Parallel Query Processing

R&G Chapters
22.1-22.4,

A little history

- Relational revolution
  - declarative set-oriented primitives
  - 1970’s
- Parallel relational database systems
  - on commodity hardware
  - 1980’s
- Big Data: MapReduce, Spark, etc.
  - scaling to thousands of machines and beyond
  - 2005-2015

Why Parallelism?

- Scan 100TB
  - At 0.5 GB/sec (see lec 4):
    ~200,000 sec = ~2.31 days

Why Parallelism? Cont.

- Scan 100TB
  - At 0.5 GB/sec (see lec 4):
    ~200,000 sec = ~2.31 days
- Run it 100-way parallel:
  - 2,000 sec = 33 minutes
- 1 big problem = many small problems
  - Trick: make them independent



Two Metrics to Shoot For

- Speed-up
  - Increase HW
  - Fix workload
- Scale-up
  - Increase HW
  - Increase workload





Roughly 2 Kinds of Parallelism



: any sequential program,
e.g. a relational operator



Pipeline
scales up to pipeline depth



Partition
scales up to amount of data

We'll get more refined soon.

Easy for us to say!

- Lots of Data:
  - Batch operations
  - Pre-existing divide-and-conquer algorithms
  - Natural pipelining

- Declarative languages
  - Can adapt the parallelism strategy to the task and the hardware
  - All without changing the program!
    - Codd’s Physical Data Independence

DBs: The Parallel Boy that Lived

- 1980s CS challenge: “parallelize” software
  - E.g. via awesome new C compilers
  - E.g. via variants of C designed for parallelism
- In broad terms, a failure
  - Dave Patterson: The “Dead Computer Society”
- Exception: Parallel SQL Databases
  - Why? **Data Independence!**
    - SQL is independent of how many machines you have!
    - The same divide-and-conquer that worked for disks works across machines, as we’ll see
- Big Data is the generalization of these lessons
  - Or in some cases a re-learning of them

Parallel Architectures

Shared Memory



Shared Disk



Shared Nothing
(cluster)



Some Early Systems

- Research
  - XPRS (Berkeley, shared-memory)
  - Gamma (Wisconsin, shared-nothing)
  - Volcano (Colorado, shared-nothing)
  - Bubba (MCC, shared-nothing)
  - Grace (U. Tokyo, shared-nothing)
- Industry
  - Teradata (shared-nothing)
  - Tandem Non-Stop SQL (shared-nothing)

This slide is FYI; will not be on exam

What about the cloud?

- Upshot: not so different from what we'll see here
- Architectural choices and competing systems jockeying for position
- Parallelism in many forms across many users and use cases
- Things still shaking out

Shared Nothing

- We will focus on Shared Nothing here
  - It's the most common
    - DBMS, web search, big data, machine learning, …
  - Runs on commodity hardware
  - Scales up with data
    - Just keep putting machines on the network!
  - Does not rely on HW to solve problems
    - Good for helping us understand what's going on
    - Control it in SW

Kinds of Query Parallelism

- Inter-query (parallelism across queries)
  - Each query runs on a separate processor
    - Single thread (no parallelism) per query
  - Does require parallel-aware concurrency control
    - A topic for later in the semester



- Note on latin prefixes
  - inter: “between”, “across”.
    “Interplanetary travel takes a long time”
  - intra: “within”.
    “The political party suffered from intraparty rivalries.”

Intra Query – Inter-operator

- Intra-query (within a single query)
  - Inter-operator (between operators)



Pipeline Parallelism

Intra Query – Inter-operator Part 2

- Intra-query
  - Inter-operator





Pipeline Parallelism

Intra Query - Inter-Operator Part 3

- Intra-query
  - Inter-operator





Pipeline Parallelism



Bushy (Tree) Parallelism

Intra Query – Intra-Operator

- Intra-query
  - Intra-operator (within a single operator)



Kinds of Query Parallelism, cont.

- Intra-query
  - Intra-operator





Partition Parallelism

Summary: Kinds of Parallelism

- Inter-Query



- Intra-Query
  - Inter-Operator



Pipeline Parallelism

  - Intra-Operator (partitioned)



Partition Parallelism

INTRA-OPERATOR PARALLELISM

Data Partitioning

- How to partition a table across disks/machines
  - A bit like coarse-grained indexing!



- Shared nothing particularly benefits from "good" partitioning

Parallel Scans

- Scan in parallel, merge (concat) output
- σ_p : skip entire sites that have no tuples satisfying p
  - range or hash partitioning
- Indexes can be built at each partition
- Q: How do indexes differ in the different data partitioning schemes?

Lookup by key

- Data partitioned on function of key?
  - Great! Route lookup only to relevant node
- Otherwise
  - Have to broadcast lookup (to all nodes)



What about Insert?

- Data partitioned on function of key?
  - Route insert to relevant node
- Otherwise
  - Route insert to *any* node



Insert to Unique Key?

- Data partitioned on function of key?
  - Route to relevant node
    - And reject if already exists



Insert to Unique Key cont.

- Otherwise
  - Broadcast lookup
  - Collect responses
  - If not exists, insert anywhere
    - Else reject



Remember Hashing?



Parallelize me! Hashing

- Phase 1: shuffle data across machines (hn)
  - streaming out to network as it is scanned
  - which machine for this record?
    - use (yet another) independent hash function hn



Parallelize me! Hashing Part 2

- Receivers proceed with phase 1 in a pipeline
  as data streams in
  - from local disk and network



Nearly same as single-node hashing

Near-perfect speed-up, scale-up! Streams through phase 1, during which time every component works at its top speed, no waiting.

Have to wait to start phase 2.

Hash Join?

- Hmmm….

If you have enough machines… Naïve parallel hash join

- Phase 1: *shuffle* each table across machines (h_n)
  - Parallel scan streaming out to network
  - Wait for building relation to finish
  - Then stream probing relation through it
- Receivers proceed with naïve hashing in a pipeline *as probe data streams in*
  - from local disk and network
  - Writes are independent, hence parallel

- Note: there is a variation that has *no waiting*: both tables stream
  - Wilschut and Apers' "Symmetric" or "Pipeline" hash join
  - Requires more memory space



Parallel Grace Hash Join Pass 1

- Pass 1 is like hashing above



Parallel Grace Hash Join Pass 1 cont

- Pass 1 is like hashing above
  - But do it 2x: once for each relation being joined



Parallel Grace Hash Join Pass 2

- Pass 2 is local Grace Hash Join per node
  - Complete independence across nodes



Parallel Grace Hash Join

- Pass 1: parallel streaming
  - Stream building and probing tables through shuffle/partition
- Pass 2 is local Grace Hash Join per node
  - Complete independence across nodes in Pass 2
- Near-perfect speed-up, scale-up!
- Every component works at its top speed
  - Only waiting is for Pass 1 to end.

- Note: there is a variant that has no waiting
  - Urhan's Xjoin, a variant of symmetric hash

Parallelize me! Sorting Pass 0

- Pass 0: shuffle data across machines
  - streaming out to network as it is scanned
  - which machine for this record?
    Split on value range (e.g. [-∞,10], [11,100], [101, ∞]).



Parallelize me! Sorting Pass 1-n

- Receivers proceed with pass 0 as the data streams in
- Passes 1–n done independently as in single-node sorting
- **A Wrinkle: How to ensure ranges are the same #pages?!**
  - **i.e. avoid data skew?**



Range partitioning

- Goal: equal frequency per machine
- Note: ranges often don’t divide x axis evenly
- How to choose?



Range partitioning cont.

- Would be easy if data small
- In general, can sample the input relation prior to shuffling, pick splits based on sample
- Note: Random sampling can be tricky to implement in a query pipeline; simpler if you materialize first.



How to sample a database table?
Advanced topic, we will not discuss in this class.

Parallel Sort-Merge Join

- Pass 0 .. n-1 are like parallel sorting above
- Note: this picture is a 2-pass sort (n=1); this is pass 0



Parallel Sort-Merge Join Pass 0…n-1

- Pass 0 .. n-1 are like parallel sorting above
  - But do it 2x: once for each relation, with same ranges
  - Note: this picture is a 2-pass sort (n=1); this is pass 0



Pass n (with optimization)

- Pass 0 .. n-1 are like parallel sorting above
  - But do it 2x: once for each relation, with same ranges
- Pass n: merge join partitions locally on each node



Parallel Aggregates

- Hierarchical aggregation
- For each aggregate function, need a global/local decomposition:
  - **sum**(S) = Σ Σ (s)
  - **count** = Σ **count** (s)
  - **avg**(S) = (Σ Σ (s)) / Σ **count** (s)
  - etc...



Parallel GroupBy

- Naïve Hash Group By
  - Local aggregation: in hash table keyed by group key k_i keep local agg_i
    - E.g. `SELECT SUM(price) group by cart;`



Parallel GroupBy, Cont.

- Naïve Hash Group By
  - Local aggregation: in hash table keyed by group key k_i keep local agg_i
    - For example, k is major, agg is (avg(gpa), count(*))
  - Shuffle local aggs by a hash function $h_p(k_i)$
  - Compute global aggs for each key k_i



Parallel Aggregates/GroupBy Challenge!

- Exercise:
  - Figure out parallel 2-pass GraceHash-based scheme to handle # large of groups
  - Figure out parallel Sort-based scheme



Joins: Bigger picture

- Alternatives:
  - Symmetric shuffle
    - What we did so far
  - Asymmetric shuffle
  - Broadcast join

Join: One-sided shuffle

- If R already suitably partitioned,
- just partition S, then run local join at every node and union results.



“Broadcast” Join

- If R is small, send it to all nodes that have a partition of S.
- Do a local join at each node (using any algorithm) and union results.



What are “pipeline breakers”?

- Sort
  - Hence sort-merge join can’t start merging until sort is complete
- Hash build
  - Hence Grace hash join can’t start probing until hashtable is built
- Is there a join scheme that pipelines?

Symmetric (Pipeline) Hash Join

- Single-phase, streaming
- Each node allocates two hash tables, one for each side
- Upon arrival of a tuple of R:
  - Build into R hashtable by join key
  - Probe into S hashtable for matches and output any that are found
- Upon arrival of a tuple of S:
  - Symmetric to R!



Symmetric (Pipeline) Hash Join cont

- Why does it work?
  - Each output tuple is generated exactly once: when the second part arrives
- Streaming!
  - Can always pull another tuple from R or S, build, and probe for outputs
  - Useful for Stream query engines!

Extensions

- Parallel Symmetric Hash Join
  - Straightforward—part of the original proposal
  - Just add a streaming partitioning phase up front
  - As in naïve hash join
- Out-of-core Symmetric Hash Join
  - Quite a bit trickier. See the X-Join paper.
- Non-blocking sort-merge join
  - See the Progressive Merge Join paper



Parallel DBMS Summary

- Parallelism natural to query processing:
  - Both pipeline and partition
- Shared-Nothing vs. Shared-Mem vs. Shared Disk
  - Shared-mem easiest SW, costliest HW.
    - Doesn’t scale indefinitely
  - Shared-nothing cheap, scales well, harder to implement.
  - Shared disk a middle ground
    - For updates, introduces icky stuff related to concurrency control
- Intra-op, Inter-op, & Inter-query parallelism all possible.

Parallel DBMS Summary, Part 2

- Data layout choices important!
- Most DB operations can be done partition-parallel
  - Sort. Hash.
  - Sort-merge join, hash-join.
- Complex plans.
  - Allow for pipeline-parallelism, but sorts, hashes block the pipeline.
  - Partition parallelism achieved via bushy trees.

Parallel DBMS Summary, Part 3

- Transactions require introducing some new protocols
  - distributed deadlock detection
  - two-phase commit (2PC)
- 2PC not great for availability, latency
  - single failure stalls the whole system
  - transaction commit waits for the slowest worker
- More on this in subsequent lectures