CS 4440 A Emerging Database Technologies

Lecture 11 02/14/24

Recap

Schedule

- Serial schedule and serializable schedule
- Conflicting actions
- Conflict-serializable schedule

Dependency (or Precedence) graphs

- their relation to conflict serializability (by acyclicity)
- Ensuring serializability via locking
 - Two phase locking
 - Shared lock, exclusive lock, update lock, increment lock

Locking scheduler

- Part 1 takes stream of requests and inserts appropriate lock actions
- Part 2 executes the sequences from Part 1



Lock table

• Maps database elements to lock information



Lock table

- Can implement with hash table
- If element is not in table, it is unlocked



Locks With Multiple Granularity

- Relations
- Pages or data blocks
- Tuples

- \rightarrow Least concurrency
- \rightarrow Most concurrency, but also expensive

Locks With Multiple Granularity

- Relations
- Pages or data blocks
- Tuples

- \rightarrow Least concurrency
- \rightarrow Most concurrency, but also expensive

We can have it all ways using warning locks

Just ask any janitor



- Ordinary locks: S and X
- Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)



• Ordinary locks: S and X

T1 wants to read t3

• Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)



• Ordinary locks: S and X

- T1 wants to read t3
- Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)



• Ordinary locks: S and X

T1 wants to read t3

• Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)



• Ordinary locks: S and X

T1 wants to read t3

• Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)



- Ordinary locks: S and X
- Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)





•

- Ordinary locks: S and X \bullet
 - T1 wants to read t3 Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock) T2 wants to write B2



- Ordinary locks: S and X
- Warning locks: I (shows intention to lock)





Compatibility matrix

• For shared, exclusive, and intention locks

Requestor

		IS	IX	S	Х
	IS	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
•	IX	Yes	Yes	No	No
	S	Yes	No	Yes	No
	X	No	No	No	No

Holder

Inserts and Deletes

- Get exclusive lock on X before deleting it
- For inserts, need to be more careful
 - Cannot lock "future" elements
 - If no exclusive lock is held, then database can become inconsistent due to "phantoms"



Inserts and Deletes

• Solution for inserts: use exclusive lock on the parent of the new tuple



Exercise #1

• Given the hierarchy of objects, what is the sequence of lock requests by T1 and T2 for the sequence of requests: $r_1(t_5)$; $w_2(t_5)$; $r_2(t_3)$;



Concurrency control by validation

- This method is optimistic
 - Assume no unserializable behavior
 - Abort transactions when violation is apparent
- In comparison, locking methods are pessimistic
 - Assume things will go wrong
 - Prevent nonserializable behavior

Validation

- Each transaction T has a read set RS(T) and write set WS(T)
- Three phases of a transaction
 - **Read** from DB all elements in RS(T) and compute locally everything it is going to write
 - Validate T by comparing RS(T) and WS(T) with other transactions
 - Write elements in WS(T) to disk, if validation is OK
- Validation needs to be done atomically
 - Validation order = hypothetical serial order

To validate, scheduler maintains three sets

- START: set of transactions that started, but have not validated
- VAL: set of transactions that validated, but not yet finished write phase
- FIN: set of transactions that have completed write phase

Rule 1: $RS(T) \cap WS(U) = \emptyset$ if FIN(U) > START(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\} \qquad RS(T) = \{B, C\}$



Validation rules (assume U validated) Rule 1: $RS(T) \cap WS(U) = \emptyset$ if FIN(U) > START(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\} \qquad RS(T) = \{B, C\}$

This violates rule 1 because T may be reading B before U writes B

U sta	art T st	art U va	lidate T	validate
		y		

Validation rules (assume U validated) Rule 1: $RS(T) \cap WS(U) = \emptyset$ if FIN(U) > START(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\} \qquad RS(T) = \{B, C\}$

This satisfies rule 1

U start	U validate	U finish	T start T validate	

Rule 2: WS(T) \cap WS(U) = Ø if FIN(U) > VAL(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\}$ $WS(T) = \{B, C\}$



Rule 2: WS(T) \cap WS(U) = Ø if FIN(U) > VAL(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\}$ $WS(T) = \{B, C\}$

This violates rule 2 because T may write B before U writes B



Rule 2: WS(T) \cap WS(U) = Ø if FIN(U) > VAL(T)

 $WS(U) = \{A, B\}$ $WS(T) = \{B, C\}$

This satisfies rule 2

U validat	e U finish	T validate	





Running example











Running example



Validation is useful when

- Conflicts are rare
- System resources are plentiful
- Application has real-time constraints

Summary: Approaches to Concurrency Control

Lock-based CC

- 2PL
- Multiple granularity

Optimistic CC

- CC by validation
- Time-stamp-based CC
 - Not covered, Chapter 18.8

Recap: ACID properties

- Atomicity: A transaction is an atomic unit of processing; it is either performed in its entirety or not performed at all.
- **Consistency**: A correct execution of the transaction must take the database from one consistent state to another.
- Isolation: A transaction should not make its updates visible to other transactions until it is committed.
- **Durability**: Once a transaction changes the database and the changes are committed, these changes must never be lost because of subsequent failure.

Ensuring atomicity and durability with logging and recovery manager

Reading Materials

Database Systems: The Complete Book (2nd edition)

• Chapter 17 - Copying with System Failures

Supplementary materials

Fundamental of Database Systems (7th Edition)

• Chapter 22 - Database Recovery Techniques



Failure modes and solutions

- Erroneous data entry
 - Typos
 - \rightarrow Write constraints and triggers
- Media failures
 - Local disk failure, head crashes
 - \rightarrow Parity checks, RAID, archiving and copying
- Catastrophic failures
 - Explosions, fires
 - \rightarrow Archiving and copying
- System failures
 - Transaction state lost due to power loss and software errors
 - \rightarrow Logging

Today's focus



Atomicity

• by "undo"ing actions of "aborted transactions"

Durability

- by making sure that all actions of committed transactions survive crashes and system failure
- - i.e. by "redo"-ing actions of "committed transactions"

The Correctness Principle

A fundamental assumption about transaction is:

If a transaction executes in the absence of any other transactions or system errors, and it starts with the database in a consistent state, then the database is also in a consistent state when the transactions ends.



- Example transaction •
 - Consistent state: A = B

Execution

B

			Mei	mory	D	isk	
T	Action	Action t					
Logical steps	READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8	
	t := t * 2	16	8		8	8	
A := A * 2	WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8	
B := B * 2	READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8	
	t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8	
	WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	

OUTPU

OUTPU

T(A)

T(B)

• Example transaction

• Consistent state: A = B

Execution

		1	Me	mory	<u>v</u> D	isk	
Le cient stars	Action	t	A	B	A	В	
Logical steps	READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8	
A := A * 2	t := t * 2	16	8		8	8	
	WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8	
B := B * 2	READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8	
	t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8	
	WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	Consistant
-	OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8	— Consistent
	OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16	

- Example transaction •
 - Consistent state: A = B0

Execution

16

16

16

			Me	mory	<u> </u>	isk
т 1 4	Action	t	A	B	A	B
Logical steps	READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8
	t := t * 2	16	8		8	8
A := A * 2	WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8
B := B * 2	READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8
	t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8
	WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8
	OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8

OUTPUT(*B*)

Consistent

44

16

16

- Example transaction
 - Consistent state: A = B

Execution

16

16

16

16

16

			Me	mory	<u> </u>	isk
• • • • • • • • • •	Action	A	В			
Logical steps	READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8
	t := t * 2	16	8		8	8
A := A * 2	WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8
B := B * 2	READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8
	t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8
	WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8
	OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8

T(B)

Not consistent! Either reset A = 8or advance B = 16

• Log: a file of log records telling what transaction has done

		Mer	nory	D	isk	
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log
						<start 7=""></start>
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8	
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8	
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >
READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8	
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8	
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >
FLUSH LOG						
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8	
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16	
						<commit t=""></commit>
FLUSH LOG						

• Log: a file of log records telling what transaction has done

		Men	nory	Di	sk		
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	T started
$\operatorname{READ}(A, t)$	8	8		8	8		
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		Takanaad (and ita
WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8	< <i>T</i> , <i>A</i> , 8>	T changed A , and its
$\operatorname{READ}(B, t)$	8	16	8	8	8		former value is 8
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16		Teemplated
FLUSH LOG						<commit t=""></commit>	successfully

• Log: a file of log records telling what transaction has done



Rule 1:

<*T*, *A*, 8> must be flushed to disk before new *A* is written to disk (same for *B*)

Log: a file of log records telling what transaction has done

Memory Disk Action A B B A Log t <START 7> READ(A, t)8 8 8 8 8 8 t := t * 28 16 8 8 < T, A, 8 >WRITE(A, t)16 16 Log 8 8 READ(B, t)8 16 8 8 8 t := t * 28 16 16 *<T*, *B*, 8> 8 8 WRITE(B, t)16 16 16 FLUSH LOG Rule 2: 8 OUTPUT(*A*) 16 16 16 16 <COMMIT T> must be OUTPUT(*B*) 16 16 16 16 16 flushed to disk after A <COMMIT T> and *B* are written to disk FLUSH LOG

Rule 1:

<*T*, *A*, 8> must be flushed to disk before new *A* is written to disk (same for *B*)

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Mem	nory	Di	sk	
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log
						<start t=""></start>
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8	
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8	
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >
READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8	
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8	
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >
FLUSH LOG						
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8	
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16	
						<commit t=""></commit>
FLUSH LOG						

Recovery

Crash



• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Men	nory	Di	sk		Recovery
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	A = 1
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8		$\begin{bmatrix} & B = 1 \end{bmatrix}$
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		
WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >	
READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8		
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		
OUTPUT(B)	16	16	16	16	16		
						<commit t=""></commit>	Observe <commit t=""> record</commit>
FLUSH LOG							
							Crash

51

Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long •

			Men	nory	Di	sk		Recovery	
Action		t	A	В	A	В	Log		_
							<start t=""></start>	A = 16	_
READ (A, t)		8	8		8	8		B = 16	
t := t * 2		16	8		8	8			_
WRITE $(A, t$)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >		
READ (B, t)		8	16	8	8	8			
t := t * 2		16	16	8	8	8			
WRITE(<i>B</i> , <i>t</i>)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	Ignore (T was committed)	
FLUSH LO	G								
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8			
OUTPUT(B)	16	16	16	16	16			
							<commit t=""></commit>	Observe <commit <i="">T> record</commit>	
FLUSH LO	G								
								Crash	5

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Men	nory	Di	sk		Recovery
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	A = 16
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8		B = 16
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		
WRITE (A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >	Ignore (T was committed)
READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8		
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	Ignore (T was committed)
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		
OUTPUT(B)	16	16	16	16	16		
						<commit t=""></commit>	Observe <commit 7=""> record</commit>
FLUSH LOG							
							Crash 53

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Men	nory	Di	sk		_
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8		
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >	
$\operatorname{READ}(B, t)$	8	16	8	8	8		
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		
OUTPUT(B)	16	16	16	16	16		
						<commit t=""></commit>	Crash
FLUSH LOG							
						1]

Recovery



Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long •

		Men	Recovery				
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
DEAD(A t)	Q	Q		Q	Q	<start t=""></start>	A = 16 $B = 16$
t := t * 2	0 16	8		8	8		
WRITE (A, t) READ (B, t)	16 8	16 16	8	8	8 8	< T, A, 8 >	
t := t * 2 WRITE(<i>B</i> , <i>t</i>)	16 16	16 16	8	8	8	<t 8="" b=""></t>	<commit <i="">T> may or may not</commit>
FLUSH LOG	10	10	10	1.0	0	1, 2, 0	have been flushed to disk. If so,
OUTPUT(A) OUTPUT(B)	16 16	16 16	16 16	16	8 16		is considered incomplete
 FLUSH LOG						<commit t=""></commit>	Crash

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long



Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long



• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Men	nory	Di	sk		Recovery		
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log			
						<start t=""></start>	Write <abort t=""> to log</abort>	A = 8	
$\operatorname{READ}(A, t)$	8	8		8	8		and flush to disk	B = 8	
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8				
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >			
$\operatorname{READ}(B, t)$	8	16	8	8	8				
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8				
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >			
FLUSH LOG									
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8				
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16				
						<commit t=""></commit>	Crash		
FLUSH LOG									
								59	

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Mem	nory	Di	sk		
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	
$\operatorname{READ}(A, t)$	8	8		8	8		
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >	
$\operatorname{READ}(B, t)$	8	16	8	8	8		
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		Crach
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16		—— Crasn
FLUSH LOG						<commit t=""></commit>	
]

A = 16B = 8

Recovery

• Simplifying assumption: use entire log, no matter how long

		Mem	Recovery				
Action	t	A	В	A	В	Log	
						<start t=""></start>	A = 8
READ(A, t)	8	8		8	8		B = 8
t := t * 2	16	8		8	8		
WRITE(A, t)	16	16		8	8	< T, A, 8 >	
READ(B, t)	8	16	8	8	8		
t := t * 2	16	16	8	8	8		Same recovery as before, but only A
WRITE (B, t)	16	16	16	8	8	< T, B, 8 >	is set to previous value
FLUSH LOG							
OUTPUT(A)	16	16	16	16	8		Create
OUTPUT(<i>B</i>)	16	16	16	16	16		Crasn
						<commit t=""></commit>	
FLUSH LOG							
							6

What happens if the system crashes during the recovery?

 Undo-log recovery is idempotent, so repeating the recovery is OK



Exercise #2

• Given the undo log, describe the action of the recovery manager

<START T> <T, *A*, 10> <START U> <U, *B*, 20> <T, *C*, 30> <U, *D*, 40> <COMMIT U>

- Entire log can be too long
- Cannot truncate log after a COMMIT because there are other running transactions

• Solution: checkpoint log periodically

<START T1> <T1, *A*, 5> <START T2> <T2, *B*, 10>

• Solution: checkpoint log periodically

<START T1> <T1, *A*, 5> <START T2> <T2, *B*, 10>

Stop accepting new transactions

• Solution: checkpoint log periodically

<START T1> <T1, *A*, 5> <START T2> <T2, *B*, 10> <T2, *C*, 15> <T1, *D*, 20> <COMMIT T1> <COMMIT T2>

Stop accepting new transactions

Wait until all transactions commit or abort

• Solution: checkpoint log periodically

<START T1> <T1, *A*, 5> <START T2> <T2, *B*, 10> <T2, *C*, 15> <T1, *D*, 20> <COMMIT T1> <COMMIT T2> <CKPT>

Stop accepting new transactions

Wait until all transactions commit or abort

Flush log Write <CKPT> and flush

• Solution: checkpoint log periodically

 $\langle START T1 \rangle$ < T1, A, 5 ><START T2> <T2, *B*, 10> <T2, *C*, 15> <T1, D, 20> <COMMIT T1> <COMMIT T2> <CKPT> <START T3> <T3, E, 25> <T3, F, 30>

Stop accepting new transactions

Wait until all transactions commit or abort

Flush log Write <CKPT> and flush

Resume transactions

Nonquiescent checkpointing

- Motivation: avoid shutting down system while checkpointing
- Checkpoint all active transactions, but allow new transactions to enter system

 $\langle START T1 \rangle$ <T1, A, 5> $\langle START T2 \rangle$ <T2, *B*, 10> <START CKPT (T1, T2)> <T2, C, 15> <START T3> <T1, D, 20> <COMMIT T1> <T3, E, 25> <COMMIT T2> <END CKPT> <T3, F, 30>

Nonquiescent checkpointing

- Motivation: avoid shutting down system while checkpointing
- Checkpoint all active transactions, but allow new transactions to enter system

 $\langle START T1 \rangle$ <T1, A, 5> $\langle START T2 \rangle$ <T2, *B*, 10> <START CKPT (T1, T2)> <T2, C, 15> <START T3> <T1, D, 20> <COMMIT T1> <T3, E, 25> <COMMIT T2> <END CKPT> <T3, F, 30> Crash

If we first meet <END CKPT>, only need to recover until <START CKPT (T1, T2)>

Nonquiescent checkpointing

- Motivation: avoid shutting down system while checkpointing
- Checkpoint all active transactions, but allow new transactions to enter system

 $\langle START T1 \rangle$ <T1, A, 5> $\langle START T2 \rangle$ <T2, *B*, 10> <START CKPT (T1, T2)> <T2, C, 15> <START T3> <T1, D, 20> Crash <COMMIT T1> <T3, E, 25> <COMMIT T2> <END CKPT> <T3, F, 30>

If we first meet <START CKPT (T1, T2)>, only need to recover until <START T1>