Relational Data: Logical View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>10K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>EECS</td>
<td>50K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>80K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C-Store: A Column-oriented DBMS

- Physical layout:
  - Row store
  - Column store
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Row Stores

- On-Line Transaction Processing (OLTP)
  - ATM, POS in supermarkets

- Characteristics of OLTP applications:
  - Transactions that involve small numbers of records (or tuples)
  - Frequent updates (including queries)
  - Many users
  - Fast response times

- OLTP needs a write-optimized row store
  - Insert and delete a record in one physical write

- Easy to add new record, but might read unnecessary data (wasted memory and I/O bandwidth)

Row Store: Columns Stored Together

Current DBMS Gold Standard

- Store columns from one record contiguously on disk

- Use B-tree indexing

- Use small (e.g. 4K) disk blocks

- Align fields on byte or word boundaries

- Conventional (row-oriented) query optimizer and executor (technology from 1979)

- Aries-style transactions

OLAP and Data Warehouses

- On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP)
  - Flexible reporting for Business Intelligence

- Characteristics of OLAP applications
  - Transactions that involve large numbers of records
  - Frequent Ad-hoc queries and infrequent updates
  - A few decision-making users
  - Fast response times

- Data Warehouses facilitate reporting and analysis
  - Read-Mostly

- Other read-mostly applications
  - Customer Relationship Management (Siebel, Oracle)
  - Catalog Search in E-Commerce (Amazon.com, Bestbuy.com)
Column Stores

• Logical data model: Relational Model

• Key Intuition: **Only read relevant columns**
  – Example: Ad-hoc queries read 2 columns out of 20

• Multiple prior column store implementations
  – Sybase IQ (early ’90s, bitmap index)
  – Addamark (i.e., SenSage, for Event Log data warehouse)
  – KDB (Column-stores for financial services companies)
  – MonetDB (Hyper-Pipelining Query Execution, CIDR’05)

• Only read necessary data, but might need multiple seeks

---

Row and Column Stores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row-Store</th>
<th>Column-Store</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Last Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>First Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone #</td>
<td>Phone #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>Street Address</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Easy to add a new record + Only need to read in relevant data

– Might read in unnecessary data – Tuple writes might require multiple seeks

---

Read-Optimized Databases

- SQL Server
- DB2
- Oracle

- Sybase IQ
- MonetDB
- KDB
- C-Store

---

Rows versus Columns

**row stores**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**column stores**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

• Effect of column-orientation on performance?
  – Read-less, seek more so depends on prefetching, query selectivity, tuple width, competing query traffic

---

Row Stores

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

Column Stores

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**project**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**reconstruct**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**seek**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**single file**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37

**3 files**

- 1 Joe 45
- 2 Sue 37
C-Store Technical Ideas

- Column Store with some “novel” ideas (below)
- Only materialized views on each relation (perhaps many)
- Active data compression
- Column-oriented query executor and optimizer
- Shared-nothing architecture
- Replication-based concurrency control and recovery

Architecture of Vertica C-Store

Basic Concepts

- A logical table is physically represented as a set of projections
- Each projection consists of a set of columns
  - Columns are stored separately, along with a common sort order defined by SORT KEY
- Each column appears in at least one projection
- A column can have different sort orders if it is stored in multiple projections

Example C-Store Projection

- LINEITEM(shipdate, quantity, retflag, suppkey | shipdate, quantity, retflag)
  - First sorted by shipdate
  - Second sorted by quantity
  - Third sorted by retflag
- Sorting increases locality of data
  - Favors compression techniques such as Run-Length Encoding (see Elephant paper)
C-Store Operators

- **Selection**
  - Produce bitmaps that can be efficiently combined
- **Mask**
  - Materialize a set of values from a column and a bitmap
- **Permute**
  - Reorder a column using a join index
- **Projection**
  - Free operation!
  - Two columns in the same order can be concatenated for free
- **Join**
  - Produces positions rather than values

Example: Join over Two Columns

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
42 & 36 & 38 \\
42 & 42 & 12 \\
44 & 46 & 32 \\
38 & & 51 \\
\end{array}
\]

Column Store has High Compressibility

- Each attribute is stored in a separate column
  - Related values are compressible (versus values of separate attributes)
- **Compression benefits**
  - Reduces the data sizes
  - Improves disk (and memory) I/O performance by:
    - reducing seek times (related data stored nearer together)
    - reducing transfer times (less data to read/write)
    - increasing buffer hit rate (buffer can hold larger fraction of data)

Compression Methods

- **Dictionary**
- **Bit-pack**
  - Pack several attributes inside a 4-byte word
  - Use as many bits as max-value
- **Delta**
  - Base value per page
  - Arithmetic differences
- **No Run-Length Encoding (unlike Elephant paper)**
C-Store Use of Snapshot Isolation

- Snapshot Isolation for Fast OLAP/Data Warehousing
  - Allows very fast transactions without locks
  - Can read large consistent snapshot of database

- Divide into RS and WS stores
  - Read Store is Optimized for Fast Read-Only Transactions
  - Write Store is Optimized for Transactional Updates

- Low Water Mark (LWM)
  - Represents earliest epoch at which read-only transactions can run
  - RS contains tuples added before LWM

- High Water Mark (HWM)
  - Represents latest epoch at which read-only transactions can run

Other Ideas

- K-safety: Can handle up to K-1 failures
  - Every piece of data replicated K times
  - Different projections sorted in different ways

- Join Tables
  - Construct original tuples given covering projects
  - Vertica gave up on Join Tables – too expensive, require super-projections

Evaluation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Query</th>
<th>C-Store</th>
<th>Row Store</th>
<th>Column Store</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>93.26</td>
<td>29.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>722.90</td>
<td>22.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>116.56</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>652.90</td>
<td>32.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>265.80</td>
<td>33.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Series of 7 queries against C-Store vs two commercial DBMS
  - C-Store faster in all cases, sometimes significantly

- Why so much faster?
  - Column Representation – avoid extra reads
  - Overlapping projections – multiple orderings of column as appropriate
  - Better data compression
  - Query operators operating on compressed data

Summary

- Columns outperform rows in listed workloads
  - Reasons:
    » Column representation avoids reads of unused attributes
    » Query operators operate on compressed representation, mitigating storage barrier problem
    » Avoids memory-bandwidth bottleneck in rows

- Storing overlapping projections, rather than the whole table allows storage of multiple orderings of a column as appropriate

- Better compression of data allows more orderings in the same space

- Results from other papers:
  - Prefetching is key to columns outperforming rows
  - Systems with competing traffic favor columns
Is this a good paper?

- What were the authors’ goals?
- What about the evaluation/metrics?
- Did they convince you that this was a good system/approach?
- Were there any red-flags?
- What mistakes did they make?
- Does the system/approach meet the “Test of Time” challenge?
- How would you review this paper today?

DB Physical Organization Problem

- Many DBMS perform well and efficiently only after being tuned by a DBA

- DBA decides:
  - *Which* indexes to build?
  - *On which* data parts?
  - *and when* to build them?

Timeline

- Sample workload
- Analyze performance
- Prepare estimated physical design
- Queries

Very complex and time consuming process!

What about:

- Dynamic, changing workloads?
- Very Large Databases?
**Database Cracking**

- Solve challenges of dynamic environments:
  - *Remove all tuning* and physical design steps, but still get similar performance as a fully tuned system
- How?
- Design new auto-tuning kernels
  - DBA with cracking (operators, plans, structures, etc.)

**Database Cracking**

- No monitoring
- No preparation
- No external tools
- No full indexes
- No human involvement
- *Continuous on-the-fly physical reorganization*
  - Partial, incremental, adaptive indexing
- *Designed for modern column-stores*

**Cracking Example**

- Each query is treated as an advice on how data should be stored
  - Triggers physical re-organization of the database

```
Q1: select * from R
    where R.A > 10
    and R.A < 14
```

**Cracking Design**

- The first time a range query is posed on an attribute $A$, a cracking DBMS makes a *copy* of column $A$, called the *cracker column* of $A$
- A cracker column is *continuously* physically re-organized based on queries that *need* to touch attribute such as the result is in a contiguous space
- For each cracker column, there is a *cracker index*
Cracking Algorithms

- Two types of cracking algorithms based on select’s where clause
  - where $X < #$
  - Split a piece into two new pieces
  - where $# < X < #$
  - Split a piece into three new pieces

Cracker Select Operator

- Traditional select operator
  - Scans the column
  - Returns a new column that contains the qualifying values

- The cracker select operator
  - Searches the cracker index
  - Physically re-organizes the pieces found
  - Updates the cracker index
  - Returns a slice of the cracker column as the result

- More steps but faster because analyzes less data

Cracking Example

- Each query is treated as advice on how data should be stored
  - Physically reorganize based on the selection predicate

Q1: select * from R
where R.A > 10
and R.A < 14

Piece 1: $A \leq 10$
Piece 2: $10 < A < 14$
Piece 3: $14 \leq A$
**Cracking Example**

- Each query is treated as advice on how data should be stored
  - Physically reorganize based on the selection predicate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Cracker Column A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q1:** select * from R where R.A > 10 and R.A < 14

- Gain knowledge on how to organize data on-the-fly within the select-operator
- Improve data access for future queries

**Piece 1:**
- A ≤ 10

**Piece 2:**
- 10 < A ≤ 14

**Piece 3:**
- 14 ≤ A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cracker Column A</th>
<th>Piece 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A ≤ 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 &lt; A ≤ 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 ≤ A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2:** select * from R where R.A > 7 and R.A ≤ 16

- Piece 1:
  - A ≤ 7
- Piece 2:
  - 7 < A ≤ 10
- Piece 3:
  - 10 < A ≤ 14
- Piece 4:
  - 14 ≤ A ≤ 16
- Piece 5:
  - 16 < A ≤ 39
**Cracking Example**

- Each query is treated as advice on how data should be stored
  - Physically reorganize based on the selection predicate

Q1: select * from R where R.A > 10 and R.A < 14

Q2: select * from R where R.A > 7 and R.A ≤ 16

*Result tuples*

**Self-Organizing Behavior (TPC-H Query 6)**

- TPC-H is an ad-hoc, decision support benchmark
  - Business oriented ad-hoc queries, concurrent data modifications
- Example:
  - Tell me the amount of revenue increase that would have resulted from eliminating certain company-wide discounts in a given percentage range in a given year
- Workload:
  - Database load
  - Execution of 22 read-only queries in both single and multi-user mode
  - Execution of 2 refresh functions

**Is this a good paper?**

- What were the authors’ goals?
- What about the evaluation/metrics?
- Did they convince you that this was a good system/approach?
- Were there any red-flags?
- What mistakes did they make?
- Does the system/approach meet the “Test of Time” challenge?
- How would you review this paper today?