I'm going to talk about my vision for the future of system administration, and a question for you to contemplate



 I don't have a crystal ball so I can't predict the future but everything I'm going to say is based on work I and my group are doing and will be doing for the next 1-2years

 When I started in 1974 I was called a "programmer"

 Not "system programmer"; I was developing applications  In 1987 I switched to "classic" system administration

 All the usual stuff: backups, O/S upgrades, etc.  In 2007 I went back to programming but this time I was called a "software engineer" or "software developer"



 In 2012 I started concentrating on software for system administration

 In 2013 I joined MathWorks, in part to work on software for system administration

# Since 1974 there have been huge changes in hardware



 My first machine took up half this room, had a 0.27 MHz CPU, 16KB of CORE (memory), and 2 x 0.5MB of disk



 Even the cheapest iPhone is between a thousand and a million times more powerful

And it fits in your pocket

 There have been similar changes in system administration but they're harder to quantify



The rate of change for H/W seems to be slowing down

 The rate for system administration is speeding up



 I predict big changes in the next 2 or 5 or 10 years



 If your company's product is S/W, I predict the changes will be in < 5 years (and maybe even in just 2 years)



 For everyone else the changes may take up to 10 years



 The software my group is writing will fundamentally change most of "server administration" at MathWorks



# Other companies are writing the same S/W

#### Most notable is Netflix



 Eventually there will be "products" to provide the same services for any company



### So what does my software do, and why do you care?



 I feel strongly that SysAdmin today lacks real automation



### Puppet et al. are "force multipliers"

 Except for repairing files that change, a SysAdmin still has to cause things to happen  Think about new servers: A SysAdmin has to create the machine and do enough configuration for it to connect to the network so Puppet can then run

 Networks are worse because there's even less automation

 Without automation this stuff doesn't scale



 Why do I care about scaling creating and deleting servers and networks?



 MathWorks has two large software products and a large handful of web and cloud apps



 Each product and app has lots of tests: unit, functional, system, integration, regression, and performance

They take a long time to run

 The integration tests are the hardest: they require 5 – 8 hosts, each running a different app, 1 of which has the code being tested



 This is really hard to schedule, and takes a long time, so instead of testing against known versions of the "foreign" apps you test against other unreleased code

It also means having <n>
integration environments
sitting around waiting for
someone to run a test



### It's a moving target

 Sometimes bugs slip through



 My current project is to let app developers specify the versions of the "foreign" as build-time dependencies

Done in Maven (pom.xml)

 My software uses those dependencies to create a private network and however many servers, runs the integration tests, then tears it all down and reports the results

 If the tests succeed, a clean copy of the VM being tested is saved for use by integration tests for the next app



# All of this happens through Maven plugins

 Maven in run by a CI tool that watches for devs to check in code



# The CI tool isn't Jenkins but it's similar enough

#### We use Maven because it handles the dependencies



 With my software, hosts and networks are automatically created, configured, and destroyed, with no input from the SysAdmin



### That's why I care about automating

• And . . .


• From there I can automate all the tests, **including** tests for changes to our Puppet code...



 Same process, including running application integration tests, to make sure a Puppet change or an O/S upgrade doesn't break the apps



 The software can also deploy a new server (with an app already loaded) into production; it's just a few different configuration parameters

 I'm betting that at least some of you are saying "What about <x>?"

I skipped a lot of details



#### • "Yeah, but what about <x>?"

#### Meh

41 of 75

 I write software, and I've been doing it for a long time; I know that I can make my software do just about anything . . .



 So instead of "but what about <x>?," my attitude is "write just enough code to give the developers something, and we'll handle <x> when it becomes important"

### It's called "Agile"

 It's not a big deal but it does require a change in attitude and mindset



 So now that my software does pretty much all the work of managing the servers, what's left for the SysAdmins to do?

#### Not much!



 Another bit of software we'll be working on monitors our VM usage and tells the SAs when to order more H/W to run the VMs



 After physically installing the new H/W, the SysAdmin goes to a web page and enters the rack location, power outlets, and network ports, selects the environment, and hits "Go"

• All the configuration of the H/W is handled by my software (using Puppet), because configuring H/W is nearly identical to configuring VMs, just with different inputs

# But what about new O/S versions or patches?



 SysAdmin edits a text file and checks it in; my software tests it and if the tests work, makes the new version available for future tests



But what about new versions of Apache or Glassfish?

Not the SysAdmin's problem



# The developers handle those!

• **WAT**?



 The devs specify the new version of Glassfish, and that causes all the tests to run



• If the tests pass, the new version is made available for production; if the tests fail, the devs either roll it back or update the app to work with the new version of Glassfish

## Either way, the SysAdmin doesn't have to care



 The new version can't be released to production unless the tests pass, and that's the exact same process as app changes



 The SysAdmin doesn't care because s/he doesn't have to care

I say that's A Good Thing



 So now, pretty much all the SysAdmin does is rack & stack hardware, edit text files, and once in a rare while, write a new Puppet module



### But is that all?

• No!



# • There's a ton of software that does all the real work



 So if I'm the guy that writes that software, am I a SysAdmin?

I say "yes!"



 So remember I said I had a question for you to contemplate?

• Here it is . . .



## Which SysAdmin do you want to be?



 Do you want to be the one that racks & stacks hardware, enters stuff on web pages, and sometimes edits text files? . . .



 Or do you want to be the SysAdmin that writes all the (cool) software?



 If you want to be the one that racks & stacks and edits text files, do nothing

Your job will change in 2 or
5 or 10 years



 But if you want to be the one that writes the software, stop being a "classic" SysAdmin and learn "software engineering"



 That is not just "learn Perl and a little bit about coding"

 It's not even learning Python or Ruby ③



 "Real" software engineering means learning algorithms, proper coding practices (for readability and maintainability), proper use of version control and branching, ...



 Agile (in whatever form), how to use & design & build APIs, design reviews, code reviews, how to write software tests, how to write testable software, how to use databases, . . .



 how to make testing an integral part of the development process (like TDD or BDD), writing software that checks all error codes, writing software that returns sensible . . .

• error codes, and oh by the way, learning languages like C/C++ and Java, plus learning how to learn new languages (Go, Haskell, Erlang)


A BS in CS isn't a requirement but it's at least worth considering, and it may help you change jobs from SysAdmin to developer



 Then, focus on writing "software for system administration" and eventually you'll be "the new kind of SysAdmin"



## So, which kind of SysAdmin do you want to be?

Thank you

