

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO PARALLEL GIS PROCESSING

by

Nathan Thomas Kerr

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

August 2009

ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO PARALLEL GIS PROCESSING

by

Nathan Thomas Kerr

has been approved

August 2009

Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Dr. Daniel Stanzione, Chair

Dr. Robert Pahle

Dr. Yi Chen

ACCEPTED BY THE GRADUATE COLLEGE

ABSTRACT

Abstract goes here

Dedication goes here

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Acknowledgments go here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| LIST OF TABLES | viii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | ix |
| CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 1.1 Parallel GIS Processing | 2 |
| 1.2 Alternative Approaches to Parallel GIS Processing | 4 |
| CHAPTER 2 RELATED WORK | 6 |
| 2.1 Current Methods | 6 |
| 2.2 Attempted solutions | 6 |
| 2.2.1 Parallel Databases | 7 |
| 2.3 Problems with Desktop Programs on Clusters | 7 |
| 2.4 GIS libraries | 8 |
| 2.5 Serial and Parallel Shared-Memory Applications | 9 |
| 2.6 Parallel Distributed-Memory Applications | 10 |
| 2.6.1 Parallel Databases | 11 |
| 2.6.2 Parallel GRASS GIS | 12 |
| CHAPTER 3 REQUIREMENTS | 14 |
| 3.1 Standard Geospatial Operations | 14 |
| 3.2 Batch Mode Processing | 14 |
| 3.3 Scalable | 14 |
| 3.4 Ease of Use | 15 |
| CHAPTER 4 DESIGN | 16 |
| 4.1 HadoopGIS | 16 |
| 4.2 ClusterGIS | 17 |
| CHAPTER 5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP | 18 |
| 5.1 Standard Geospatial Operations | 18 |
| 5.2 Batch Mode Processing | 18 |
| 5.3 Scalability | 18 |
| 5.3.1 Operation set | 18 |
| 5.3.2 Dataset Description | 20 |
| 5.3.3 Required Runs | 21 |
| 5.4 Execution Environment | 21 |
| 5.5 PostGIS Implementation | 21 |
| 5.5.1 Create | 21 |

| | | |
|--------------|------------------------------------|----|
| 5.5.2 | Read | 21 |
| 5.5.3 | Update | 21 |
| 5.5.4 | Destroy | 22 |
| 5.5.5 | Filter | 22 |
| 5.5.6 | Nearest | 22 |
| 5.5.7 | Chaining | 22 |
| 5.6 | HadoopGIS Implementation | 22 |
| 5.6.1 | Create | 22 |
| 5.6.2 | Read | 23 |
| 5.6.3 | Update | 23 |
| 5.6.4 | Destroy | 23 |
| 5.6.5 | Filter | 23 |
| 5.6.6 | Nearest | 23 |
| 5.6.7 | Chaining | 23 |
| 5.7 | ClusterGIS | 23 |
| 5.7.1 | Create | 24 |
| 5.7.2 | Read | 24 |
| 5.7.3 | Update | 24 |
| 5.7.4 | Destroy | 24 |
| 5.7.5 | Filter | 24 |
| 5.7.6 | Nearest | 25 |
| 5.7.7 | Chaining | 25 |
| CHAPTER 6 | RESULTS | 26 |
| 6.1 | Performance Analysis | 26 |
| 6.2 | Comparisons | 26 |
| CHAPTER 7 | CONCLUSION | 27 |
| 7.1 | Future Work | 27 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | | 28 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 5.1 OGC Methods by Number of Required Geometries | 19 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 2.1 | Shared-Memory Machine Architecture | 9 |
| 2.2 | Distributed-Memory Machine Architecture | 10 |

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

Geographic Information Systems (GIS) were designed to model aspects of the world around us. From roads to temperature, GIS data can be used to represent a large range of real-world objects, allowing for sophisticated analysis and processing. Data is usually stored as raster or vector data. Raster data represents the world as a grid, with each grid cell containing attributes associated with that area. The grid is georeferenced and has a specific resolution, which is the amount of space each grid cell represents. Vector data is comprised of a set of geometries such as points, lines, or polygons that are georeferenced. Popular forms of georeferencing include latitude and longitude, zip codes, and street addresses.

The implementations used in this thesis only deal with vector data, though the principles discussed can be applied to other data types.

GIS analysis and simulation are used to understand and develop the environment around us. A common use of GIS data is found in the GPS based car navigation systems common today. City planners will use GIS data in applications such as population growth models, land use planning, and traffic management.

The amount of data to be processed increases as populations grow, communities become more complex, or the size of the processing area grows. In the year 2000, Maricopa County, Arizona, mapped 1.2 million parcels of land in its 9,224 square miles of land. Each parcel of land is represented as a georeferenced polygon along with various attribute data such as a unique parcel id, ownership information, and zoning codes. Parcels of land is just one layer of data that is kept for Maricopa County. Other layers include roadways, railways, rivers, schools, voting districts, etc.

When the data required to complete some GIS processing grows beyond the memory available to a single processor, the processing method must be adapted to fit within that

limitation. A common method is to not load the entire dataset into memory, but to read it off disk as needed and not keep what is not. This method works well if the data is only needed once, as reading from disk is slow.

One application, which is looked at in more detail later, associates businesses with parcels of land (the data was geocoded differently). The algorithm is quite simple: for each business, find the nearest parcel of land with a compatible zoning code. In Maricopa County in the year 2000, there were 34,302 businesses and 1,218,130 parcels of land. While these particular datasets fit into memory today, they did not just a few years ago. Given increased parcel density, or a larger area of land, the memory capabilities of a standard computer are quickly reached. While there are specially made computers with extraordinarily large amounts of memory, they are also extraordinarily expensive.

In addition to memory limitations, the processor also limits the processing that can be done. In this case 41,784,295,260 comparisons between businesses and parcels is made. If a computer is able to make one million comparisons per second, the processing will take approximately 11 hours, 37 minutes. A factor increase in speed to ten million comparisons per second reduces the time to 1 hour 10 minutes. If only there was a single computer that would perform 100 billion of these comparisons per second, then the processing would be done in less than half a second!

As an infinitely fast computer with infinite memory does not exist, more effort is required to perform this processing in a reasonable time.

1.1 Parallel GIS Processing

Using multiple interconnected computers together to complete the required GIS processing allows for increased memory capabilities along with increased computation power. Processing algorithms must be reworked to allow for this collaboration between comput-

ers.

Programming for multiple machines is not the easiest of tasks. A common paradigm is Single Program, Multiple Data[?] (SPMD), uses a single program that is run on all the computers included in the parallel computations where each instance of the program operates on different data, for example a different set of businesses. This paradigm simplifies parallel algorithm complexity while providing enough power to increase memory capability and computation power.

The first step in working with an SPMD program is splitting the data. GIS data can be split in several different ways. The specific data splitting method used is dependent on what data is needed on what machine. As GIS vector data is based on a record that contains a geometry with associated attributes, one method that can be used is to evenly distribute the records among the participating machines. Another method takes into account the varying size of geometries in memory by splitting the data up by size while taking into account record boundaries. Another class of data distribution is to geographically split up the dataset, for instance into quadrants with each machine having responsibility for one or more quadrants. This method is more complicated in the setup required and the exceptions that need to be handled such as how to handle geometries that span more than one quadrant.

After the data is distributed, the processing methodology often needs to be adjusted because access to the full dataset at once is no longer possible. Combined with the data distribution, these two additions are needed for a parallel implementation, but not the serial case. This is the overhead required by the parallel case.

Parallel performance is measured through speedup:

$$\text{speedup}(n) = \text{time}(n)/\text{time}(1) \quad (1.1)$$

which compares the execution time of the process on n processors to the execution time on 1 processor. Ideal speedup is n . The quality of speedup gained is efficiency:

$$\text{efficiency}(n) = \text{speedup}(n)/n \quad (1.2)$$

Ideal efficiency is 1.

The scalability of a parallel solution can be seen by graphing speedup by number of processors used. The best realistic case is to have linear scalability, meaning that speedup is directly proportional to the number of processing elements used.

1.2 Alternative Approaches to Parallel GIS Processing

This thesis implements and evaluates two parallel, dataset centric approaches to processing large geospatial datasets on clusters. The first approach, called HadoopGIS, uses the Hadoop[1] map/reduce framework. The second approach, ClusterGIS, uses the more traditional approach to programming for clusters, MPI. Both approaches provide the geospatial operations required by the Open Geospatial Consortium's Simple Features[2] standard. By applying data parallel programming methods and dispensing with record centric processing methods, both these methods create a fairly easy environment to program in while providing significant speedup and scaleup.

HadoopGIS adds GIS capabilities to the Hadoop map/reduce framework. Hadoop is based on Google's MapReduce[3]. Map reduce defines a two-phase method to working with data. The first phase, map, applies a function to every record in a data set. The map function can output one or more key-value pairs. Map is an inherently parallel process, as no record is need to process any other record.

After the map phase, the generated key-value pairs are aggregated by key and passed to reduce processes, one reduce process per key. There are generally many fewer reduce

operations as compared to map operations. Reduce operations are inherently serial, as the operation must have access to all the key-value pairs associated with the key being processed.

ClusterGIS is a library of functions based on MPI[?] and the GEOS[?] library. MPI is a message passing interface standard that allows multiple computers to collaborate on solving a problem by passing messages between themselves. GEOS is an open source geometry engine that handles the geometric calculations required by GIS processing. The combination of MPI and GEOS creates a cluster based, parallel GIS processing environment.

MPI has become the standard way of programming for clusters. Because ClusterGIS harnesses the power of MPI, a wide variety of parallel algorithms and configurations can be made, while maintaining the ability to execute on most clusters.

The rest of this thesis is organized as follows: Chapter 2 explores related efforts in GIS processing. Chapter 3 then defines the specific requirements needed for a good parallel GIS processing engine. Chapter 4 details the design choices for HadoopGIS and ClusterGIS. Chapter 5 defines a set of tests and list individual results. Chapter 6 evaluates the two implementations by comparing performance results against the requirements defined in chapter 3. Chapter 8 summarizes conclusions drawn from the evaluation.

CHAPTER 2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Current Methods

Desktop GIS packages such as ArcGIS[4], QuantumGIS[5], and GRASS GIS[6] are commonly used for GIS processing and analysis. While these programs provide graphical interfaces to their GIS capabilities, their capabilities are limited by the computers they run on. Datasets can be too large for their memories and computations can take too long to be practical. The popular urban simulation package, UrbanSim[7] faces these same constraints.

An alternative approach to using these desktop programs is to employ a geospatial database like PostGIS[8], ArcSDE[9] or Oracle Spatial[10]. Geospatial databases allow centralized access to, and processing of, geospatial data through query languages such as SQL. As data is stored and managed by the database software, advanced database features such as indexes can be utilized to speedup data access and processing.

PostGIS is utilized as the core component of the Urban Systems Framework[11] (USF) designed by the Digital Phoenix[12] project group at Arizona State University. Digital Phoenix tries to integrate 3D visualization technology with simulated and gathered GIS data to better understand the impacts of urban planning decisions.

2.2 Attempted solutions

Attempts have been made to overcome the limitations of single machine implementations. Of primary interest are those extending current methods to use multiple computers.

2.2.1 Parallel Databases

One method of using multiple computers to perform the required processing is the use of parallel databases[13]. Parallel databases should be able to spread both data storage and processing across multiple computers transparently from the view of the SQL query programmer. Parallel database techniques have been used to build a scalable geospatial database system[14, 15].

Data is spread between computers using round-robin, hash, or spatial partitioning. Because the data is able to be distributed between multiple computers, the processing is able to scale to larger datasets. When a query is processed across the database, a thread is created for each fragment of the data. Thus as the data grows larger, the processing capabilities of the system also increase.

Databases excel at working with indexed data while allowing multiple users to interact with the data in a concurrently safe manner through the use of atomic transactions. The requirements placed upon database systems to handle these situations slow down computations that don't utilize indexes or work on an entire dataset at once. The processing operations this research examines do not require these restrictions, and as such a more efficient system can be created.

2.3 Problems with Desktop Programs on Clusters

Current desktop approaches to GIS processing such as ArcGIS are unable to make use of the multi-machine processing environment that compute clusters provide. While reworking these programs to utilize these extended resources is possible, it is non-trivial. GRASS GIS was reworked[16] to use its collaboration features to distribute sub-queries among computers. The method described in this paper utilizes multiple instances of GRASS in a master-slave configuration where all participants access a shared data repository or

filesystem. The geometries are portioned between the various nodes. Operations are done on the subsets, and the results are merged to produce the final result.

While the method used to extend GRASS GIS will in fact speed up GIS processing, it has two flaws. First, GRASS is designed to be used in an interactive mode rather than a batch or script driven approach. Second, the entire set of data used must still fit on a single computer to move it in or out of the environment.

GIS processing is not new, and a large body of work exists to draw from. Here I discuss a few aspects of that body of work that are most applicable to this thesis. I start with the programmer's view of GIS - libraries. Then I move to serial and parallel shared-memory programs. Then I move to work done on parallel, distributed memory implementations. The main goal of parallel applications is to make use of multiple processors to complete the required processing more quickly. In short, the processors must work together to complete a single processing operation.

2.4 GIS libraries

The Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) defined a core set of geospatial processing operations in their Simple Features[2] standard. These core operations allow for most geospatial processing needs. One of the main libraries that provides these operations and related data types is the Java Topology Suite[?] (JTS). Though written in Java, the JTS has been used as the basis for ports into other languages. The Geometry Engine, Open Source (GEOS) library is a C++ port of the JTS that also provides a C interface. PostGIS is implemented using the GEOS library. The NetTopologySuite[?] (NTS) is a port of the JTS into .NET.

As quality libraries are available for a variety of languages, there is no need to re-implement the functionality they provide. This thesis makes direct use of the JTS and

Figure 2.1: Shared-Memory Machine Architecture

GEOS libraries.

2.5 Serial and Parallel Shared-Memory Applications

Computer programs are executed by processors. The simplest of programs is made up of a series of operations that are executed in order by the processor. As this type of application is comprised by a series of operations it is known as a serial program. Serial programs are not able to take advantage of more than one processor. To utilize more than one processor at a time, a set of serial programs that can communicate with each other is required. Each serial program in this set is referred to as a thread. Thus multi-threaded programs can utilize more than one processing core. The simplest method of communication between threads is to share a common section of memory. Therefore a parallel shared-memory application could utilize at most the number of processors able to be connected to a single section of memory.

Both serial and parallel shared-memory applications are limited to a single computer, where computer means a group of processors that are connected to the same memory. Most modern computers provide this capability.

The wide variety of desktop GIS processing applications such as ESRI's ArcGIS[4], QuantumGIS[5] and GRASS GIS[6] work on shared memory machines. While these programs provide GIS processing capabilities and graphical user interfaces, they are limited to working on a shared memory. Thus they are limited to a single computer's memory and processing capabilities.

Geospatial databases such as PostGIS[8] and ArcSDE[9] also work on shared-memory machines, but with the intent of sharing the processing capabilities of the machine they

Figure 2.2: Distributed-Memory Machine Architecture

run on. Because of my work on the Urban Systems Framework[11] (USF), I am most familiar with PostGIS. PostGIS is able to execute multiple queries at one time, but no single query uses more than one thread. Even if these databases could utilize all the processing capabilities of the computer to execute one query, they would still be limited to a single machine.

2.6 Parallel Distributed-Memory Applications

To overcome the limitations of a single computer, the more scalable architecture of a parallel distributed-memory machine was created. The basic unit of this architecture is a processing element (PE) comprised of one or more processors couple with memory. In other words, a PE is a shared-memory machine. The PEs are interconnected using some sort of networking technology. This architecture scales as well as the interconnect does. Common interconnect technologies in use today are Gigabit-Ethernet and InfiniBand. Clusters are parallel distributed-memory machines.

For a program to run on a parallel distributed-memory machine, it must be able to work with multiple thread of operation where communication between the threads goes over the interconnect. For the purposes of discussion, threads running on different PEs are called tasks.

The main task in designing a parallel program is figuring out how to split up the work between tasks. One method is to split up the processing between tasks. Each task would generally have the same data and perform variations of an operation on the data; for instance, running multiple scenarios. This methodology is called Task Parallel. An example of task parallelism is simulating the effects of various weather patterns on an

urban environment. Each task would have a copy of the environment and run its variety of weather on it. The capability of executing each scenario is limited to the capabilities of a single processing element, but many scenarios can be executed at the same time.

Data Parallel methods split the data up between tasks and perform the same, or similar, operations on each piece of data. To calculate the effects of a weather pattern on an urban environment, the environment would first be divided between the tasks with each task responsible for one part of the environment. Each task would then calculate the effects of the weather on its section of the environment, communicating with the other PEs as needed to share information related to edge conditions, etc.

2.6.1 Parallel Databases

Parallel databases such as TeraData[17] and Oracle[10] use data parallel methods. Paradise[14, 15] spreads data between computers using round-robin, hash, or spatial partitioning. Because the data is able to be distributed between multiple computers, the processing is able to scale to larger datasets.

When a query is processed across the database, a task is created for each fragment of the data. Thus as the data grows larger, the processing capabilities of the system also increase. If a particular processing operation requires relatively less computation for each data record this is fine. However, after the amount of computation per data record increases beyond a certain point, which is dependent on the speed of the machine used, the processing operation can be sped up by utilizing more processors. Major factors in determining how much data should be processed on each machine, and therefore how the data should be spread between machines, are memory, computation, and communication overhead to move the data and computation to another machine. The ratio of computation to memory and communication requirements is often referred to as grain size. Coarser

grained processes have more computation per data record, while finer grained processes have little computation for each data record.

Databases excel at working with indexed data while allowing multiple users to interact with the data in a concurrently safe manner through the use of atomic transactions. The requirements placed upon database systems to handle these situations slow down computations that don't utilize indexes or work on an entire dataset at once. The processing operations this research examines do not require these restrictions, and as such a more efficient system can be created.

Many universities and research institutions already have significant investment in compute clusters. These clusters are groups of computer linked together with high speed network interconnects and high performance parallel filesystems such as Lustre[18]. By separating compute and storage resources at the cost of a high speed network, compute clusters are able to separate computation from data storage.

Parallel filesystems allow the data to be separated from the computer where the processing will be executed by spreading files across multiple network connected file servers allowing access that can be faster than utilizing a computer's local disk for storage while also enabling processing to spread across the available compute resources based entirely on the process' grain size.

2.6.2 Parallel GRASS GIS

GRASS GIS was reworked[16] to use its collaboration features to distribute sub-queries among computers. The method described in this paper utilizes multiple instances of GRASS in a master-slave configuration where all participants access a shared data repository or filesystem. The geometries are portioned between the various nodes. Operations are done on the subsets, and the results are merged to produce the final result.

While the method used to extend GRASS GIS will in fact speed up GIS processing, it has two flaws. First, GRASS is designed to be used in an interactive mode rather than a batch or script driven approach. Second, the entire set of data used must still fit on a single computer to move it in or out of the environment.

CHAPTER 3 REQUIREMENTS

The chapter on related work teaches us what is needed for a good parallel GIS processing engine. Some of these requirements are derived from what makes good cluster based software, such as batch mode processing and scalability. This chapter defines the requirements and describes how to determine if an implementation meets them or not.

3.1 Standard Geospatial Operations

Any GIS processing application must have at least a core set of GIS processing operations.

The Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC) defines a set of such operations in their Simple Features[2] standard.

What is OGC?

History of SFS (Part 1 and various part 2s)

What does the SFS require (data, access)?

JTS, GEOS are open implementations of SFS-SQL

Measured by: yes or no

3.2 Batch Mode Processing

Measured by: yes or no

3.3 Scalable

Goal: Decrease processing time while using resources effectively.

vary procs, same data

vary data, same procs

vary data, vary procs

Measured by: speedup, scaleup

3.4 Ease of Use

Urban scientists != computer programmers, ease of use

subjective measure, but needs to be discussed.

Sample program:

initClusterGIS

loadData (distributed/replicated)

process (user code here)

saveData (distributed/replicated)

finalizeClusterGIS

CHAPTER 4 DESIGN

How fulfill requirements

- Operation set (OGC-SFS)

- Batch Mode Processing

- Scalability Provided by:

- Dataset centric (no need for record level locking, etc.) A good cluster based GIS processing environment needs to be separate from a graphical user interface so that it does not incur additional overhead on the compute nodes and so that it can interact well with the generally batch-scheduled environment of a cluster. In addition, it must be able to distribute data between all the nodes used such that a single node does not become a limiting factor in the environment's scalability. A variety of data distribution models should also be available so that the data is distributed in a manner consistent with the required processing. Of course, the environment should be able to execute all the standard geospatial operations as defined by the Open Geospatial Consortium in their Simple Features[2] standard.

- Data parallel for speed/scaleup, different distribution models possible?

4.1 HadoopGIS

Uses JTS

Map/Reduce

Communication only possible in Reduce

Multiple Map/Reduce phases

How to use more than one dataset

Limited dataset distribution models

4.2 ClusterGIS

Uses GEOS

Split using MPI-IO

Communicate using MPI, possibility for different distributions

How a basic program works

How to use more than one dataset

Datasets could be distributed in any way imaginable.

CHAPTER 5 EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

How to show how well requirements were filled

Some of the needed research has already been completed. After determining the query set and creating the PostGIS implementation of it, the processing environment was prototyped in Hadoop[1], an opensource implementation of Google's MapReduce[3] framework. MapReduce works by utilizing two user defined function, map and reduce. For each record of the primary dataset the map function is called. This process is made parallel by splitting the data up among several computers and running the individual map functions on those computers. After the map function is complete, the resulting set of data is passed to several reduce functions. Each instance of the reduce function receives all the data from the resulting dataset associated with the same key. The lessons learned from this prototyping phase will be applied to the MPI implementation.

5.1 Standard Geospatial Operations

Used JTS, GEOS.

5.2 Batch Mode Processing

Method of execution

5.3 Scalability

5.3.1 Operation set

Assuming OGC-SFS compliance (Because of using JTS and GEOS), operations come down to data interaction. How to get data where it belongs. Differences between record-centric and dataset-centric processing methods.

| Section | 1 Geometry | 2 Geometries |
|--------------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| 6.1.2 (Geometry) | 16 | 15 |
| 6.1.4 (Point) | 4 | 0 |
| 6.1.6 (Curve) | 5 | 0 |
| 6.1.7 (LineString, Line, LinearRing) | 2 | 0 |
| 6.1.8 (MultiCurve) | 2 | 0 |
| 6.1.10 (Surface) | 3 | 0 |
| 6.1.11 (Polygon, Triangle) | 3 | 0 |
| 6.1.12 (PolyhedralSurface) | 4 | 0 |
| 6.1.13 (MultiSurface) | 3 | 0 |
| 6.1.15 (Relational Operators) | 0 | 9 |
| Total | 42 | 24 |

Table 5.1: OGC Methods by Number of Required Geometries

<http://www.opengeospatial.org/standards/sfa> (Simple Feature Access - Part 1: Common Architecture 1.2.0)

All operations must be performed as if they were part of a series of operations.

5.3.1.1 Create

Adds a new record to an existing dataset, serial id needs to be calculated.

Compares record-centric to dataset-centric. What gets written? Mutability of dataset?

5.3.1.2 Read

Reads an existing record (by id)

Compares record-centric to dataset-centric access times.

5.3.1.3 Update

Updates an attribute of a record

Compares record-centric to dataset-centric. What gets written? Mutability of dataset?

5.3.1.4 Destroy

Removes a record from the dataset.

Compares record-centric to dataset-centric. What gets written? Mutability of dataset?

5.3.1.5 Filter

Apply a geospatial operation across the entire dataset - should be better for dataset-centric methods.

5.3.1.6 Nearest

Find the nearest feature in a secondary dataset for every feature in the primary dataset.

5.3.1.7 Chaining

Filter the datasets, then find the nearest in the filtered data

Can we reuse data without pushing it to disk?

5.3.2 Dataset Description

Full datasets; 34k employers, 1.2m parcels

sub datasets, how to generate from full

Operations 1-5: Use parcels

1 record 10 records 100 records 1,000 records 10,000 records 100,000 records 1,000,000 records 1.2M records (full dataset)

Operations 6-7: Employers and Parcels

1 sq mile 10 sq mile 100 sq mile ... full

5.3.3 Required Runs

5.4 Execution Environment

Description of Saguaro (common execute environment)

CentOS 5.3 based

Moab/Torque scheduler

GigE/Inifiband network

Lustre version, options

5.5 PostGIS Implementation

PostgreSQL 8.4

PostGIS 1.3....

Full or chunk of code per operation, description of how the operation was accomplished

All operations must be performed as if they were part of a series of operations.

5.5.1 Create

insert...

5.5.2 Read

select ... where id =

5.5.3 Update

update....

5.5.4 Destroy

delete ...

5.5.5 Filter

select...where

5.5.6 Nearest

Crazy set of queries (nested would have been nice, but too slow)

5.5.7 Chaining

Modify crazy set of queries to use the filter

5.6 HadoopGIS Implementation

Hadoop 0.20.0

HOD on Saguaro

JTS ...

JDK ...

Full or chunk of code per operation, description of how the operation was accomplished

All operations must be performed as if they were part of a series of operations.

5.6.1 Create

map: emit all record giving them the same key (forcing one reduce); reduce emits all received records with the addition of one

5.6.2 Read

map: emit only the record with the correct id; reduce: identity

5.6.3 Update

map: emit all records, updating the one with the correct id; reduce: identity

5.6.4 Destroy

map: emit all records except for the one with the correct id; reduce: identity

5.6.5 Filter

map: emit only records matching the requested criteria; reduce: identity

5.6.6 Nearest

map: loop through secondary dataset emitting id of primary and secondary; reduce: identity

5.6.7 Chaining

(Filter the datasets, then find the nearest in the filtered data)

filter secondary dataset on load; map: only search for nearest for filtered data, skip others; reduce: identity

5.7 ClusterGIS

Intel compiler 10....

MVAPICH 1.0.1

IB backend

Lustre

Full or chunk of code per operation, description of how the operation was accomplished

All operations must be performed as if they were part of a series of operations.

5.7.1 Create

emits all records and the new one

5.7.2 Read

emit only the record with the correct id;

5.7.3 Update

emit all records updating the correct one

5.7.4 Destroy

emit all record except the correct one

5.7.5 Filter

emit only records matching the requested criteria

5.7.6 Nearest

loop through primary and secondary dataset, emitting the id of primary and secondary which match

5.7.7 Chaining

(Filter the datasets, then find the nearest in the filtered data)

remove nodes in the datasets not matching the filter, find nearest as before

CHAPTER 6 RESULTS

6.1 Performance Analysis

vary procs, maintain data

vary data, maintain procs

vary data, vary procs

6.2 Comparisons

PostGIS as baseline

PostGIS to Hadoop

Hadoop to ClusterGIS

PostGIS to ClusterGIS

CHAPTER 7 CONCLUSION

By simplifying the requirements to handle process GIS operations in parallel, the cost to implementing parallel solutions will decrease, enabling more parallel processing methods to be created. This parallel methods will be able to take advantage of the increased processing powers made available through compute clusters.

Another benefit of this research is a classification of geospatial operations based on data access requirements and a sample set of queries to evaluate the efficiency of a parallel GIS processing implementation.

7.1 Future Work

additional decomposition methods, combined with alternative MPI communicators

addition of preprocessing methods (indexing, etc)

chunking of replicated dataset

CHAPTER Bibliography

- [1] G. Mackey, S. Sehrish, J. Bent, J. Lopez, S. Habib, and J. Wang, "Introducing map-reduce to high end computing," in *Petascade Data Storage Workshop, 2008. PDSW '08. 3rd*, pp. 1–6, Nov. 2008.
- [2] "Opengis implementation specification for geographic information - simple feature access - part 1: Common architecture," standard, Open Geospatial Consortium, Inc., 2006.
- [3] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "Mapreduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, 2008.
- [4] T. Ormsby and R. Burke, *Getting to Know ArcGIS Desktop: Basics of ArcView, ArcEditor, and ArcInfo*. ESRI, Inc., 2nd ed., 2004.
- [5] J. Gray, "Quantum gis: the open-source geographic information system," *Linux J.*, vol. 2008, no. 172, p. 8, 2008.
- [6] M. Neteler and H. Mitasova, *Open source GIS: a grass GIS approach*. Springer, 3rd ed., 2002.
- [7] P. Waddell, A. Borning, M. Noth, N. Freier, M. Becke, and G. Ulfarsson, "Microsimulation of urban development and location choices: Design and implementation of urbansim," *Networks and Spatial Economics*, vol. 3, pp. 43–67, 2003.
- [8] D. Blasby, "Building a spatial database in postgresql," in *Open Source Database Summit*, 2001.
- [9] R. West, *Understanding ArcSDE*. ESRI, Inc., 2001.
- [10] S. Ravada and J. Sharma, "Oracle8i spatial: Experiences with extensible databases," in *SSD '99: Proceedings of the 6th International Symposium on Advances in Spatial Databases*, (London, UK), pp. 355–359, Springer-Verlag, 1999.
- [11] R. Pahle and N. Kerr, "A datacentric framework for research in planning," in *UPE8, The 8th International Symposium (UPE 8) of the International Urban Planning and Environment Association*, 2009.
- [12] S. Guhathakurta, Y. Kobayashi, M. Patel, J. Holston, T. Lant, J. Crittenden, K. Li, G. Konjevod, and K. Date, "Digital phoenix project: A multidimensional journey through time." Not published, 2006.
- [13] D. DeWitt and J. Gray, "Parallel database systems: the future of high performance database systems," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 35, no. 6, pp. 85–98, 1992.

- [14] J. Patel, J. Yu, N. Kabra, K. Tufte, B. Nag, J. Burger, N. Hall, K. Ramasamy, R. Lueder, C. Ellmann, J. Kupsch, S. Guo, J. Larson, D. De Witt, and J. Naughton, “Building a scaleable geo-spatial dbms: technology, implementation, and evaluation,” in *SIGMOD '97: Proceedings of the 1997 ACM SIGMOD international conference on Management of data*, (New York, NY, USA), pp. 336–347, ACM, 1997.
- [15] D. J. DeWitt, N. Kabra, J. Luo, J. M. Patel, and J.-B. Yu, “Client-server paradise,” in *VLDB '94: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, (San Francisco, CA, USA), pp. 558–569, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1994.
- [16] F. Huang, D. Liu, P. Liu, S. Wang, Y. Zeng, G. Li, W. Yu, J. Wang, L. Zhao, and L. Pang, “Research on cluster-based parallel gis with the example of parallelization on grass gis,” in *Grid and Cooperative Computing, 2007. GCC 2007. Sixth International Conference on*, pp. 642–649, Aug. 2007.
- [17] “Dbc/1012 data base computer concepts & facilities,” tech. rep., Teradata Corp Document No C02-0001-00, 1983.
- [18] P. J. Braam, “Lustre file system,” white paper, Cluster File Systems, Inc., 2007.