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Administrivia – Final Exam

• Who: You
• What: R&G Chapters 15-22
• When: Tuesday May 6th 5:30pm-8:30pm
• Where: WEH 7500
• Why: Databases will help your love life.

Today’s Class

• High-level overview of distributed DBMSs.
• Not meant to be a detailed examination of all aspects of these systems.
Today’s Class
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- Design Issues
- Distributed OLTP
- Distributed OLAP
- Real-world Examples

Why Do We Need Parallel/Distributed DBMSs?

- PayPal in 2008…
- Single, monolithic Oracle installation.
- Had to manually move data every xmas.
- Legal restrictions.

Why Do We Need Parallel/Distributed DBMSs?

- Increased Performance.
- Increased Availability.
- Potentially Lower TCO.
Parallel/Distributed DBMS

- Database is spread out across multiple resources to improve parallelism.
- Appears as a single database instance to the application.
  - SQL query for a single-node DBMS should generate same result on a parallel or distributed DBMS.

Parallel vs. Distributed

- **Parallel DBMSs:**
  - Nodes are physically close to each other.
  - Nodes connected with high-speed LAN.
  - Communication cost is assumed to be small.
- **Distributed DBMSs:**
  - Nodes can be far from each other.
  - Nodes connected using public network.
  - Communication cost and problems cannot be ignored.

Database Architectures

- The goal is parallelize operations across multiple resources.
  - CPU
  - Memory
  - Network
  - Disk
Database Architectures

- **Shared Memory**: CPUs and disks have access to common memory via a fast interconnect.
  - Very efficient to send messages between processors.
  - Sometimes called “shared everything”
- **Examples**: All single-node DBMSs.

- **Shared Disk**: All CPUs can access all disks directly via an interconnect but each have their own private memories.
  - Easy fault tolerance.
  - Easy consistency since there is a single copy of DB.
- **Examples**: Oracle Exadata, ScaleDB.
Shared Nothing

- Each DBMS instance has its own CPU, memory, and disk.
- Nodes only communicate with each other via network.
  - Easy to increase capacity.
  - Hard to ensure consistency.
- Examples: Vertica, Parallel DB2, MongoDB.

Early Systems

- **MUFFIN** – UC Berkeley (1979)
- **SDD-1** – CCA (1980)
- **System R** – IBM Research (1984)
- **Gamma** – Univ. of Wisconsin (1986)
- **NonStop SQL** – Tandem (1987)

Inter- vs. Intra-query Parallelism

- **Inter-Query**: Different queries or txns are executed concurrently.
  - Increases throughput but not latency.
  - Already discussed for shared-memory DBMSs.
- **Intra-Query**: Execute the operations of a single query in parallel.
  - Increases latency for long-running queries.
Parallel/Distributed DBMSs

• Advantages:
  – Data sharing.
  – Reliability and availability.
  – Speed up of query processing.

• Disadvantages:
  – May increase processing overhead.
  – More database design issues.
  – Harder to ensure ACID guarantees.

Today’s Class

• Overview & Background
• Design Issues
  • Distributed OLTP
  • Distributed OLAP
  • Real-world Examples

Design Issues

• How do we store data across nodes?
• How does the application find data?
• How to execute queries on distributed data?
  – Push query to data.
  – Pull data to query.
• How does the DBMS ensure correctness?
Database Partitioning

- Split database across multiple resources:
  - Disks, nodes, processors.
  - Sometimes called “sharding”
- The DBMS executes query fragments on each partition and then combines the results to produce a single answer.

Naïve Table Partitioning

- Each node stores one and only table.
- Assumes that each node has enough storage space for a table.

**Ideal Query:**

\[
\text{SELECT * FROM table}
\]
Horizontal Partitioning

- Split a table’s tuples into disjoint subsets.
  - Choose column(s) that divides the database equally in terms of size, load, or usage.
  - Each tuple contains all of its columns.
- Three main approaches:
  - Round-robin Partitioning.
  - Hash Partitioning.
  - Range Partitioning.

Horizontal Partitioning

![Diagram of table partitioning]

**Ideal Query:**

```
SELECT * FROM table
WHERE partitionKey = ?
```

Vertical Partitioning

- Split the columns of tuples into fragments:
  - Each fragment contains all of the tuples’ values for column(s).
- Need to include primary key or unique record id with each partition to ensure that the original tuple can be reconstructed.
Vertical Partitioning

Table

Partitions

Ideal Query:

\[ \text{SELECT column FROM table} \]

Replication

- **Partition Replication**: Store a copy of an entire partition in multiple locations.
  - Master – Slave Replication
- **Table Replication**: Store an entire copy of a table in each partition.
  - Usually small, read-only tables.
- The DBMS ensures that updates are propagated to all replicas in either case.
Data Transparency

- Users should not be required to know where data is physically located, how tables are partitioned or replicated.
- A SQL query that works on a single-node DBMS should work the same on a distributed DBMS.

OLTP vs. OLAP

- On-line Transaction Processing:
  - Short-lived txns.
  - Small footprint.
  - Repetitive operations.
- On-line Analytical Processing:
  - Long running queries.
  - Complex joins.
  - Exploratory queries.

Workload Characterization

Michael Stonebraker – “Ten Rules For Scalable Performance In Simple Operations”
http://cacm.acm.org/magazines/2011/6/108651
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Distributed OLTP

• Execute txns on a distributed DBMS.
• Used for user-facing applications:
  – Example: Credit card processing.
• Key Challenges:
  – Consistency
  – Availability

Single-Node vs. Distributed Transactions

• Single-node txns do not require the DBMS to coordinate behavior between nodes.
• Distributed txns are any txn that involves more than one node.
  – Requires expensive coordination.
Simple Example

Application Server

Node 1

Node 2

Transaction Coordination

- Assuming that our DBMS supports multi-operation txns, we need some way to coordinate their execution in the system.
- Two different approaches:
  - Centralized: Global “traffic cop”.
  - Decentralized: Nodes organize themselves.

TP Monitors

- Example of a centralized coordinator.
- Originally developed in the 1970-80s to provide txns between terminals + mainframe databases.
  - Examples: ATMs, Airline Reservations.
- Many DBMSs now support the same functionality internally.
Observation

• **Q:** How do we ensure that all nodes agree to commit a txn?
  – What happens if a node fails?
  – What happens if our messages show up late?

CAP Theorem

• Proposed by Eric Brewer that it is impossible for a distributed system to always be:
  – Consistent
  – Always Available
  – Network Partition Tolerant
• Proved in 2002.

CAP Theorem

- Consistency
- Availability
- Partition Tolerant

Linearizability

All up nodes can satisfy all requests.

No Man’s Land

Still operate correctly despite message loss.
**CAP – Consistency**

Must see both changes or no changes

Set $A=2, B=9$

$A=2, B=9$

**CAP – Availability**

Must see both changes or no changes

Set $A=2, B=9$

$A=2, B=9$

**CAP – Partition Tolerance**

Must see both changes or no changes

Set $A=2, B=9$

$A=2, B=9$

$A=3, B=6$

$A=3, B=6$
**CAP Theorem**

- **Relational DBMSs:** CA/CP
  - Examples: IBM DB2, MySQL Cluster, VoltDB
- **NoSQL DBMSs:** AP
  - Examples: Cassandra, Riak, DynamoDB

**Atomic Commit Protocol**

- When a multi-node transaction finishes, the DBMS needs to ask all of the nodes involved whether it is safe to commit.
  - All nodes must agree on the outcome
- Examples:
  - Two-Phase Commit
  - Three-Phase Commit
  - Paxos

**Two-Phase Commit**

- Phase 1: Prepare
  - Application Server sends a Prepare request to all participants.
  - Each participant sends an OK back to the coordinator.
- Phase 2: Commit
  - The coordinator sends a Commit request to all participants.
  - Each participant sends an OK back to the coordinator.
Two-Phase Commit

- Each node has to record the outcome of each phase in a stable storage log.
- **Q:** What happens if coordinator crashes?
  - Participants have to decide what to do.
- **Q:** What happens if participant crashes?
  - Coordinator assumes that it responded with an abort if it hasn’t sent an acknowledgement yet.
- The nodes have to block until they can figure out the correct action to take.

Three-Phase Commit

- The coordinator first tells other nodes that it intends to commit. Failure doesn’t always mean a hard crash.
- If the coordinator fails, then the participants elect a new coordinator and finish commit.
- Nodes do not have to block if there are no network partitions.
Paxos

- Consensus protocol where a coordinator proposes an outcome (e.g., commit or abort) and then the participants vote on whether that outcome should succeed.
- Does not block if a majority of participants are available and has provably minimal message delays in the best case.
  - First correct protocol that was provably resilient in the face asynchronous networks

2PC vs. Paxos

- **Two-Phase Commit**: blocks if coordinator fails after the prepare message is sent, until coordinator recovers.
- **Paxos**: non-blocking as long as a majority participants are alive, provided there is a sufficiently long period without further failures.

Distributed Concurrency Control

- Need to allow multiple txns to execute simultaneously across multiple nodes.
  - Many of the same protocols from single-node DBMSs can be adapted.
- This is harder because of:
  - Replication.
  - Network Communication Overhead.
  - Node Failures.
**Distributed 2PL**

![Diagram of Distributed 2PL]

**Recovery**

- **Q:** What do we do if a node crashes in CA/CP DBMS?
  - If node is replicated, use Paxos to elect a new primary.
    - If node is last replica, halt the DBMS.
  - Node can recover from checkpoints + logs and then catch up with primary.
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Distributed OLAP

- Execute analytical queries that examine large portions of the database.
- Used for back-end data warehouses:
  - Example: Data mining
- Key Challenges:
  - Data movement.
  - Query planning.

Distributed OLAP

![Diagram of Distributed OLAP]

Distributed Joins Are Hard

```sql
SELECT * FROM table1, table2
WHERE table1.val = table2.val
```

- Assume tables are horizontally partitioned:
  - Table1 Partition Key → table1.key
  - Table2 Partition Key → table2.key
- Q: How to execute?
- Naïve solution is to send all partitions to a single node and compute join.
Semi-Joins

- Main Idea: First distribute the join attributes between nodes and then recreate the full tuples in the final output.
  - Send just enough data from each table to compute which rows to include in output.
- Lots of choices make this problem hard:
  - What to materialize?
  - Which table to send?
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NuoDB

- Distributed MVCC+OCC.
- Split the database into “atoms” (i.e., blocks)
  - Nodes assigned as executor and storage nodes.
  - Move atoms to the node where a txn is executing, push writes at commit.
Facebook Infrastructure

- World’s largest MySQL cluster.

Google Spanner

- 2PL + T/O
- Ensures ordering through globally unique timestamping ordering generated from atomic clocks and GPS devices.
Summary

- Everything is harder in a distributed setting:
  - Concurrency Control
  - Query Execution
  - Recovery

Next Class

- Discuss distributed OLAP more.
  - You'll learn why MapReduce was a bad idea.
- Compare NoSQL vs. NewSQL
- Learn the answer to the #1 student question:
  - What DBMS should I use for my start-up?