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Introduction

• Parallel machines are becoming quite common and affordable
  – Prices of microprocessors, memory and disks have dropped sharply
  – Recent desktop computers feature multiple processors and this trend is projected to accelerate

• Databases are growing increasingly large
  – large volumes of transaction data are collected and stored for later analysis.
  – multimedia objects like images are increasingly stored in databases

• Large-scale parallel database systems increasingly used for:
  – storing large volumes of data
  – processing time-consuming decision-support queries
  – providing high throughput for transaction processing
Multiple levels of parallelism
Cache coherence?

- Note – parallel queries already discussed under concurrency control/locking
Parallel Sort

Parallel External Sort-Merge

- Assume the relation has already been partitioned among disks $D_0, \ldots, D_{n-1}$ (in whatever manner).
- Each processor $P_i$ locally sorts the data on disk $D_i$.
- The sorted runs on each processor are then merged to get the final sorted output.
- Parallelize the merging of sorted runs as follows:
  - The sorted partitions at each processor $P_i$ are range-partitioned across the processors $P_0, \ldots, P_{m-1}$.
  - Each processor $P_i$ performs a merge on the streams as they are received, to get a single sorted run.
  - The sorted runs on processors $P_0, \ldots, P_{m-1}$ are concatenated to get the final result.

NOTE: Actually hard to do!
Parallel Join

- The join operation requires pairs of tuples to be tested to see if they satisfy the join condition, and if they do, the pair is added to the join output.
- Parallel join algorithms attempt to split the pairs to be tested over several processors. Each processor then computes part of the join locally.
- In a final step, the results from each processor can be collected together to produce the final result.
Query Optimization

• Query optimization in parallel databases is significantly more complex than query optimization in sequential databases.

• Cost models are more complicated, since we must take into account partitioning costs and issues such as skew and resource contention.

• When scheduling execution tree in parallel system, must decide:
  – How to parallelize each operation and how many processors to use for it.

• Determining the amount of resources to allocate for each operation is a problem.
  – E.g., allocating more processors than optimal can result in high communication overhead.

• Long pipelines should be avoided as the final operation may wait a lot for inputs, while holding precious resources
Design of Parallel Systems

Some issues in the design of parallel systems:

• Parallel loading of data from external sources is needed in order to handle large volumes of incoming data.

• Resilience to failure of some processors or disks.
  – Probability of some disk or processor failing is higher in a parallel system.
  – Operation (perhaps with degraded performance) should be possible in spite of failure.
  – Redundancy achieved by storing extra copy of every data item at another processor.
Design of Parallel Systems (Cont.)

• On-line reorganization of data and schema changes must be supported.
  – For example, index construction on terabyte databases can take hours or days even on a parallel system.
    • Need to allow other processing (insertions/deletions/updates) to be performed on relation even as index is being constructed.
  – Basic idea: index construction tracks changes and “catches up” on changes at the end.

• Also need support for on-line repartitioning and schema changes (executed concurrently with other processing).
Chapter 19: Distributed Databases
Distributed Database System

- A distributed database system consists of loosely coupled sites that share no physical component.
- Database systems that run on each site are independent of each other.
- Transactions may access data at one or more sites.
Homogeneous Distributed Databases

- In a homogeneous distributed database
  - All sites have identical software
  - Are aware of each other and agree to cooperate in processing user requests.
  - Each site surrenders part of its autonomy in terms of right to change schemas or software
  - Appears to user as a single system

- In a heterogeneous distributed database
  - Different sites may use different schemas and software
    - Difference in schema is a major problem for query processing
    - Difference in software is a major problem for transaction processing
  - Sites may not be aware of each other and may provide only limited facilities for cooperation in transaction processing
Distributed Data Storage

- Assume relational data model
- Replication
  - System maintains multiple copies of data, stored in different sites, for faster retrieval and fault tolerance.
- Fragmentation
  - Relation is partitioned into several fragments stored in distinct sites
- Replication and fragmentation can be combined
  - Relation is partitioned into several fragments: system maintains several identical replicas of each such fragment.
Data Fragmentation

- Division of relation $r$ into fragments $r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_n$ which contain sufficient information to reconstruct relation $r$.
- **Horizontal fragmentation**: each tuple of $r$ is assigned to one or more fragments.
- **Vertical fragmentation**: the schema for relation $r$ is split into several smaller schemas.
  - All schemas must contain a common candidate key (or superkey) to ensure lossless join property.
  - A special attribute, the tuple-id attribute may be added to each schema to serve as a candidate key.
Naming of Data Items - Criteria

1. Every data item must have a system-wide unique name.
2. It should be possible to find the location of data items efficiently.
3. It should be possible to change the location of data items transparently.
4. Each site should be able to create new data items autonomously.
**Distributed Transactions**

- Transaction may access data at several sites.
- Each site has a local **transaction manager** responsible for:
  - Maintaining a log for recovery purposes
  - Participating in coordinating the concurrent execution of the transactions executing at that site.
- Each site has a **transaction coordinator**, which is responsible for:
  - Starting the execution of transactions that originate at the site.
  - Distributing subtransactions at appropriate sites for execution.
  - Coordinating the termination of each transaction that originates at the site, which may result in the transaction being committed at all sites or aborted at all sites.
Commit Protocols

- Commit protocols are used to ensure atomicity across sites
  - a transaction which executes at multiple sites must either be committed at all the sites, or aborted at all the sites.
  - not acceptable to have a transaction committed at one site and aborted at another
- The *two-phase commit* (2PC) protocol is widely used
Two Phase Commit Protocol (2PC)

- Assumes **fail-stop** model – failed sites simply stop working, and do not cause any other harm, such as sending incorrect messages to other sites.
- Execution of the protocol is initiated by the coordinator after the last step of the transaction has been reached.
- The protocol involves all the local sites at which the transaction executed.
- Let $T$ be a transaction initiated at site $S_i$, and let the transaction coordinator at $S_i$ be $C_i$. 
Phase 1: Obtaining a Decision

- Coordinator asks all participants to \textit{prepare} to commit transaction $T_i$.
  - $C_i$ adds the records \textit{prepare $T$} to the log and forces log to stable storage
  - sends \textit{prepare $T$} messages to all sites at which $T$ executed
- Upon receiving message, transaction manager at site determines if it can commit the transaction
  - if not, add a record \textit{no $T$} to the log and send \textit{abort $T$} message to $C_i$
  
  - if the transaction can be committed, then:
    - add the record \textit{ready $T$} to the log
    - force \textit{all records} for $T$ to stable storage
    - send \textit{ready $T$} message to $C_i$
Phase 2: Recording the Decision

- $T$ can be committed if $C_i$ received a **ready** $T$ message from all the participating sites: otherwise $T$ must be aborted.
- Coordinator adds a decision record, `<**commit** $T$>` or `<**abort** $T$>`, to the log and forces record onto stable storage. Once the record stable storage it is irrevocable (even if failures occur)
- Coordinator sends a message to each participant informing it of the decision (commit or abort)
- Participants take appropriate action locally.
Distributed Query Processing

• For centralized systems, the primary criterion for measuring the cost of a particular strategy is the number of disk accesses.

• In a distributed system, other issues must be taken into account:
  – The cost of a data transmission over the network.
  – The potential gain in performance from having several sites process parts of the query in parallel.
Heterogeneous Distributed Databases

- Many database applications require data from a variety of preexisting databases located in a heterogeneous collection of hardware and software platforms.
- Data models may differ (hierarchical, relational, etc.).
- Transaction commit protocols may be incompatible.
- Concurrency control may be based on different techniques (locking, timestamping, etc.).
- System-level details almost certainly are totally incompatible.
- A **multidatabase system** is a software layer on top of existing database systems, which is designed to manipulate information in heterogeneous databases.
  - Creates an illusion of logical database integration without any physical database integration.
Advantages

• Preservation of investment in existing
  – hardware
  – system software
  – Applications

• Local autonomy and administrative control

• Allows use of special-purpose DBMSs

• Step towards a unified homogeneous DBMS
  – Full integration into a homogeneous DBMS faces
    • Technical difficulties and cost of conversion
    • Organizational/political difficulties
      – Organizations do not want to give up control on their data
      – Local databases wish to retain a great deal of autonomy
Unified View of Data

• Agreement on a common data model
  – Typically the relational model

• Agreement on a common conceptual schema
  – Different names for same relation/attribute
  – Same relation/attribute name means different things

• Agreement on a single representation of shared data
  – E.g., data types, precision,
  – Character sets
    • ASCII vs EBCDIC
    • Sort order variations

• Agreement on units of measure

• Variations in names
  – E.g., Köln vs Cologne, Mumbai vs Bombay
Query Processing

• Several issues in query processing in a heterogeneous database

• Schema translation
  – Write a **wrapper** for each data source to translate data to a global schema
  – Wrappers must also translate updates on global schema to updates on local schema

• Limited query capabilities
  – Some data sources allow only restricted forms of selections
    • E.g., web forms, flat file data sources
  – Queries have to be broken up and processed partly at the source and partly at a different site

• Removal of duplicate information when sites have overlapping information
  – Decide which sites to execute query

• Global query optimization
Directory Access Protocols

• Most commonly used directory access protocol:
  – LDAP (Lightweight Directory Access Protocol)
  – Simplified from earlier X.500 protocol

• Question: Why not use database protocols like ODBC/JDBC?

• Answer:
  – Simplified protocols for a limited type of data access, evolved parallel to ODBC/JDBC
  – Provide a nice hierarchical naming mechanism similar to file system directories
    • Data can be partitioned amongst multiple servers for different parts of the hierarchy, yet give a single view to user
      – E.g., different servers for Bell Labs Murray Hill and Bell Labs Bangalore
  – Directories may use databases as storage mechanism
Real examples

- Vertica
- TeraData
- BigTable
- (aside on MapReduce)

http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1629197 - Stonebreaker et al. CACM 2010
http://portal.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1629198 – Dean and Gemwhat. CACM 2010