

L10

Transactions, Concurrency, Recovery

Eugene Wu

Fall 2018

Overview

Why do we want transactions?

What guarantees do we want from transactions?

Why Transactions?

Concurrency (for performance)

N clients, no concurrency

1st client runs fast

2nd client waits a bit

3rd client waits a bit longer

Nth client walks away

N clients, concurrency

client 1 runs $x += y$

client 2 runs $x -= y$

what happens?

Can we prevent stepping on toes? *Isolation*

```
x += y
a1 = read(x)
b1 = read(y)
store(a1 + b1)
x -= y
a2 = read(x)
b2 = read(y)
store(a2 - b2)
```

```
x += y
a1 = read(x)
a2 = read(x)
b2 = read(y)
store(a2 - b2)
b1 = read(y)
store(a1 + b1)
```

Why Transactions?

What about 1 client, no concurrency?

Client runs big update query

`update set x += y`

Power goes out

What is the state of the database?

Why Transactions?

What about 1 client, no concurrency?

Client runs big update query

update set $x += y$

Aborts the query (e.g., ctrl-c)

What is the state of the database?

If an abort happens, can the database recover to something sensible? *Atomicity, Durability*

Transactions

Transaction: a sequence of actions

action = read object, write object, commit, abort

API between app semantics and DBMS's view

User's view

T1: begin $A = A + 100$ $B = B - 100$ END

T2: begin $A = 1.5 * A$ $A = 1.5 * B$ END

DBMS's logical view

T1: begin $r(A)$ $w(A)$ $r(B)$ $w(B)$ END

T2: begin $r(A)$ $w(A)$ $r(B)$ $w(A)$ END

Transaction Guarantees

Atomicity

users never see in-between xact state.
only see a xact's effects once it's committed

Consistency

database always satisfies ICs.
xacts move from valid database to valid database

Isolation:

from xact's point of view, it's the only xact running

Durability:

if xact commits, its effects *must persist*

Concepts

Concurrency Control

techniques to ensure **correct** results when running transactions concurrently

what does this mean?



Recovery

On crash or abort, how to get back to a consistent (**correct**) state?



The two are intertwined! The CC mechanism dictates the complexity of recovery!

What is Correct?

Serializability

Regardless of the interleaving of operations, end result same as a serial ordering

Schedule

One specific interleaving of the operations

Serial Schedules

Logical xacts

T1: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

T2: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

No concurrency (**serial 1**)

T1: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

T2:

r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

No concurrency (**serial 2**)

T1:

r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

T2: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

Are serial 1 and serial 2 equivalent?

More Example Schedules

Logical xacts

T1: r(A) w(A) r(A) w(B)

T2: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

Concurrency (bad)

T1: r(A) w(A) r(A) w(B)

T2: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

Concurrency (same as serial !)

T1: r(A) w(A) r(A) w(B)

T2: r(A) w(A) r(B) w(B)

Concepts

Serial schedule

single threaded model. no concurrency.

Equivalent schedule

the database state same at end of both schedules

Serializable schedule (gold standard)

equivalent to a serial schedule

SQL → R/W Operations

```
UPDATE    accounts
SET       bal = bal + 1000
WHERE     bal > 1M
```

Read all balances for every tuple

Update those with balances > 1000

Does the access method matter?

Why Serializable Schedule? Anomalies

Reading in-between (uncommitted) data

T1: R(A) W(A) R(B) W(B) abort

T2: R(A) W(A) commit

WR conflict or dirty reads

Reading same data gets different values

T1: R(A) R(A) W(A) commit

T2: R(A) W(A) commit

RW conflict or unrepeatable reads

Why Serializable Schedule? Anomalies

Stepping on someone else's writes

Tl: $W(A)$ $W(B)$ commit

T2: $W(A) \ W(B) \ \text{commit}$

WW conflict or lost writes

Notice: all anomalies involve writing to data that is read/written to.

If we track our writes, maybe can prevent anomalies

Conflict Serializability

What is a conflict?

For 2 operations, if run in different order, get different results

Conflict?	R	W
R	NO	YES
W	YES	YES

Conflict Serializability

def: possible to swap non-conflicting operations to derive a serial schedule.

∀ conflicting operations O_1 of T_1 , O_2 of T_2

O_1 always before O_2 in the schedule or

O_2 always before O_1 in the schedule

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)

Logical


Conflicts

16, 25, 26, 38, 47, 48

Logical

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)


Serializable



Logical

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)

Not Serializable



Conflict Serializability

Transaction Precedence Graph

Edge $T_i \rightarrow T_j$ if:


1. T_i read/write A before T_j writes A or
2. T_i writes some A before T_j reads A

If graph is acyclic (does not contain cycles) then conflict serializable!

Logical

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)


Serializable



Logical

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)


Serializable



Logical

	1	2	3	4
T1:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)
	5	6	7	8
T2:	R(A)	W(A)	R(B)	W(B)

Not Serializable



Fine, but what about COMMITing?

T1	R(A) W(A)	R(B) ABORT
T2	R(A) COMMIT	

Not recoverable

Promised T2 everything is OK. IT WAS A LIE.

T1	R(A) W(B) W(A)	ABORT
T2	R(A) W(A)	

Cascading Rollback.

T2 read uncommitted data → T1's abort undoes T1's ops & T2's

Lock-based Concurrency Control

Must get a shared(read) or exclusive(write) lock BEFORE op
 If other xact has lock, can get if lock table says so

YES

		T1	
	Allowed?	S	X
T2	S	Y	N
	X	N	N

Can this schedule happen?


T1	R(A)	W(A)		R(B)	ABORT
T2			R(A)	COMMIT	

Lock-based Concurrency Control

Two-phase locking (2PL)

Growing phase: acquire locks

Shrinking phase: release locks



Uh Oh, same problem

Lock-based Concurrency Control

Strict two-phase locking (Strict 2PL)

Growing phase: acquire locks

Shrinking phase: release locks

Hold onto locks until commit/abort



Why? Which problem does it prevent?

T1	R(A) W(B)	W(A)	ABORT
T2		R(A) W(A)	

Guarantees serializable schedules! Avoids cascading rollbacks!

HW 4 due Wednesday

beginning of class, hard copy (2:30pm)

sample final solutions up

some corrections to practice problem solutions

extra OH Friday – 5pm?

Final next Wednesday in class

Review

Issues

TR: dirty reads

RW: unrepeatable reads

WW: lost writes

Schedules

Equivalence

Serial

Serializable

Serializability

Conflict serializability

how to detect

Conflict Serializable Issues


Not recoverable

Cascading Rollback


Strict 2 phase locking

CRASH


Normal Execution




After a Crash



If DB did not say “OK, committed”



If T1 Committed and DB said “OK”



Recovery

Two properties: Atomicity, Durability

Assumption in class

Disk is safe. Memory is not.

Running strict-2PL

Need to account for

when pages are modified

when pages are flushed to disk

Recovery

Deal with 2 cases

When could uncommitted ops appear after crash?
wrote modified pages before commit

If T2 commits, what could make it not durable?
didn't write all changed pages to disk

Aborts and Undos

If Tx aborts, must undo all its actions

Ty that read Tx's writes must be aborted
(cascading abort)

Strict 2PL avoids cascading aborts

Use a log to know what actions to undo

1. $A = 1$
2. $B = 5$
3. $C = 10$
4. BEGIN T5
5. $A = 10$
6. $B = B + A$
7. $C = B - 2$
8. ABORT
9. undo 7
10. undo 6
- ...

Aborts and Undos

If Tx aborts, must undo all its actions

Ty that read Tx's writes must be aborted
(cascading abort)

Strict 2PL avoids cascading aborts

Use a log to know what actions to undo

On crash, abort all non-committed xacts

1. $A = 1$
2. $B = 5$
3. $C = 10$
4. BEGIN T5
5. $A = 10$
6. $B = B + A$
7. CRASH

Logs

Log is the *ground truth*

Log records

- writes: old & new value

- commit/abort actions

- xact id & xact's previous log record

Persist log records (write to disk) *before* data pages persisted

Is this enough?

Durability

OK scenario

T1 writes to A in memory

log record of write written to disk

start writing page with A to disk...

crash

T1 commits

Durability

OK scenario

T1 writes to A in memory

log record of write written to disk

crash

start writing page with A to disk...

T1 commits

Durability

Bad scenario

TI writes to A in memory

TI commits

log record of write and commit written to disk

start writing page with A to disk...

crash

Can undo help us?

Need to redo TI, otherwise no durability!

Durability

Worse scenario

TI writes to A in memory

TI commits

crash

log record of write and commit written to disk

start writing page with A to disk...

Can undo help us?

Can't redo TI, no durability! Shareholders mad

Logs

Log is the *ground truth*

Log records

writes: old & new value

commit/abort actions

xact id & xact's previous log record

Write ahead logging (WAL)

1. Persist log records (write to disk) *before* data pages persisted
2. Persist all log records *before* commit
3. Log is *ordered*, if record flushed, all previous records must be flushed

(1) guarantees UNDO info

(2) guarantees REDO info

Aries Recovery Algorithm

3 phases

Analyze the log to find status of all xacts

Committed or in flight?

Redo xacts that were committed

Now at the same state at the point of the crash

Undo partial (in flight) xacts

Recovery is *extremely* tricky and *must be correct*

Aries

T1 R(A) R(B) W(A)

COMMIT

T2

W(B)


CRASH

CRASH


1. A = 1
2. B = 5
3. begin T1
4. begin T2
5. A = A + 5
6. B = 10
7. commit

flush to disk

DISK



Aries: alternative flushing order



Aborts and Undos

T1 R(A) R(B) W(A)


COMMIT

T2


W(B)

CRASH

RAM



DISK



1. $A = 1$
2. $B = 5$
3. **begin T1**
4. **begin T2**
5. **$A = 1 + 5$**
6. **$B = 10$**
7. **commit T1**
8. redo op5
9. undo op6

Aborts and Undos

T1 R(A) R(B) W(A)


COMMIT

T2


W(B)

CRASH

RAM



DISK



1. $A = 1$
2. $B = 5$
3. **begin T1**
4. **begin T2**
5. **$A = 1 + 5$**
6. **$B = 10$**
7. **commit T1**
8. redo op5
9. undo op6

Summary

Recovery depends on what failures are tolerable

Buffer pool can write RAM pages to disk any time

Recover to the moment of the crash, then undo all non-committed operations

WAL protocol

Recovery Manager ensures durability and atomicity via redo and undo

You should know

What transactions/schedules/serializable are

Can identify conflict serializable schedules

Can identify schedule anomalies

Can identify strict 2PL executions

Understand WAL and what it provides

Given an executed schedule, and a log file, run the proper sequence of undo/redos