Parallel DBMSs: Motivation

- **Scalability**: Database is too large for a single node’s disk
- **Performance**: Exploit multiple cores/disks/nodes
- … while maintaining almost all other benefits of (R)DBMSs!

Three Paradigms of Parallelism

- **Shared-Disk Parallelism**
- **Shared-Memory Parallelism**
- **Shared-Nothing Parallelism**
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Shared-Nothing Parallelism

❖ Followed by almost all parallel DBMSs (and “Big Data” sys.)
❖ 1 master node orchestrates multiple worker nodes
❖ Need partitioned parallel implementation algorithms for relational op implementations and query proc.; modify QO

**Q:** If we give 10 workers (CPUs/nodes) for processing a query in parallel, will its runtime go down by a factor of 10? It depends!
(Access patterns of the query's operators, communication of intermediate data, relative startup overhead, etc.)

---

Shared-Nothing Parallelism: Outline

❖ Data Partitioning
❖ Parallel Operator Implementations
❖ Parallel Query Optimization
❖ Parallel vs “Distributed” DBMSs

---

Data Partitioning

❖ A part of ETL (Extract-Transform-Load) for database
❖ Typically, record-wise/horizontal partitioning (aka “sharding”)
❖ Three common schemes (given k machines):
  ❖ **Round-robin**: assign tuple i to machine i MOD k
  ❖ **Hashing-based**: needs partitioning attribute(s)
  ❖ **Range-based**: needs ordinal partitioning attribute(s)
❖ Tradeoffs: Round-robin often inefficient for parallel query processing (why?); range-based good for range queries but faces new kind of “skew”; hashing-based is most common
❖ **Replication** often used for more availability, performance
Parallel Scans and Select

- **Intra-operator parallelism** is our primary focus
  - Inter-operator and inter-query parallelism also possible!
- **Filescan:**
  - Trivial! Worker simply scans its partition and streams it
  - Apply selection predicate (if any)
- **Indexed:**
  - Depends on data partitioning scheme and predicate!
  - Same tradeoffs: Hash index vs B+ Tree index
  - Each worker can have its own (sub-)index
  - Master routes query based on “matching workers”

Parallel Sorting

- **Naive algorithm:** each worker sorts its own partition; master orchestrates merging of sorted runs
  - Parallelism is limited during merging phase!
- **Faster algorithm:** scan in parallel and *range partition* data
  - (most likely a repartitioning) on SortAttribute; each worker sorts its allotted range using regular EMS; result is sorted and conveniently range-partitioned!
  - **Potential issue:** skew in range partitioning; handled by roughly estimating distribution using **sampling**

Parallel Aggregates

- **Without Group By List:**
  - Trivial for MAX, MIN, COUNT, SUM, AVG (why?)
  - MEDIAN requires parallel sorting (why?)
- **With Group By List:**
  - Depending on AggFunc, pre-compute partial aggregates
  - Master assigns each worker some groups (hash partition)
  - Each worker communicates its partial aggregate for a group to corresponding assigned worker (aka “shuffle”)
  - Each worker finishes its groups’ aggregate computation

Parallel Project

- **Non-deduplicating Project:**
  - Trivial! Pipelined with Scans/Select
- **Deduplicating Project:**
  - Each worker deduplicates its partition on ProjectionList
  - If estimated output size is small (catalog?), workers communicate their result to master to finish deduplication
  - If estimated output size is too large for master’s disk, similar algorithm as Parallel Aggregate with Group By, except, there is no aggregation computation
Parallel Nested Loops Join

- Given two tables A and B and JoinAttribute for equi-join
- Repartition both A and B using range/hash partitioning on JoinAttribute (unless pre-partitioned on it!)
- Master assign partitions to workers
- Each worker applies BNLJ locally on its partitions
- Join output is simply union of local outputs
- If join is not equi-join, there might be a lot of communication between workers; worst-case: all-to-all for cross-product!

Parallel “Split” and “Merge” for Joins

- Repartitioning quite common for parallel (equi-)joins
- Functionality abstracted as two new “phy. ops”
  - **Split**: each worker sends a subset of its partition to another worker based on master’s command (hash/range)
  - **Merge**: each worker unions subsets sent to it by others and constructs its assigned (re)partitioned subset
- Useful for parallel BNLJ, Sort-Merge Join, and Hash Join

Parallel Sort-Merge and Hash Join

- For SMJ, split is on ranges of (ordinal) JoinAttribute; for HJ, split is on hash function over JoinAttribute
- Worker i does local join of Ai and Bi using SMJ or HJ

Improved Parallel Hash Join

- Two-phase parallel HJ to improve performance
- **Idea**: Previous version hash partitions JoinAttribute to k (same as # of workers); instead, decouple the two and do a two-stage partitioning: partition phase and join phase
  - **Partition Phase**: WLOG, let |A| < |B|; divide A and B into k’ partitions using h1() such that each F x |Ai| < Cluster RAM
  - **Join Phase**: Repartition an Ai into k partitions using h2(); build hash table on new Aij at worker j as tuples arrive; repartition Bi using h2(); do HJ locally for Aij and Bij; do the same for each i
- Uses all k workers for join of each subset pair $A_i \bowtie B_i$
Parallel Query Optimization

❖ Far more complex than single-node QO!
❖ I/O cost, CPU cost, and communication cost for each phy. op.
❖ Space of PQPs explodes: each node can have its own different local sub-plan (e.g., filescan v indexed)
❖ Pipeline parallelism and partitioned parallelism can be interleaved in complex ways!
❖ Join order enumeration affected: bushy trees can be good!
❖ … (we will skip more details)

Parallel vs “Distributed” DBMSs

❖ A parallel DBMS can be built on top of a distributed file system
   ❖ Can handle dozens of nodes (Gamma, Teradata, etc.)
❖ A “distributed” DBMS: collection of “independent” DBMSs
   ❖ Quirk of terminology; “federated” DBMS more accurate
   ❖ Each base DBMS can be at a different location!
   ❖ Each DBMS might host a subset of the database files
   ❖ Might need to ship entire files for distributed QP
   ❖ … (we will skip more details)
❖ These days: “Polystores,” federated DBMSs on steroids!
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Beyond RDBMSs: A Brief History

❖ Relational model and RDBMSs are too restrictive:
   1. “Flat” tables with few data/attribute types
   2. Restricted language interface (SQL)
   3. Need to know schema first!
   4. Optimized for static dataset
❖ Object-Relational DBMSs: UDT, UDFs, text, multimedia, etc.
   1. PL/SQL; recursive SQL; embedded SQL; QBE; visual interfaces
   2. “Schema-later” semi-structured XML data model; XQuery
   3. Stream data model; “standing” queries; time windows
So, why did people still need to look beyond RDBMSs?

Beyond RDBMSs: A Brief History

- The DB community got blindsided by the unstoppable rise of the Web/Internet giants!

- DB folks underappreciated 4 key concerns of Web folks:
  - Developability
  - Fault Tolerance
  - Elasticity
  - Cost/Politics!

DB/Enterprise vs. Web Dichotomy

- DB folks underappreciated 4 key concerns of Web folks:
  - **Developability**: RDBMS extensibility mechanisms (UDTs, UDFs, etc.) are too painful to use for programmers!
    - **DB companies**: we write the software and sell to our customers, viz., enterprise companies (banks, retail, etc.)
    - **Web companies**: we will hire an army of software engineers to build own in-house software systems!
  - **Fault Tolerance**: What if we run on 100Ks of machines?!
    - **DB companies**: our customers do not need more than a few dozen machines to store and analyze their data!
    - **Web companies**: we need hundreds of thousands of machines for planetary-scale Web services!
    - *If a machine fails, user should not have to rerun entire query! DBMS should take care of fault tolerance, not user/appl.*
  - Need simpler APIs and DBMSs that scale custom programs
DB/Enterprise vs. Web Dichotomy

- DB folks underappreciated 4 key concerns of Web folks:
  - **Elasticity**: Resources should adapt to “query” workload
    - **DB companies**: our customers have “fairly predictably” sized datasets and workloads; can fix their clusters!
    - **Web companies**: our workloads could vary widely and the datasets they need vary widely!
      - Need to be able to **upsize** and **downsize** clusters easily on-the-fly, based on current query workload
  - **Cost/Poltics**: Commercial RDBMS licenses too costly!
    - **DB companies**: our customers have $$!
    - **Web companies**: our products are mostly free (ads?); why pay so much $$ if we can build our own DBMSs?
      - Many started with MySQL (!) but then built their own DBMSs
      - New tools were free & open source: led to viral adoption!

Cool, so, these new systems jolted the DB folks from being smug and complacent!
But what is “Big Data”?

“Big Data”

- Marketing term; think “Big” as in “Big Oil”, not “big building”
- Wikipedia says: “Data that is so large and complex that existing toolkits [read RDBMSs!] are not adequate [hah!]”
- Typical characterization by 3 Vs:
  - **Volume**: larger-than-RAM; >= TBs, even Exabytes!
  - **Variety**: relations, webpages, docs, tweets, multimedia, etc.
  - **Velocity**: high generation rate, e.g., sensors, surveillance, etc.
Why “Big Data” now? 1. Applications

- New “data-driven mentality” in almost all applications:
  - **Web**: search, e-commerce, e-mails, social media
  - **Science**: satellite imagery, CERN’s LHC, document corpora
  - **Medicine**: pharmacogenomics, precision medicine
  - **Logistics**: sensors, GPS, “Internet of Things”
  - **Finance**: high-throughput trading, monitoring
  - **Humanities**: digitized books/literature, social media
  - **Governance**: e-voting, targeted campaigns, NSA

...
What is MapReduce?


- Programming model for writing data-parallel programs +
  distributed system architecture for processing large data
- **Map** and **Reduce** are terms/ideas from functional PL
- Engineer only implements the “logic” of Map and Reduce
- Libraries in Java, C++, etc. handle orchestration of data
  distribution, parallelization, etc. “under the covers”

*Was radically easier for engineers to write programs with!*

---

How MapReduce Works

- Parallel flow of control and data upon running the MapReduce program:

  Each “Mapper” and “Reducer” is a separate process; parallel!
  Fault tolerance achieved using **data replication**

---

SQL Strikes Back!

**Q:** How would you do the word counting in RDBMS / in SQL?

**First step:** **Transform** text docs into relations and load (how?)

Part of a stage called **Extract-Transform-Load (ETL)**

Suppose we pre-divide each document into words and
have the schema: **DocWords** (DocName, Word)

**Second step:** a single, simple SQL query!

```
SELECT Word, COUNT(*)
FROM  DocWords
GROUP BY Word
ORDER BY Word
```

Parallelism, scaling, etc. done
by RDBMS “under the covers”
What is Hadoop then?

- Open-source impl. of Google’s ideas; includes MapReduce model and a distributed file system (HDFS)
- **Summary:** User writes logic of Map and Reduce functions in API; input splitting, data distribution, shuffling, fault tolerance, etc. all handled by the Hadoop library “under the covers”
- Exploded in popularity! 100s of papers, 10s of products!

*A real “revolution” in scalable data processing that took the DB community by surprise!*

“Young Turks” vs. “Old Guard”? **Swift and scathing rebuttal from MapReduce/Hadoop world!**

1. A giant step backward in the programming paradigm for large-scale data intensive applications
2. A sub-optimal implementation, in that it uses brute force instead of indexing
3. Not novel at all: it represents a specific implementation of well known techniques developed nearly 25 years ago
4. Missing most of the features that are routinely included in current DBMSs
5. Incompatible with all of the tools DBMS users have come to depend on

DBMSs too high-level/hard to use for low-level text ETL

Meant for “offline” fault-tolerant workloads on cheap nodes

Google awarded a patent for MapReduce (ahem)!

MapReduce/Hadoop not meant to be an RDBMS replacement

A Spectacular “War of the Worlds”

- No declarativity!
- Filescan-based!
- DeWitt’s work on parallel DBMSs!
- Cheap rip-off of RDBMSs!

Enter Hybrid Systems!

- **Clever DB researchers:** “Let’s get the best of both worlds!”
- Numerous projects on hybrid systems in industry/academia:

  **Programming model-level:** Bring declarativity from RDBMS world to MapReduce/Hadoop world

  - SQL dialect over Hadoop
  - Dataflow language over Hadoop

  **Systems-level:** Intermix system implementation ideas

  - HadoopDB from Yale U.
  - Microsoft Polybase
"Big Data" Systems

- Parallel RDBMSs
- Beyond RDBMSs: A Brief History
- "Big Data" Systems
  - The MapReduce/Hadoop Craze
  - **Spark and Other Dataflow Systems**
  - Key-Value NoSQL Systems
  - Graph Processing Systems
  - Advanced Analytics/ML Systems

Spark from UC Berkeley

- Extended dataflow programming model (subsumes most of RA: MapReduce); system (re)designed from ground up
- **Agenda**: Unified system to handle relations, text, etc.; support more general distributed data processing
- Tons of sponsors, gazillion bucks, unbelievable hype!
- **Key idea**: exploit distributed memory to cache data
- **Key novelty**: lineage-based fault tolerance, not replication
- Open-sourced to Apache; commercialized as Databricks

What does Spark have?


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>map(f : T → U)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filter(f : T → Bool)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flatMap(f : T → Seq[U])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sample(n: Int, frac: Float)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>groupByKey()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduceByKey(f : (V, V) → V)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>union()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cogroup()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crossProduct()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapValues(f : V → W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sortByKey(order: String, numPartitions: Int)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partitionBy(k : Partitioner[K])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>RDD[T]</th>
<th>RDD[U]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count()</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce(f : (T, T) → T)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lookup(k : K)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saveAsPath(path : String)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spark has libraries for Python, Scala, and Java

```
from pyspark import SparkContext
from operator import add

sc = SparkContext()

text_file = sc.textFile("hdfs://.../")
counts = text_file.flatMap(lambda line: line.split(" "))
  .map(lambda word: (word, 1))
  .reduceByKey(add)

counts.saveAsTextFile("hdfs://...")
```

SparkSQL offers an SQL-like front-end
The Berkeley Data Analytics Stack (BDAS)

Spark-based Ecosystem of Tools

How does Spark work?


Databricks is basically building yet another parallel RDBMS! 😊

Reinventing the Wheel?

Other Dataflow Systems

❖ Stratosphere/Apache Flink from TU Berlin
❖ Myria from U Washington
❖ AsterixDB from UC Irvine
❖ Azure Data Lakes from Microsoft
❖ …

Building such “Big Data” systems is (was?) one of the hottest topics in both industry and academia

My bias: Lot of system building; not sure of “research novelty”
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