containerNames": [
      "carts-db"
    ]
  }
}
'''
```

```
Detailed parameters of PodChaos ({{'namespace': 'sock-shop', 'label': 'name=front-end'}})
'''
```

```
{
  "action": "pod-kill",
  "mode": "one",
  "selector": {
    "namespaces": ["sock-shop"],
    "labelSelectors": {
      "name": "front-end"
    }
  },
  "value": "1"
}
'''
```

## Chaos experiment (Planning)

### Time Schedule

The chaos engineering experiment is designed to test the system's resilience under stress conditions and potential failures. Given the constraints, the experiment must be completed within 1 minute. The experiment is divided into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation.

1. Pre-validation Phase: This phase ensures that the system is in a steady state before any faults are injected. We will allocate 20 seconds for this phase. During this time, we will verify that the 'carts-db' deployment maintains at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas 80% of the time, and that the 'front-end' deployment maintains at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time.

2. Fault-injection Phase: This phase involves injecting faults to simulate the Black Friday event. We will allocate 20 seconds for this phase. The faults include a 'StressChaos' fault to simulate high CPU usage on the 'carts-db' pods and a 'PodChaos' fault to kill the 'front-end' pod. These faults will test the system's ability to maintain the defined steady states under stress and failure conditions.

3. Post-validation Phase: This phase ensures that the system returns to its steady state after the faults are removed. We will allocate 20 seconds for this phase. During this time, we will again verify the steady states for the 'carts-db' and 'front-end' deployments to ensure they meet the defined thresholds.

The total time for the experiment is 60 seconds, with each phase receiving an equal allocation of 20 seconds. This allocation allows for a balanced approach to validating the system's steady state, injecting faults, and confirming recovery.

Total experiment time: 60s

Pre-validation Phase: 20s

Fault-injection Phase: 20s

Post-validation Phase: 20s

### Pre-validation Phase

In the pre-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system is in a steady state before we introduce any faults. This involves verifying that the current state of the system meets the defined steady state thresholds. Given the constraints of a 20-second total time for this phase, we will execute the unit tests for both steady states simultaneously to maximize efficiency. The first steady state, 'carts-db-replicas' requires checking that at least 1 replica is ready 100% of the time and 2 replicas are ready at least 80% of the time. The second steady state, 'front-end-replica', requires ensuring that the single replica is ready 100% of the time. Both tests will run for the full 20 seconds, with checks occurring every second. This approach ensures that we have sufficient data to confirm the system's readiness before proceeding to the fault injection phase.

- Verified Steady State #0: carts-db-replicas
  - Workflow Name: pre-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 20s
- Verified Steady State #1: front-end-replica
  - Workflow Name: pre-unittest-front-end-replica
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 20s

### Failure-injection Phase

In this fault-injection phase, we aim to simulate a Black Friday sale scenario by introducing two types of faults: 'StressChaos' and 'PodChaos'. The goal is to observe how the system behaves under stress and potential failure conditions. The phase is limited to 20 seconds, so we need to carefully time the injections and tests to fit within this window.

First, we will inject a 'StressChaos' fault on the 'carts-db' deployment to simulate high CPU usage. This will help us test the system's ability to maintain the steady state of having at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas 80% of the time. We will start this fault injection immediately at the beginning of the phase and let it run for 10 seconds.

Simultaneously, we will run the unit test for the 'carts-db-replicas' steady state to verify if the system can maintain the required number of ready replicas during the stress period. This test will also start at the beginning of the phase and run for 10 seconds.

Next, we will inject a 'PodChaos' fault to kill the 'front-end' pod. This will test the system's ability to maintain the steady state of having at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time for the 'front-end' deployment. We will start this fault injection at the 10-second mark and let it run for 5 seconds.

Finally, we will run the unit test for the 'front-end-replica' steady state to verify if the system can maintain the required readiness during the pod failure. This test will start at the 10-second mark and run for 5 seconds.

By staggering the fault injections and unit tests in this manner, we can effectively simulate the Black Friday scenario and assess the system's resilience under stress and failure conditions.

- Verified Steady State #0: carts-db-replicas
  - Workflow Name: fault-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s
- Verified Steady State #1: front-end-replica
  - Workflow Name: fault-unittest-front-end-replica
  - Grace Period: 10s
  - Duration: 5s

- Injected Faults #0: StressChaos
  - Workflow Name: fault-stresschaos
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s
- Injected Faults #1: PodChaos
  - Workflow Name: fault-podchaos
  - Grace Period: 10s
  - Duration: 5s

## Post-validation Phase

In the post-validation phase, we need to ensure that the system has returned to its steady states after the fault injection. The steady states we are concerned with are the 'carts-db-replicas' and 'front-end-replica'. The post-validation phase will involve running unit tests to verify these steady states. Given the total time of 20 seconds for this phase, we will stagger the unit tests to ensure both steady states are verified within this timeframe.

The 'carts-db-replicas' steady state requires that at least 1 ready replica is available 100% of the time and 2 ready replicas are available at least 80% of the time. We will allocate 10 seconds for this test, with a grace period of 0 seconds, as we want to immediately verify the recovery of the 'carts-db' deployment after the stress test.

The 'front-end-replica' steady state requires that at least 1 ready replica is available 100% of the time. We will allocate the remaining 10 seconds for this test, also with a grace period of 0 seconds, to ensure the 'front-end' deployment has recovered from the pod kill fault.

By staggering the tests in this manner, we ensure that both steady states are verified within the 20-second post-validation phase, allowing us to confirm that the system has returned to its expected operational state.

- Verified Steady State #0: carts-db-replica
  - Workflow Name: post-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s
- Verified Steady State #1: front-end-replica
  - Workflow Name: post-unittest-front-end-replica
  - Grace Period: 0s
  - Duration: 10s

## Summary

The chaos engineering experiment is structured into three phases, each lasting 20 seconds, to test the system's resilience. In the pre-validation phase, both unit tests for verifying steady states are executed simultaneously for the entire 20 seconds. The 'carts-db-replicas' test checks that at least one replica is ready 100% of the time and two replicas are ready 80% of the time, while the 'front-end-replica' test ensures one replica is ready 100% of the time. In the fault-injection phase, the 'StressChaos' fault is injected on the 'carts-db' deployment to simulate high CPU usage, starting immediately and lasting for 10 seconds. Concurrently, the 'carts-db-replicas' unit test runs for 10 seconds to verify readiness under stress. At the 10-second mark, the 'PodChaos' fault is injected to kill the 'front-end' pod, lasting for 5 seconds, while the 'front-end-replica' unit test runs for 5 seconds to check readiness during the fault. In the post-validation phase, the 'carts-db-replicas' unit test runs for the first 10 seconds to verify recovery, followed by the 'front-end-replica' unit test for the next 10 seconds, ensuring both deployments return to their steady states.

The generated Chaos Mesh workflow manifest:

```
apiVersion: chaos-mesh.org/v1alpha1
kind: Workflow
metadata:
  name: chaos-experiment-20241127-045539
spec:
  entry: the-entry
  templates:
    #-----
    # entry point of whole workflow
    #-----
    - name: the-entry
      templateType: Serial
      deadline: 30m45s
      children:
        - pre-validation-phase
```

```

    - fault-injection-phase
    - post-validation-phase

#-----
# Entry point of pre-validation-phase
#-----
- name: pre-validation-phase
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 10m20s
  children:
    - pre-validation-parallel-workflows

- name: pre-validation-parallel-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m20s
  children:
    - pre-unittest-carts-db-replicas
    - pre-unittest-front-end-replica

# Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
- name: pre-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m20s
  task:
    container:
      name: pre-unittest-carts-db-replicas-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py
--duration 20"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
      volumes:
        - name: pvc-volume
          persistentVolumeClaim:
            claimName: pvc

- name: pre-unittest-front-end-replica
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m20s
  task:
    container:
      name: pre-unittest-front-end-replica-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_front-end-replica_mod0.py
--duration 20"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
      volumes:
        - name: pvc-volume
          persistentVolumeClaim:
            claimName: pvc

#-----
# Entry point of fault-injection-phase
#-----
- name: fault-injection-phase
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 10m15s
  children:
    - fault-injection-overlapped-workflows

- name: fault-injection-parallel-workflow
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m10s
  children:
    - fault-unittest-carts-db-replicas
    - fault-stresschaos

- name: fault-injection-suspend-workflow
  templateType: Serial

```

```

    deadline: 5m15s
    children:
      - fault-injection-suspend
      - fault-injection-parallel-workflows
- name: fault-injection-suspend
  templateType: Suspend
  deadline: 10s

- name: fault-injection-parallel-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m5s
  children:
    - fault-unittest-front-end-replica
    - fault-podchaos

- name: fault-injection-overlapped-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m15s
  children:
    - fault-injection-parallel-workflow
    - fault-injection-suspend-workflow

# Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
# unit tests
- name: fault-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m10s
  task:
    container:
      name: fault-unittest-carts-db-replicas-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py
--duration 10"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

- name: fault-unittest-front-end-replica
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m5s
  task:
    container:
      name: fault-unittest-front-end-replica-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_front-end-replica_mod0.py
--duration 5"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

# fault_injections
- name: fault-stresschaos
  templateType: StressChaos
  deadline: 10s
  stressChaos:
    containerNames:
      - carts-db
    mode: all
    selector:
      labelSelectors:
        name: carts-db
    namespaces:
      - sock-shop

```

```

    stressors:
      cpu:
        load: 80
        workers: 2

- name: fault-podchaos
  templateType: PodChaos
  deadline: 5s
  podChaos:
    action: pod-kill
    mode: one
    selector:
      labelSelectors:
        name: front-end
      namespaces:
        - sock-shop
    value: '1'

#-----
# Entry point of post-validation phase
#-----
- name: post-validation-phase
  templateType: Serial
  deadline: 10m10s
  children:
    - post-validation-parallel-workflows

- name: post-validation-parallel-workflows
  templateType: Parallel
  deadline: 5m10s
  children:
    - post-unittest-carts-db-replicas
    - post-unittest-front-end-replica

# Definitions of children of pre-validation-phase
- name: post-unittest-carts-db-replicas
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m10s
  task:
    container:
      name: post-unittest-carts-db-replicas-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_carts-db-replicas_mod0.py
--duration 10"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc

- name: post-unittest-front-end-replica
  templateType: Task
  deadline: 5m10s
  task:
    container:
      name: post-unittest-front-end-replica-container
      image: chaos-eater/k8sapi:1.0
      imagePullPolicy: IfNotPresent
      command: ["/bin/bash", "-c"]
      args: ["python
/chaos-eater/sandbox/cycle_20241127_043136/unittest_front-end-replica_mod0.py
--duration 10"]
      volumeMounts:
        - name: pvc-volume
          mountPath: /chaos-eater
    volumes:
      - name: pvc-volume
        persistentVolumeClaim:
          claimName: pvc
...

```



## Analysis

The chaos engineering experiment aimed to test the resilience of the 'sock-shop' system under simulated fault conditions, specifically focusing on the 'carts-db' and 'front-end' deployments. The experiment was structured into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation. The results indicate that while the 'carts-db' deployment maintained its steady state throughout the experiment, the 'front-end' deployment failed to meet the expected steady state during both the fault-injection and post-validation phases.

### 1. Pre-Validation Phase:

- Both the 'carts-db-replicas' and 'front-end-replica' tests passed, indicating that the system was in a stable state before any faults were injected. This confirms that the initial configuration of the system was functioning as expected.

### 2. Fault-Injected Phase:

- The 'carts-db-replicas' test passed during the fault-injection phase, demonstrating that the 'carts-db' deployment was resilient to the 'StressChaos' fault, which simulated high CPU usage. This suggests that despite the lack of resource requests, the 'carts-db' deployment was able to maintain at least one ready replica 100% of the time and two ready replicas 80% of the time.
- The 'front-end-replica' test failed during the fault-injection phase. The 'PodChaos' fault, which involved killing the 'front-end' pod, resulted in 0 ready replicas throughout the test duration. This failure highlights the critical issue of having only a single replica for the 'front-end' deployment, making it a single point of failure. The system was unable to recover or maintain availability when the single pod was terminated.

### 3. Post-Validation Phase:

- The 'carts-db-replicas' test continued to pass in the post-validation phase, indicating that the 'carts-db' deployment returned to its steady state after the fault was removed.
- The 'front-end-replica' test failed again in the post-validation phase, with 0 ready replicas recorded throughout the test. This suggests that the 'front-end' deployment did not recover after the fault was removed, likely due to the absence of additional replicas to take over when the single pod was killed.

### Insights and Recommendations:

- The failure of the 'front-end' deployment to maintain its steady state during and after the fault-injection phase underscores the importance of addressing the 'Single Replica Deployment' issue. To improve resilience, it is recommended to increase the number of replicas for the 'front-end' deployment. This will ensure that the system can maintain availability even if one pod fails.

- Consider implementing horizontal pod autoscaling for the 'front-end' deployment to dynamically adjust the number of replicas based on traffic and resource usage. This can help the system handle sudden spikes in demand, such as those experienced during events like Black Friday.

- Review and potentially adjust the readiness and liveness probes for the 'front-end' deployment to ensure that Kubernetes can accurately determine the health of the pods and take corrective actions if necessary.

By addressing these issues, the system's resilience can be significantly improved, reducing the risk of downtime during high-traffic events and fault scenarios.

## Improvement

To improve the resiliency of the 'front-end' deployment and avoid failures during fault scenarios, we need to address the 'Single Replica Deployment' issue. The simplest reconfiguration is to increase the number of replicas for the 'front-end' deployment from 1 to 2. This change will ensure that there is at least one additional replica available to handle traffic if one pod fails, thus maintaining the steady state of having at least 1 ready replica 100% of the time.

```
Modification_type: replace
File name: sock-shop-2/manifests/09-front-end-dep.yaml
```

```
Increase the number of replicas from 1 to 2 to improve resiliency and ensure
availability during pod failures.
```

```
```
apiVersion: apps/v1
kind: Deployment
metadata:
```

```

name: front-end
namespace: sock-shop
spec:
  replicas: 2
  selector:
    matchLabels:
      name: front-end
  template:
    metadata:
      labels:
        name: front-end
    spec:
      containers:
        - name: front-end
          image: weaveworksdemos/front-end:0.3.12
          resources:
            limits:
              cpu: 300m
              memory: 1000Mi
            requests:
              cpu: 100m
              memory: 300Mi
          ports:
            - containerPort: 8079
          env:
            - name: SESSION_REDIS
              value: "true"
          securityContext:
            runAsNonRoot: true
            runAsUser: 10001
            capabilities:
              drop:
                - all
            readOnlyRootFilesystem: true
          livenessProbe:
            httpGet:
              path: /
              port: 8079
            initialDelaySeconds: 300
            periodSeconds: 3
          readinessProbe:
            httpGet:
              path: /
              port: 8079
            initialDelaySeconds: 30
            periodSeconds: 3
          nodeSelector:
            beta.kubernetes.io/os: linux
...

```

## Experiment replanning

### Failure scope of StressChaos

The current Kubernetes manifests show that the 'carts-db' deployment remains unchanged in terms of its namespace and labels. The 'carts-db' deployment is still in the 'sock-shop' namespace and has the label 'name: carts-db'. Therefore, the scope of the fault injection, which targets the 'carts-db' pods using the label selector 'name: carts-db' in the 'sock-shop' namespace, does not need to be adjusted. The original goal of the chaos experiment, which is to test the system's resilience under stress conditions by applying a 'StressChaos' fault to the 'carts-db' pods, remains valid with the current manifests.

### Failure scope of PodChaos

The current Kubernetes manifests show that the 'front-end' deployment has increased its replicas from 1 to 2. This change does not affect the label selectors or namespace, which remain the same. Therefore, the scope of the fault injection, which targets the 'front-end' pod using the label 'name: front-end' in the 'sock-shop' namespace, remains valid. The fault injection will still target one of the 'front-end' pods, as specified by the 'mode: one' parameter.

### VaC script for steady state #1

The unit test is specifically targeting the carts-db deployment, which is defined in the 03-carts-db-dep.yaml manifest. Upon comparing the previous and reconfigured manifests for carts-db, there are no changes in the configuration. The number of replicas remains the same, and there are no modifications to the deployment's

specifications that would affect the unit test. Therefore, the unit test does not require any adjustments as the reconfigured manifests do not introduce any changes that would impact the test's logic or its threshold conditions.

### **VaC script for steady state #2**

The unit test is targeting the 'front-end' deployment in the 'sock-shop' namespace. In the reconfigured manifests, the 'front-end' deployment has been modified to increase the number of replicas from 1 to 2. However, the unit test is designed to verify that there is at least 1 ready replica at all times, which is still valid even with the increased number of replicas. The test checks for a minimum of 1 ready replica, and the reconfiguration was likely done to ensure that this condition is met more reliably. Therefore, the unit test does not require any modification, as the threshold of having at least 1 ready replica remains unchanged and is still applicable.

## Summary of the completed CE cycle

The Chaos Engineering cycle for the 'sock-shop' system involved a detailed analysis and testing of the system's resilience under simulated fault conditions. The system is composed of multiple Kubernetes manifests that define various microservices, such as 'carts', 'catalogue', 'orders', 'payment', and 'user', each with associated deployments and services.

The primary focus of the experiment was to address identified resiliency issues, including missing resource requests, single replica deployments, missing liveness and readiness probes, and hardcoded environment variables.

The experiment was structured into three phases: pre-validation, fault-injection, and post-validation, each lasting 20 seconds, to fit within a total duration of 60 seconds. The pre-validation phase ensured that the system was in a steady state before any faults were injected. The fault-injection phase simulated a Black Friday sale scenario by introducing 'StressChaos' and 'PodChaos' faults to test the system's behavior under stress and potential failure conditions. The post-validation phase verified that the system returned to its steady state after the faults were removed.

The initial experiment revealed that while the 'carts-db' deployment maintained its steady state throughout, the 'front-end' deployment failed during the fault-injection and post-validation phases due to having only a single replica, which made it a single point of failure.

This led to a recommendation to increase the number of replicas for the 'front-end' deployment to improve resilience.

After modifying the 'front-end' deployment to have two replicas, a second experiment was conducted. This time, all unit tests passed, indicating that the system successfully maintained its steady states during and after the fault-injection phase. The improvements ensured that the system could handle the simulated high-traffic event and recover from faults, demonstrating enhanced resilience and availability.