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Parallel and Distributed Data Processing

- so far, one machine
- now: data and operation distribution

- Parallelism
  – performance

- Data distribution
  – increased availability, e.g. when a site goes down
  – distributed local access to data (e.g. an organization may have branches in several cities)
  – analysis of distributed data

Parallel vs. Distributed DBMS

Parallel DBMS

- Parallelization of various operations
  – e.g. loading data, building indexes, evaluating queries
- Data may or may not be distributed initially
- Distribution is governed by performance consideration

Distributed DBMS

- Data is physically stored across different sites
  – Each site is typically managed by an independent DBMS
- Location of data and autonomy of sites have an impact on Query opt., Conc. Control and recovery
- Also governed by other factors:
  – increased availability for system crash
  – local ownership and access
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### Why Parallel Access To Data?

At 10 MB/s
1.2 days to scan
1,000 x parallel
1.5 minute to scan.

Parallelism: divide a big problem into many smaller ones to be solved in parallel.

### Parallel DBMS

- Parallelism is natural to DBMS processing
  - Pipeline parallelism: many machines each doing one step in a multi-step process.
  - Data-partitioned parallelism: many machines doing the same thing to different pieces of data.
  - Both are natural in DBMS!

#### Parallel Pipeline

Pipeline

Parallel Data Partitioning

Outputs split N ways, inputs merge M ways

### DBMS: The parallel Success Story

- DBMSs are the most successful application of parallelism
  - Teradata (1979), Tandem (1974, later acquired by HP),...
  - Every major DBMS vendor has some parallel server

- Reasons for success:
  - Bulk-processing (= partition parallelism)
  - Natural pipelining
  - Inexpensive hardware can do the trick
  - Users/app-programmers don’t need to think in parallel

### Some \|\| Terminology

- **Speed-Up**
  - More resources means proportionally less time for given amount of data.

- **Scale-Up**
  - If resources increased in proportion to increase in data size, time is constant.

### Architecture for Parallel DBMS

- Among different computing units
  - Whether memory is shared
  - Whether disk is shared
**Basics of Parallelism**

- **Units**: a collection of processors
  - assume always have local cache
  - may or may not have local memory or disk (next)

- A communication facility to pass information among processors
  - a shared bus or a switch

**Shared Memory**

- **Interconnection Network**
  - Global Shared Memory
  - Shared memory

**Shared Disk**

- **Interconnection Network**
  - local memory
  - shared disk

**Shared Nothing**

- **Interconnection Network**
  - local memory and disk
  - no two CPU can access the same storage area
  - all communication through a network connection

---

**Architecture: At A Glance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Memory (SMP)</th>
<th>Shared Disk</th>
<th>Shared Nothing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLIENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLIENTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>CLIENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sequent, SGI, Sun</em></td>
<td><em>VMcluster, Sysplex</em></td>
<td><em>Tandem, Teradata, SP2</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Easy to program
- Expensive to build
- Low communication overhead: shared mem.
- Difficult to scale up (memory contention)
- Trade-off but still interference like shared-memory (contention of memory and nw bandwidth)
- Hard to program and design parallel algos
- Cheap to build
- Easy to scale up and speed up
- Considered to be the best architecture
- Considered to be the best architecture

**What Systems Worked This Way**

- **Shared Nothing**
  - Teradata: 400 nodes
  - Tandem: 110 nodes
  - IBM / SP2 / DB2: 126 nodes
  - Informix/SP2: 48 nodes
  - ATT & Sybase: ? nodes

- **Shared Disk**
  - Oracle DEC Hels: 170 nodes
  - 24 nodes

- **Shared Memory**
  - Informix RedBrick: 9 nodes
  - 7 nodes
Different Types of DBMS Parallelism

- Intra-operator parallelism
  - get all machines working to compute a given operation (scan, sort, join)
  - OLAP (decision support)

- Inter-operator parallelism
  - each operator may run concurrently on a different site (exploits pipelining)
  - For both OLAP and OLTP

- Inter-query parallelism
  - different queries run on different sites
  - For OLTP

We’ll focus on intra-operator parallelism

Data Partitioning

Horizontally Partitioning a table (why horizontal?):

- Range-partition
  - Good for equijoins, range queries, group-by
  - Can lead to data skew

- Hash-partition
  - Good for equijoins
  - But only if hashed on that attribute
  - Can lead to data skew

- Block-partition or Round Robin
  - Send i-th tuple to i-mod-n processor
  - Good to spread load
  - Good when the entire relation is accessed

Shared disk and memory less sensitive to partitioning, Shared nothing benefits from "good" partitioning.

Example

- R(Key, A, B)

  - Can Block-partition be skewed?
    - no, uniform

  - Can Hash-partition be skewed?
    - on the key: uniform with a good hash function
    - on A: may be skewed,
      - e.g. when all tuples have the same A-value

Parallelizing Sequential Evaluation Code

- "Streams" from different disks or the output of other operators
  - are "merged" as needed as input to some operator
  - are "split" as needed for subsequent parallel processing

- Different Split and merge operations appear in addition to relational operators

  - No fixed formula for conversion
  - Next: parallelizing individual operations

Parallel Scans

- Scan in parallel, and merge.

- Selection may not require all sites for range or hash partitioning
  - but may lead to skew
  - Suppose σ_{A=1}R and partitioned according to A
  - Then all tuples in the same partition/processor

- Indexes can be built at each partition

Parallel Sorting

Idea:

- Scan in parallel, and range-partition as you go
  - e.g. salary between 10 to 210, #processors = 20
  - salary in first processor: 10-20, second: 21-30, third: 31-40, ...

- As tuples come in, begin "local" sorting on each
- Resulting data is sorted, and range-partitioned
- Visit the processors in order to get a full sorted order
- Problem: skew!

  - Solution: "sample" the data at start to determine partition points.
Parallel Joins

- Need to send the tuples that will join to the same machine
  - also for GROUP-BY
- Nested loop:
  - Each outer tuple must be compared with each inner tuple that might join
  - Easy for range partitioning on join cols, hard otherwise
- Sort-Merge:
  - Sorting gives range-partitioning
  - Merging partitioned tables is local

Parallel Hash Join

- In first phase, partitions get distributed to different sites:
  - A good hash function automatically distributes work evenly
- Do second phase at each site.
- Almost always the winner for equi-join

Dataflow Network for parallel Join

- Good use of split/merge makes it easier to build parallel versions of sequential join code.

Parallel Aggregates

- For each aggregate function, need a decomposition:
  - \( \text{count}(S) = \sum \text{count}(s(i)) \), ditto for \( \text{sum}() \)
  - \( \text{avg}(S) = (\sum \text{sum}(s(i))) / \sum \text{count}(s(i)) \)
  - and so on...
- For group-by:
  - Sub-aggregate groups close to the source.
  - Pass each sub-aggregate to its group's site.
  - Chosen via a hash fn.

Best serial plan may not be best ||

- Why?
- Trivial counter-example:
  - Table partitioned with local secondary index at two nodes
  - Range query: all of node 1 and 1% of node 2.
  - Node 1 should do a scan of its partition.
  - Node 2 should use secondary index.

Examples
Example problem: Parallel DBMS

R(a, b) is horizontally partitioned across N = 3 machines.

Each machine locally stores approximately 1/N of the tuples in R.

The tuples are randomly organized across machines (i.e., R is block partitioned across machines).

Show a RA plan for this query and how it will be executed across the N = 3 machines.

Pick an efficient plan that leverages the parallelism as much as possible.

- SELECT a, max(b) as topb
- FROM R
- WHERE a > 0
- GROUP BY a

If more than one relation on a machine, then "scan S", "scan R" etc.

- Hash on a
- σ_{a > 0}
- scan
- Machine 1

- Hash on a
- σ_{a > 0}
- scan
- Machine 2

- Hash on a
- σ_{a > 0}
- scan
- Machine 3
Same Example Problem: Map Reduce

Explain how the query will be executed in MapReduce (recall Lecture-3)

- SELECT a, max(b) as topb
- FROM R
- WHERE a > 0
- GROUP BY a

Specify the computation performed in the map and the reduce functions

Map

- Each map task
  - Scans a block of R
  - Calls the map function for each tuple
  - The map function applies the selection predicate to the tuple
  - For each tuple satisfying the selection, it outputs a record with key = a and value = b

*When each map task scans multiple relations, it needs to output something like key = a and value = ('R', b) which has the relation name 'R'*

Shuffle

- The MapReduce engine reshuffles the output of the map phase and groups it on the intermediate key, i.e. the attribute a

Reduce

- Each reduce task
  - computes the aggregate value \( \text{max}(b) = \text{topb} \) for each group (i.e. a) assigned to it (by calling the reduce function)
  - outputs the final results: \((a, \text{topb})\)

A local combiner can be used to compute local max before data gets reshuffled (in the map tasks)

Note that the programmer has to write only the map and reduce functions, the shuffle phase is done by the MapReduce engine (although the programmer can rewrite the partition function), but you should still mention this in your answers

Multiple aggregates can be output by the reduce phase like key = a and value = (\text{sum}(b), \text{min}(b)) etc.

* Sometimes a second (third etc) level of Map-Reduce phase might be needed.
Benefit of hash-partitioning

- What would change if we hash-partitioned \( R \) on \( R.a \) before executing the same query on the previous parallel DBMS and MR

- First Parallel DBMS

...