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Gamma: the Big Idea

• Database - stores data

• Relational
  ‣ structured data
  ‣ tables of rows and columns
  ‣ context turns data into information

• Supports Data Definition

• Supports Data Manipulation: CRUD
Gamma: the Big Idea

• Parallel - many processors, many disks

• Three keys to parallelism:
  1. tables are horizontally partitioned
  2. parallel hash algorithms for relational operators
  3. coordinated dataflow scheduling

• Shared-nothing architecture
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History

• Began with DIRECT (1977-1984)
  ‣ One of the first operational parallel database systems. [2]
  ‣ Built on the DEC PDP 11 (16-bit)
History

- 1984 - The GAMMA project began in January 1984 and ran until late 1992 at which point the code was so broken from years of patching that we gave up.
  
  - David J. DeWitt on his web site [2]

- Built on a network of VAX computers (32-bit)

- Operational in 1985
History

- 1984
History

• 1984
• 1988: Intel ipsc/2 hypercube - 32 i386 CPUs

• Nodes connected via VLSI routers.
  ‣ Small messages sent as datagrams.
  ‣ Large messages sent via circuits.
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Hardware Architecture

- Shared-nothing
  - All nodes are self-sufficient and independent, sharing neither disks nor memory nor CPU nor ... anything, communicating only by sending messages. (Like people.)
- Storage is distributed among the nodes.
- Nodes are connected ...
Hardware Architecture

• Why shared-nothing?
  ‣ *In scalable, tunable, nearly delightful databases, [shared-nothing] systems will have no apparent disadvantages compared to the other alternatives [shared memory, disk].* - Michael Stonebraker [3]

• This remains an excellent approach today. (Erlang, Scala with Akka, others.)

• Shared-nothing scales better than shared architectures. Why?
Hardware Architecture

• Converting from VAX to Intel uncovered previously unseen bugs in their code.
  ‣ The VAX did not trap null pointer dereference errors.
  ‣ The Intel 386 did. They found a number of hidden bugs.

• They also had to rewrite a lot of code because the VAX began numbering nodes at 1 while Intel began at 0.
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Software Architecture

• Storage Organization

  ‣ Tables are *Horizontally Partitioned* across all disks at all nodes.

    - exploits all available I/O bandwidth

  ‣ This “declustering” (Bubba) makes parallelizing selections trivial.

    - Just send a message to each node to execute the selection operator with the passed-in parameters.
Software Architecture

- Storage Organization
  - Three declustering strategies.
    1. round robin - default method
    2. hashed - keys hashed into node ids
    3. range partitioned (“shards”)
      - Specify a range of keys for each node in a Range Table.
      - MongoDB and others do this today.
Software Architecture

- Storage Organization - Round Robin
Software Architecture

• Storage Organization - Round Robin

Data Heap

Node 0

Node 1

Node 2
**Software Architecture**

- **Storage Organization - Hashed**

  ![Diagram](image)

  - Data Heap
  - (Goofy) Hash function: Even or Odd
  - Node 0
    - 02
    - DATA
  - Node 1
    - 01
    - DATA
  - Node 2
Software Architecture

- Storage Organization - Hashed

(Goofy) Hash function: Even or Odd
Software Architecture

• Storage Organization - Shards

Data Heap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Range Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Node</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>id &lt;= 5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id &gt; 5 and id &lt;= 10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id &gt; 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Node 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
<th>05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Node 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>06</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Node 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATA</td>
<td>DATA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Software Architecture

• Storage Organization

  ‣ Partition data is stored in the system catalog via the Catalog Manager.

  ‣ This partition data is used in query optimization and planning.

  ‣ Indexes are supported -- both clustered and non-clustered -- and are used in query optimization and planning.
Software Architecture

- Indexes [4]
  - No Index
    - Scan the data
  - With Index
    - Clustered (not pictured)
    - Non-clustered B-Tree
Software Architecture

• Gamma’s Process Structure
Software Architecture

• Catalog Manager
  ‣ Central repository for all schema and partition data.
  ‣ Loaded when database is started.
  ‣ Ensures consistency among cached copies elsewhere.
Software Architecture

- **Query Manager**
  - Each user gets a Query Manager process.
  - Locally caches schema data.
  - Provides interface for ad-hoc queries
  - Performs query parsing, optimization, planning, and compilation.
Software Architecture

• Scheduler Processes
  ‣ Each query is controlled by a scheduler process.
  ‣ Activates operator processes on participating nodes.
  ‣ They can be run on any node, ensuring that none becomes a bottleneck.
• Scheduler Processes

  ‣ If the Query Manager/optimizer notes that a query requires only a single site it is sent to the appropriate node for execution.

  ‣ In that case the scheduler processes are bypassed.
Software Architecture

• Execution/Operator Processes
  ‣ There is one operator process for every relational operator (select, join, etc.) in the compiled query.
  ‣ The scheduler spreads these out over the nodes participating in the query execution.
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  ‣ User invokes ad-hoc query interface.
  ‣ Range of $u$ is users
    Retrieve $u$.name
    Where $u$.clue > 0

Hey... What language is that?
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview
  ‣ A Query Manager process starts
Software Architecture

- Query Execution Overview
  - A Query Manager process starts,
  - connects itself to the Catalog Manager process
Software Architecture

• **Query Execution Overview**
  
  ‣ A Query Manager process starts,
  
  ‣ connects itself to the Catalog Manager process,
  
  ‣ and gets to work on the query.

```
Range of u is users
Retrieve u.name
Where u.clue > 0
```
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  ‣ The Query Manager does...
    - parsing
    - optimization
    - planning

  ‣ ... in the traditional relational ways,

  ‣ but with only hash-based joins.

Range of $u$ is users
Retrieve $u$.name
Where $u$.clue > 0
• Aside: Three Common Join Types
  ‣ the Nested-Loop join
  ‣ the Merge join
  ‣ the Hash join
Software Architecture

- Aside: the Nested Loop Join

[4]

**Nested Loop Join with Sequential Scan**

Table 1

- aag
- aay
- aar
- aai

Table 2

- aai
- aag
- aas
- aar
- aay
- aaa
- aag

No Setup Required

Used For Small Tables
Software Architecture

• Aside: the Merge Join \[4\]

![Diagram of Merge Join]

Ideal for large tables.
An index can be used to eliminate the sort.
Software Architecture


Hash Join

Outer Table

- aay
- aag
- aak
- aar

Inner Table

- aak
- aas
- aam
- aay
- aar
- aao
- aaw

Hashed

Must fit in Main Memory
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  ‣ The Query Manager does...
    - parsing
    - optimization
    - planning

  ‣ ... in the traditional relational ways,

  ‣ but with only hash-based joins.
Software Architecture

- Query Execution Overview
  - Now the Query Manager connects to an idle scheduler

Range of u is users
Retrieve u.name
Where u.clue > 0
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  ‣ Now the Query Manager connects to an idle scheduler,
  ‣ and sends it the planned, compiled query.
Software Architecture

- **Query Execution Overview**
  - The scheduler activates operator processes (select, join, etc.) at various nodes to execute the query.
  - The Query Manager waits as the scheduler monitors the progress.
Software Architecture

- Query Execution Overview
  - Each participating operator process reads tuples from the database at its node,
  - performs its operation (index select, scan, etc.)
  - and sends the matching tuples ... somewhere?
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

 › If we’re doing a join, then there are other processes available to help with the join.

 › But who gets what?

 › How do we parallelize the work of a join?

 › Remember the Hash Join?
Software Architecture

Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview
  ‣ The operator process performs a hash on the join attribute of each resulting tuple,
  ‣ and sends it to the appropriate join node.
  ‣ But where is that node?
Software Architecture

- Query Execution Overview
  - Gamma builds **Split Tables** to demultiplex matching tuples to join operator processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Split Table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Value</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diagram:
- **Join Node**
- **Split Table**
- **Hash function**
- **Matching Tuples**
- **Operator Process at Node N**
- **Stream of Tuples**
- **DATABASE**
- **Gamma Processor**
Software Architecture

- Query Execution Overview
  - Each join process operates in two phases (controlled by the scheduler)
    - Building Phase
    - Probing Phase
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  › Each join process operates in two phases:

    - Building Phase
      ◦ An in-memory hash table is built for the join’s inner table.
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview
  ‣ Each join process operates in two phases:
    - Building Phase
    - Probing Phase
      ○ Tuples from the outer table are used to probe the hash table for matches.
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

- The scheduler, who has been monitoring and controlling all of this, collects the partial results as the various probing phases complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Destination Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Software Architecture

• Query Execution Overview

  ‣ Finally, the Query Manager reads the combined results from the scheduler and returns them to the user.

  ‣ Warning: No Rows Selected.
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(That was cool, wasn’t it?)
Query Algorithms

• Selection - two cases

  ‣ Selection on a partitioning attribute
    - Scheduler initiates selection operator on a subset of nodes.

  ‣ Selection on a non-partitioning attribute or we used round-robin partitioning in the first place
    - Scheduler initiates the selection operation at all nodes.
Query Algorithms

- Aggregates - sum, min, max, etc.
  - Each participating node maps the aggregate operator to the elements of its portion of the data in parallel.
  - The individual node results are collected (by the scheduler) and combined (reduced) to the final answer.
  - Does this sound familiar?
Query Algorithms

• Aggregates - sum, min, max, etc.
  ‣ Each participating node maps the aggregate operator to the elements of its portion of the data in parallel.
  ‣ The individual node results are collected (by the scheduler) and combined (reduced) to the final answer.
  ‣ Does this sound familiar? It should.
Query Algorithms

• Updates - insert, update, delete
  ‣ Mostly done as typical RDBMS do it.
  ‣ Exception: modifying the partitioning attribute.
    - Use the split tables or partition data in the system catalog held at the Catalog Manager to reroute the modified tuples to the proper node.
The Plan

• History
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• Software Architecture
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Transactions

• (Pessimistic) Concurrency Control - Locks
  ‣ Basic Lock Types
    - S: shared / read
    - X: exclusive / write
  ‣ Lock Terms
    - Short-term: until end of access
    - Long-term: until end of transaction
Transactions

- Concurrency Control - Locks
  - Lock Types + Lock Terms = Lock Modes
    - Gamma’s Lock Modes: S, X, IS, IX, SIX
      - The “I” is for “intent”
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Locks
  ‣ Lock Granularity
    - Database, Table, Page, Row, Field
    - Gamma supports “file” and page locking granularities.
      ◦ This means there could be a lot of lock contention in the average to worst case, depending on the data and its indexes.
Transactions

- Concurrency Control - Locks
  - Two-phase locking
    - Growing phase: acquiring locks
    - Shrinking phase: releasing locks
  - This helps relieve some lock contention.
  - But **deadlock** is still a worry.
Transactions

- Concurrency Control - Deadlock
  
  ‣ Deadlock - mutual waiting, the dreaded deadly embrace
    - Transaction $T_1$ needs resources A, and B, has a lock on A, waiting for B.
    - Transaction $T_2$ needs resources A and B, has a lock on B, waiting for A.
  
  ‣ What will we do? What **will** we do!!?
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Deadlock
  ‣ Each Gamma Node has a Lock Manager that maintains a wait-for graph
    - One vertex ($V_i$) for each transaction
    - An edge from $V_i$ to $V_j$ means that $V_i$ is blocked and waiting for a resource that $V_j$ is holding (has locked).
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Deadlock

  › Deadlock - mutual waiting, the dreaded deadly embrace

  - Transaction $T_1$ needs resources A, and B, has a lock on A, waiting for B at $T_2$.

  - Transaction $T_2$ needs resources A and B, has a lock on B, waiting for A at $T_1$.

  › Combine the pieces into one wait-for graph to detect deadlock.
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Deadlock

  ‣ Combine the pieces into one wait-for graph to detect cycles and therefore deadlock.

  ‣ Gamma does this across many nodes.

  - Lock Managers periodically exchange wait-for graphs with a central node who stitches them together for central deadlock detection.
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Deadlock
  ‣ One we’ve detected deadlock, what do we do?
Transactions

• Concurrency Control - Deadlock
  ‣ One we’ve detected deadlock, what do we do?
  ‣ Kill (roll back) the transaction that’s holding the fewest locks.
Transactions

- Concurrency Control - Deadlock
  - One we’ve detected deadlock, what do we do?
  - Kill (roll back) the transaction that’s holding the fewest locks.
  - This unclogs the wait-for graph and lets the other transactions proceed.
Transactions

• Log Manager

› When an operator process updates a record it generates a log record that contains . . .
  - LSL: Log Sequence Number
  - Before Image of the data
  - After Image of the data
Transactions

• Log Manager

  ‣ Log records are sent to Log Manager processes at various nodes where they are collected, merged, and written to disk a page at a time.

  ‣ This process seems pretty fragile to me and I’m not convinced it worked.

  - Jim Gray had this figured out and documented in his famous paper 1981 paper “The Recovery Manager of the System R Database Manager”.
Transactions

• Recovery

  ‣ Log records can be read by the Log Manager and transactions “undone” in reverse LSN order, using before images.

  ‣ There’s more to do (checkpoints, write-ahead durability, and more). They were still working on it at the time this paper was written.

  - DeWitt published at least five papers with Jim Gray, one in 2005, the others in the early 1990s.
Transactions

- Failure Management

  - Gamma keeps a primary copy and a backup copy of each table.

  - Reads are serviced from the primary copy.

  - Writes update both copies.

    - I hope the data is (exclusive) locked until the primary copy is updated.
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Performance

- The authors conducted many benchmark experiments. Let’s look at two of the most interesting ones.

1. Constant number of processors (30), vary the number of tuples - Measure performance relative to table size.

2. Constant number of tuples (1M), vary the number of processors - Measure speed up / scale up
Performance

- 30 processors, variable tuples, 6 queries

### Selection Queries. 30 Processors with Disks (All Execution Times in Seconds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Description</th>
<th>Number of Tuples in Source Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using non-clustered index</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tuple select using clustered index</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- 30 processors, variable tuples, 6 queries

### Selection Queries. 30 Processors with Disks (All Execution Times in Seconds)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Description</th>
<th>Number of Tuples in Source Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using non-clustered index</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tuple select using clustered index</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- 30 processors, variable tuples, 6 queries
- Linear increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Description</th>
<th>Number of Tuples in Source Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using non-clustered index</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tuple select using clustered index</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- 30 processors, variable tuples, 6 queries
- Constant performance here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Description</th>
<th>Number of Tuples in Source Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using non-clustered index</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tuple select using clustered index</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- 30 processors, variable tuples, 6 queries
- Not constant performance here. Why?

**Selection Queries. 30 Processors with Disks (All Execution Times in Seconds)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query Description</th>
<th>Number of Tuples in Source Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% nonindexed selection</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% selection using clustered index</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% selection using non-clustered index</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single tuple select using clustered index</td>
<td><strong>0.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance

- 1M tuples, variable processors, 2 queries

- Query response time decreases as the number of nodes/processors increase.

- This is speed-up (or scale-up)
Performance

- 1M tuples, variable processors, 2 queries
- Same data expressed as speed-up.
- Why does the query with 10% selectivity speed up less?
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Summary

- David J. DeWitt’s *Gamma* was a big deal.
- A few projects/areas citing DeWitt, et al. [5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DB2 Parallel Edition</th>
<th>NUMA Clusters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IBM S/390 Parallel Sysplex</td>
<td>vehicular ad-hoc networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map-reduce</td>
<td>SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensor Networks</td>
<td>extensible web crawlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Mining, OLAP, and BI</td>
<td>parallel query processing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• David J. DeWitt’s Gamma was a big deal.
  ‣ In 1995, David was named a Fellow of the ACM and received the ACM SIGMOD Innovations Award for his contributions to the database field. [2]
Summary

• David J. DeWitt’s Gamma was a big deal.
  ‣ In 2009, the ACM recognized the seminal contributions of the Gamma parallel database system project with the ACM Software Systems Award. [2]
Summary

• Gamma was a fast, parallel, relational database that scaled with the number of processors and the size of the data and influenced many systems we still use today.

Questions? Comments?

Thank you for your attention.
Summary
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