DISTRIBUTED DATABASES

CS561-SPRING 2012
WPI, MOHAMED ELTABAKH

RECAP: PARALLEL DATABASES

- **Three possible architectures**
  - Shared-memory
  - Shared-disk
  - Shared-nothing (the most common one)
- **Parallel algorithms**
  - **Intra-operator**
    - Scans, projections, joins, sorting, set operators, etc.
  - **Inter-operator**
    - Distributing different operators in a complex query to different nodes
- **Partitioning and data layout is important and affect the performance**
  - Range-based, hash-based, round robin
- **Optimization of parallel algorithms is a challenge**

DISTRIBUTED DATABASE

DEFINITIONS

A distributed database (DDB) is a collection of multiple, *logically interrelated* databases distributed over a *computer network*.

A distributed database management system (D–DBMS) is the software that manages the DDB and provides an access mechanism that makes this distribution *transparent* to the users.

Distributed database system (DDBS) = DB + Communication

DISTRIBUTED DATABASES MAIN CONCEPTS

- **Data are stored at several locations**
  - Each managed by a DBMS that can run autonomously
- **Ideally, location of data is unknown to client**
  - ***Distributed Data Independence***
- **Distributed Transactions**
  - Clients can write Transactions regardless of where the affected data are located
  - ***Big question:*** *How to ensure the ACID properties Distributed Transactions???*

DISTRIBUTED DBMS PROMISES

- ***Transparent management of distributed, fragmented, and replicated data***
- ***Improved reliability/availability through distributed transactions***
- ***Improved performance***
- ***Easier and more economical system expansion***

TRANSPARENCY & DATA INDEPENDENCE

- Data distributed (with some replication)
- Transparently ask query:

```
SELECT ENAME,SAL
FROM   EMP,ASG,PAY
WHERE  DUR > 12
AND    EMP.ENO = ASG.ENO
AND    PAY.TITLE = EMP.TITLE
```



TYPES OF DISTRIBUTED DATABASES

- **Homogeneous**
  - Every site runs the same type of DBMS
- **Heterogeneous:**
  - Different sites run different DBMS (maybe even RDBMS and ODBMS)



Homogeneous DBs can communicate directly with each other



Heterogeneous DBs communicate through gateway interfaces

DISTRIBUTED DATABASE ARCHITECTURE

- **Client-Server**
  - Client connects directly to specific server(s) and access only their data
  - Direct queries only
- **Collaborative Servers**
  - Servers can serve queries or be clients and query other servers
  - Support indirect queries



DISTRIBUTED DATABASE ARCHITECTURE (CONT'D)

- **Peer-to-Peer Architecture**
  - Scalability and flexibility in growing and shrinking
  - All nodes have the same role and functionality
  - Harder to manage because all machines are ***autonomous*** and ***loosely coupled***



MAIN ISSUES

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication
- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit
  - Transaction serializability using distributed locking

MAIN ISSUES

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication



- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit
  - Transaction serializability using distributed locking

FRAGMENTATION

- **How to divide the data? Can't we just distribute relations?**
- **What is a reasonable unit of distribution?**
  - **relation**
    - views are subsets of relations
    - extra communication
    - Less parallelism
  - **fragments of relations (sub-relations)**
    - concurrent execution of a number of transactions that access different portions of a relation
    - views that cannot be defined on a single fragment will require extra processing
    - semantic data control (especially integrity enforcement) more difficult

FRAGMENTATION ALTERNATIVES – HORIZONTAL

$PROJ_1$: projects with budgets less than $200,000

$PROJ_2$: projects with budgets greater than or equal to $200,000

PROJ

PNO	PNAME	BUDGET	LOC
P1	Instrumentation	150000	Montreal
P2	Database Develop.	135000	New York
P3	CAD/CAM	250000	New York
P4	Maintenance	310000	Paris
P5	CAD/CAM	500000	Boston

$PROJ_1$

PNO	PNAME	BUDGET	LOC
P1	Instrumentation	150000	Montreal
P2	Database Develop.	135000	New York

Stored in London

$PROJ_2$

PNO	PNAME	BUDGET	LOC
P3	CAD/CAM	250000	New York
P4	Maintenance	310000	Paris
P5	CAD/CAM	500000	Boston

Stored in Boston

FRAGMENTATION ALTERNATIVES – VERTICAL

$PROJ_1$: information about project budgets

$PROJ_2$: information about project names and locations

PROJ

PNO	PNAME	BUDGET	LOC
P1	Instrumentation	150000	Montreal
P2	Database Develop.	135000	New York
P3	CAD/CAM	250000	New York
P4	Maintenance	310000	Paris
P5	CAD/CAM	500000	Boston

Horizontal partitioning is more common

$PROJ_1$

PNO	BUDGET
P1	150000
P2	135000
P3	250000
P4	310000
P5	500000

Stored in London

$PROJ_2$

PNO	PNAME	LOC
P1	Instrumentation	Montreal
P2	Database Develop.	New York
P3	CAD/CAM	New York
P4	Maintenance	Paris
P5	CAD/CAM	Boston

Stored in Boston

CORRECTNESS OF FRAGMENTATION

- **Completeness**
  - Decomposition of relation R into fragments R_1, R_2, ..., R_n is complete if and only if each data item in R can also be found in some R_i
- **Reconstruction (Lossless)**
  - If relation R is decomposed into fragments R_1, R_2, ..., R_n, then there should exist some relational operator ∇ such that

    $$R = \nabla_{1 \le i \le n} R_i$$
- **Disjointness (Non-overlapping)**
  - If relation R is decomposed into fragments R_1, R_2, ..., R_n, and data item d_i is in R_j, then d_i should not be in any other fragment R_k ($k \neq j$).

REPLICATION ALTERNATIVES

- Non-replicated
  - partitioned : each fragment resides at only one site
- Replicated
  - fully replicated : each fragment at each site
  - partially replicated : each fragment at some of the sites
- Rule of thumb:

If $\frac{\text{read - only queries}}{\text{update queries}} \geq 1$ replication is advantageous,

otherwise replication may cause problems

DATA REPLICATION

- **Pros:**
  - Improves availability
  - Disconnected (mobile) operation
  - Distributes load
  - Reads are cheaper
- **Cons:**
  - N times more updates
  - N times more storage

Catalog Management

- Catalog is needed to keep track of the location of each fragment & replica
- Catalog itself can be centralized or distributed

- **Synchronous vs. asynchronous**
  - **Synchronous:** all replica are up-to-date
  - **Asynchronous:** cheaper but delay in synchronization

COMPARISON OF REPLICATION ALTERNATIVES

	Full-replication	Partial-replication	Partitioning
QUERY PROCESSING	Easy	Same Difficulty ⟷	
DIRECTORY MANAGEMENT	Easy or Non-existant	Same Difficulty ⟷	
CONCURRENCY CONTROL	Moderate	Difficult	Easy
RELIABILITY	Very high	High	Low
REALITY	Possible application	Realistic	Possible application

MAIN ISSUES

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication
- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit
  - Transaction serializability using distributed locking



DISTRIBUTED JOIN R(X,Y) ⋈ S(Y,Z)



- **Option 1:** Send R to S's location and join their
- **Option 2:** Send S to R's location and join their
- ***Communication cost is expensive, too much data to send***

- **Is there a better option ???**
  - **Semi Join**
  - **Bloom Join**

SEMI-JOIN



- Send only S.Y column to R's location
- Do the join based on Y columns in R's location ***(Semi Join)***
- Send the records of R that will join (without duplicates) to S's location
- Perform the final join in S's location

IS SEMI-JOIN EFFECTIVE



Depends on many factors:

- If the size of Y attribute is small compared to the remaining attributes in R and S
- If the join selectivity is high → $R \ltimes S$ is small
- If there are many duplicates that can be eliminated

BLOOM JOIN

- Build a bit vector of size K in R's location (all 0's)

0	0	1	1	…	0	0	1

- **For every record in R, use a hash function(s) based on Y value (return from 1 to K)**
  - Each function hashes Y to a bit in the bit vector. Set this bit to 1
- Send the bit vector to S's location
- **S will use the same hash function(s) to hash its Y values**
  - If the hashing matched with 1's in all its hashing positions, then this Y is candidate for Join
  - Otherwise, not candidate for join
  - Send S's records having candidate Y's to R's location for join

MAIN ISSUES

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication
- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - **Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit**
  - Transaction serializability using distributed locking



TRANSACTIONS

- A Transaction is an atomic sequence of actions in the Database (reads and writes)
- Each Transaction has to be executed *completely*, and must leave the Database in a consistent state
- If the Transaction fails or aborts midway, then the Database is "rolled back" to its initial consistent state (before the Transaction began)



ACID Properties of Transactions

ATOMICITY IN DISTRIBUTED DBS

- **One transaction *T* may touch many sites**
  - T has several components T1, T2, …Tm
  - Each Tk is running (reading and writing) at site k
  - **How to make *T* is atomic ????**
    - Either T1, T2, …, Tm complete or None of them is executed

- **Two-Phase Commit techniques is used**



TWO-PHASE COMMIT

- **Phase 1**
  - Site that initiates T is the ***coordinator***
  - When coordinator wants to commit (complete T), it sends a *"prepare T"* msg to all participant sites
  - Every other site receiving *"prepare T"*, either sends *"ready T"* or *"don't commit T"*
    - A site can wait for a while until it reaches a decision (Coordinator will wait reasonable time to hear from the others)
  - **These msgs are written to local logs**



TWO-PHASE COMMIT (CONT'D)

- **Phase 2**
  - ***IF coordinator received all "ready T"***
    - Remember no one committed yet
    - Coordinator sends *"commit T"* to all participant sites
    - Every site receiving *"commit T"* commits its transaction
  - ***IF coordinator received any "don't commit T"***
    - *Coordinator sends "abort T"* to all participant sites
    - Every site receiving *"abort T"* commits its transaction



  - **These msgs are written to local logs**

Example 1: What if one sites in Phase 1 replied "don't commit T", and then crashed???

Example 2: What if all sites in Phase 1 replied "ready T", then one site crashed???

- Straightforward if no failures happen
- In case of failure logs are used to ensure **ALL** are done or **NONE**

MAIN ISSUES

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication
- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit
  - **Transaction serializability using distributed locking**



DATABASE LOCKING

- *Locking mechanisms are used to prevent concurrent transactions from updating the same data at the same time*

- *Reading(x) → shared lock on x*
- *Writing(x) → exclusive lock on x*
- **More types of locks exist for efficiency**

What you have

What you request

	Shared lock	Exclusive lock
Shared lock	Yes	No
Exclusive lock	No	No

In Distributed DBs:

- x may be replicated in multiple sites (not one place)
- The transactions reading or writing x may be running at different sites

DISTRIBUTED LOCKING

- **Centralized approach**
  - One dedicated site managing all locks
  - Cons: bottleneck, not scalable, single point of failure
- **Primary-Copy approach**
  - Every item in the database, say x, has a primary site, say Px
  - Any transaction running any where, will ask Px for lock on x
- **Fully Distributed approach**
  - To read, lock any copy of x
  - To write, lock all copies of x
  - Variations exists to balance the cots of read and write op.

Deadlocks are very possible. How to resolve them???
Using timeout: After waiting for a while for a lock, abort and start again

SUMMARY OF DISTRIBUTED DBS

- ***Promises of DDBMSs***
  - Transparent management of distributed, fragmented, and replicated data
  - Improved reliability/availability through distributed transactions
  - Improved performance
  - Easier and more economical system expansion
- ***Classification of DDBMS***
  - Homogeneous vs. Heterogeneous
  - Client-Sever vs. Collaborative Servers vs. Peer-to-Peer

SUMMARY OF DISTRIBUTED DBS (CONT'D)

- **Data Layout Issues**
  - Data partitioning and fragmentation
  - Data replication
- **Query Processing and Distributed Transactions**
  - Distributed join
  - Transaction atomicity using two-phase commit
  - Transaction serializability using distributed locking