

The University of New South Wales
COMP9315 DBMS Implementation
Final Exam 14s2

[\[Instructions\]](#) [\[Notes\]](#) [\[PostgreSQL\]](#) [\[C\]](#)
[\[Q1\]](#) [\[Q2\]](#) [\[Q3\]](#) [\[Q4\]](#) [\[Q5\]](#) [\[Q6\]](#) [\[Q7\]](#) [\[Q8\]](#)

Question 8 (11 marks)

In multi-version concurrency control, transactions are allocated a timestamp (their start-time) and tuples are tagged with additional fields that hold information about the timestamp of the transaction that last read/wrote the tuple.

- $TS(T)$ = start time of transaction T
- $WTS(X)$ = TS of last transaction that wrote X
- $RTS(X)$ = TS of last transaction that read X

Consider the following schedule:

	t_0	t_1	t_2	t_3	t_4	t_5	t_6
T1:		R(X)		W(X)		Commit	
T2:			W(X)		Commit		

Assume the following:

- $TS(T1) = t_1$ and $TS(T2) = t_2$
 - the initial value of X is 1 and its WTS and RTS are both t_0
 - the value of X that $T1$ writes is 10 and the value of X that $T2$ writes is 5
- Is the schedule conflict serializable?
(Do not attempt to put a graph in your `q8.txt` file; you could draw it on your worksheet and describe your working in words in `q8.txt`.)
 - Is the schedule view serializable?
 - For each of the time-points t_0, t_1, t_2, t_3 , show the versions of X that exist and show their RTS and WTS values
 - If a transaction commences at t_6 , which version of X does it see?
 - Under most concurrency control schemes, $T1$ would be rolled back when it attempts to write X , and the final version of X would be the value written by $T2$ (which is what it should be). If MVCC allows the write to proceed, discuss briefly whether this will cause problems?

Instructions:

- Type your answer to this question into the file called `q8.txt`
- Submit via: **submit q8**

End of Question