



Chapter 19: Distributed Databases

Database System Concepts, 6th Ed.

©Silberschatz, Korth and Sudarshan

See www.db-book.com for conditions on re-use



Chapter 19: Distributed Databases

- Heterogeneous and Homogeneous Databases
- Distributed Data Storage
- Distributed Transactions
- Commit Protocols
- Concurrency Control in Distributed Databases
- Availability
- Distributed Query Processing
- Heterogeneous Distributed Databases
- Directory Systems



Distributed Database System

- A distributed database system consists of loosely coupled sites that share no physical component
- Database systems that run on each site are independent of each other
- Transactions may access data at one or more sites



Homogeneous Distributed Databases

- In a homogeneous distributed database
 - All sites have identical software
 - Are aware of each other and agree to cooperate in processing user requests.
 - Each site surrenders part of its autonomy in terms of right to change schemas or software
 - Appears to user as a single system
- In a heterogeneous distributed database
 - Different sites may use different schemas and software
 - ▶ Difference in schema is a major problem for query processing
 - ▶ Difference in software is a major problem for transaction processing
 - Sites may not be aware of each other and may provide only limited facilities for cooperation in transaction processing



Distributed Data Storage

- Assume relational data model
- Replication
 - System maintains multiple copies of data, stored in different sites, for faster retrieval and fault tolerance.
- Fragmentation
 - Relation is partitioned into several fragments stored in distinct sites
- Replication and fragmentation can be combined
 - Relation is partitioned into several fragments: system maintains several identical replicas of each such fragment.



Data Replication

- A relation or fragment of a relation is **replicated** if it is stored redundantly in two or more sites.
- **Full replication** of a relation is the case where the relation is stored at all sites.
- Fully redundant databases are those in which every site contains a copy of the entire database.



Data Replication (Cont.)

■ Advantages of Replication

- **Availability:** failure of site containing relation r does not result in unavailability of r if replicas exist.
- **Parallelism:** queries on r may be processed by several nodes in parallel.
- **Reduced data transfer:** relation r is available locally at each site containing a replica of r .

■ Disadvantages of Replication

- Increased cost of updates: each replica of relation r must be updated.
- Increased complexity of concurrency control: concurrent updates to distinct replicas may lead to inconsistent data unless special concurrency control mechanisms are implemented.
 - ▶ One solution: choose one copy as **primary copy** and apply concurrency control operations on primary copy



Data Fragmentation

- Division of relation r into fragments $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n$ which contain sufficient information to reconstruct relation r .
- **Horizontal fragmentation**: each tuple of r is assigned to one or more fragments
- **Vertical fragmentation**: the schema for relation r is split into several smaller schemas
 - All schemas must contain a common candidate key (or superkey) to ensure lossless join property.
 - A special attribute, the tuple-id attribute may be added to each schema to serve as a candidate key.



Horizontal Fragmentation of *account* Relation

<i>branch_name</i>	<i>account_number</i>	<i>balance</i>
Hillside	A-305	500
Hillside	A-226	336
Hillside	A-155	62

$$account_1 = \sigma_{branch_name="Hillside"}(account)$$

<i>branch_name</i>	<i>account_number</i>	<i>balance</i>
Valleyview	A-177	205
Valleyview	A-402	10000
Valleyview	A-408	1123
Valleyview	A-639	750

$$account_2 = \sigma_{branch_name="Valleyview"}(account)$$



Vertical Fragmentation of *employee_info* Relation

<i>branch_name</i>	<i>customer_name</i>	<i>tuple_id</i>
Hillside	Lowman	1
Hillside	Camp	2
Valleyview	Camp	3
Valleyview	Kahn	4
Hillside	Kahn	5
Valleyview	Kahn	6
Valleyview	Green	7

$deposit_1 = \Pi_{branch_name, customer_name, tuple_id}(employee_info)$

<i>account_number</i>	<i>balance</i>	<i>tuple_id</i>
A-305	500	1
A-226	336	2
A-177	205	3
A-402	10000	4
A-155	62	5
A-408	1123	6
A-639	750	7

$deposit_2 = \Pi_{account_number, balance, tuple_id}(employee_info)$



Advantages of Fragmentation

- Horizontal:
 - allows parallel processing on fragments of a relation
 - allows a relation to be split so that tuples are located where they are most frequently accessed
- Vertical:
 - allows tuples to be split so that each part of the tuple is stored where it is most frequently accessed
 - tuple-id attribute allows efficient joining of vertical fragments
 - allows parallel processing on a relation
- Vertical and horizontal fragmentation can be mixed.
 - Fragments may be successively fragmented to an arbitrary depth.



Data Transparency

- **Data transparency:** Degree to which system user may remain unaware of the details of how and where the data items are stored in a distributed system
- Consider transparency issues in relation to:
 - Fragmentation transparency
 - Replication transparency
 - Location transparency



Naming of Data Items - Criteria

1. Every data item must have a system-wide unique name.
2. It should be possible to find the location of data items efficiently.
3. It should be possible to change the location of data items transparently.
4. Each site should be able to create new data items autonomously.



Centralized Scheme - Name Server

- Structure:
 - name server assigns all names
 - each site maintains a record of local data items
 - sites ask name server to locate non-local data items
- Advantages:
 - satisfies naming criteria 1-3
- Disadvantages:
 - does not satisfy naming criterion 4
 - name server is a potential performance bottleneck
 - name server is a single point of failure



Use of Aliases

- Alternative to centralized scheme: each site prefixes its own site identifier to any name that it generates i.e., *site 17.account*.
 - Fulfills having a unique identifier, and avoids problems associated with central control.
 - However, fails to achieve network transparency.
- Solution: Create a set of **aliases** for data items; Store the mapping of aliases to the real names at each site.
- The user can be unaware of the physical location of a data item, and is unaffected if the data item is moved from one site to another.



Distributed Transactions and 2 Phase Commit




Distributed Transactions

- Transaction may access data at several sites.
- Each site has a local **transaction manager** responsible for:
 - Maintaining a log for recovery purposes
 - Participating in coordinating the concurrent execution of the transactions executing at that site.
- Each site has a **transaction coordinator**, which is responsible for:
 - Starting the execution of transactions that originate at the site.
 - Distributing subtransactions at appropriate sites for execution.
 - Coordinating the termination of each transaction that originates at the site, which may result in the transaction being committed at all sites or aborted at all sites.



Transaction System Architecture





System Failure Modes

- Failures unique to distributed systems:
 - Failure of a site.
 - Loss of messages
 - ▶ Handled by network transmission control protocols such as TCP-IP
 - Failure of a communication link
 - ▶ Handled by network protocols, by routing messages via alternative links
 - **Network partition**
 - ▶ A network is said to be **partitioned** when it has been split into two or more subsystems that lack any connection between them
 - Note: a subsystem may consist of a single node
- Network partitioning and site failures are generally indistinguishable.



Commit Protocols

- Commit protocols are used to ensure atomicity across sites
 - a transaction which executes at multiple sites must either be committed at all the sites, or aborted at all the sites.
 - not acceptable to have a transaction committed at one site and aborted at another
- The *two-phase commit* (2PC) protocol is widely used
- The *three-phase commit* (3PC) protocol is more complicated and more expensive, but avoids some drawbacks of two-phase commit protocol. This protocol is not used in practice.



Two Phase Commit Protocol (2PC)

- Assumes **fail-stop** model – failed sites simply stop working, and do not cause any other harm, such as sending incorrect messages to other sites.
- Execution of the protocol is initiated by the coordinator after the last step of the transaction has been reached.
- The protocol involves all the local sites at which the transaction executed
- Let T be a transaction initiated at site S_i , and let the transaction coordinator at S_i be C_i



Phase 1: Obtaining a Decision

- Coordinator asks all participants to *prepare* to commit transaction T_i .
 - C_i adds the records **<prepare T >** to the log and forces log to stable storage
 - sends **prepare T** messages to all sites at which T executed
- Upon receiving message, transaction manager at site determines if it can commit the transaction
 - if not, add a record **<no T >** to the log and send **abort T** message to C_i
 - if the transaction can be committed, then:
 - add the record **<ready T >** to the log
 - force *all records* for T to stable storage
 - send **ready T** message to C_i



Phase 2: Recording the Decision

- T can be committed if C_i received a **ready** T message from all the participating sites: otherwise T must be aborted.
- Coordinator adds a decision record, **<commit T >** or **<abort T >**, to the log and forces record onto stable storage. Once the record stable storage it is irrevocable (even if failures occur)
- Coordinator sends a message to each participant informing it of the decision (commit or abort)
- Participants take appropriate action locally.



Handling of Failures - Site Failure

When site S_i recovers, it examines its log to determine the fate of transactions active at the time of the failure.

- Log contain **<commit T >** record: txn had completed, nothing to be done
- Log contains **<abort T >** record: txn had completed, nothing to be done
- Log contains **<ready T >** record: site must consult C_i to determine the fate of T .
 - If T committed, **redo** (T); write **<commit T >** record
 - If T aborted, **undo** (T)
- The log contains no log records concerning T :
 - Implies that S_k failed before responding to the **prepare T** message from C_i
 - since the failure of S_k precludes the sending of such a response, coordinator C_1 must abort T
 - S_k must execute **undo** (T)



Handling of Failures- Coordinator Failure

- If coordinator fails while the commit protocol for T is executing then participating sites must decide on T 's fate:
 1. If an active site contains a **<commit T >** record in its log, then T must be committed.
 2. If an active site contains an **<abort T >** record in its log, then T must be aborted.
 3. If some active participating site does not contain a **<ready T >** record in its log, then the failed coordinator C_i cannot have decided to commit T .
 - Can therefore abort T ; however, such a site must reject any subsequent **<prepare T >** message from C_i
 4. If none of the above cases holds, then all active sites must have a **<ready T >** record in their logs, but no additional control records (such as **<abort T >** or **<commit T >**).
 - In this case active sites must wait for C_i to recover, to find decision.
- **Blocking problem:** active sites may have to wait for failed coordinator to recover.



Handling of Failures - Network Partition

- If the coordinator and all its participants remain in one partition, the failure has no effect on the commit protocol.
- If the coordinator and its participants belong to several partitions:
 - Sites that are not in the partition containing the coordinator think the coordinator has failed, and execute the protocol to deal with failure of the coordinator.
 - ▶ No harm results, but sites may still have to wait for decision from coordinator.
- The coordinator and the sites are in the same partition as the coordinator think that the sites in the other partition have failed, and follow the usual commit protocol.
 - ▶ Again, no harm results



Recovery and Concurrency Control

- **In-doubt transactions** have a **<ready T >**, but neither a **<commit T >**, nor an **<abort T >** log record.
- The recovering site must determine the commit-abort status of such transactions by contacting other sites; this can slow and potentially block recovery.
- Recovery algorithms can note lock information in the log.
 - Instead of **<ready T >**, write out **<ready T, L >** L = list of locks held by T when the log is written (read locks can be omitted).
 - For every in-doubt transaction T , all the locks noted in the **<ready T, L >** log record are reacquired.
- After lock reacquisition, transaction processing can resume; the commit or rollback of in-doubt transactions is performed concurrently with the execution of new transactions.



Three Phase Commit (3PC)

- Assumptions:
 - No network partitioning
 - At any point, at least one site must be up.
 - At most K sites (participants as well as coordinator) can fail
- Phase 1: Obtaining Preliminary Decision: Identical to 2PC Phase 1.
 - Every site is ready to commit if instructed to do so
- Phase 2 of 2PC is split into 2 phases, Phase 2 and Phase 3 of 3PC
 - In phase 2 coordinator makes a decision as in 2PC (called the **pre-commit decision**) and records it in multiple (at least K) sites
 - In phase 3, coordinator sends commit/abort message to all participating sites,
- Under 3PC, knowledge of pre-commit decision can be used to commit despite coordinator failure
 - Avoids blocking problem as long as $< K$ sites fail
- Drawbacks:
 - higher overheads
 - assumptions may not be satisfied in practice



Alternative Models of Transaction Processing

- Notion of a single transaction spanning multiple sites is inappropriate for many applications
 - E.g. transaction crossing an organizational boundary
 - No organization would like to permit an externally initiated transaction to block local transactions for an indeterminate period
- Alternative models carry out transactions by sending messages
 - Code to handle messages must be carefully designed to ensure atomicity and durability properties for updates
 - ▶ Isolation cannot be guaranteed, in that intermediate stages are visible, but code must ensure no inconsistent states result due to concurrency
 - **Persistent messaging systems** are systems that provide transactional properties to messages
 - ▶ Messages are guaranteed to be delivered exactly once
 - ▶ Will discuss implementation techniques later



Alternative Models (Cont.)

- Motivating example: funds transfer between two banks
 - Two phase commit would have the potential to block updates on the accounts involved in funds transfer
 - Alternative solution:
 - ▶ Debit money from source account and send a message to other site
 - ▶ Site receives message and credits destination account
 - Messaging has long been used for distributed transactions (even before computers were invented!)
- Atomicity issue
 - once transaction sending a message is committed, message must guaranteed to be delivered
 - ▶ Guarantee as long as destination site is up and reachable, code to handle undeliverable messages must also be available
 - e.g. credit money back to source account.
 - If sending transaction aborts, message must not be sent



Error Conditions with Persistent Messaging

- Code to handle messages has to take care of variety of failure situations (even assuming guaranteed message delivery)
 - E.g. if destination account does not exist, failure message must be sent back to source site
 - When failure message is received from destination site, or destination site itself does not exist, money must be deposited back in source account
 - ▶ Problem if source account has been closed
 - get humans to take care of problem
- User code executing transaction processing using 2PC does not have to deal with such failures
- There are many situations where extra effort of error handling is worth the benefit of absence of blocking
 - E.g. pretty much all transactions across organizations



Persistent Messaging and Workflows

- **Workflows** provide a general model of transactional processing involving multiple sites and possibly human processing of certain steps
 - E.g. when a bank receives a loan application, it may need to
 - ▶ Contact external credit-checking agencies
 - ▶ Get approvals of one or more managersand then respond to the loan application
 - We study workflows in Chapter 25
 - Persistent messaging forms the underlying infrastructure for workflows in a distributed environment



Implementation of Persistent Messaging

■ Sending site protocol.

- When a transaction wishes to send a persistent message, it writes a record containing the message in a special relation *messages_to_send*; the message is given a unique message identifier.
- A message delivery process monitors the relation, and when a new message is found, it sends the message to its destination.
- The message delivery process deletes a message from the relation only after it receives an acknowledgment from the destination site.
 - ▶ If it receives no acknowledgement from the destination site, after some time it sends the message again. It repeats this until an acknowledgment is received.
 - ▶ If after some period of time, that the message is undeliverable, exception handling code provided by the application is invoked to deal with the failure.

- ## ■ Writing the message to a relation and processing it only after the transaction commits ensures that the message will be delivered if and only if the transaction commits.



Implementation of Persistent Messaging (Cont.)

■ Receiving site protocol.

- When a site receives a persistent message, it runs a transaction that adds the message to a *received_messages* relation
 - ▶ provided message identifier is not already present in the relation
- After the transaction commits, or if the message was already present in the relation, the receiving site sends an acknowledgment back to the sending site.
 - ▶ Note that sending the acknowledgment before the transaction commits is not safe, since a system failure may then result in loss of the message.
- In many messaging systems, it is possible for messages to get delayed arbitrarily, although such delays are very unlikely.
 - ▶ Each message is given a timestamp, and if the timestamp of a received message is older than some cutoff, the message is discarded.
 - ▶ All messages recorded in the received messages relation that are older than the cutoff can be deleted.



Concurrency Control



Concurrency Control

- Modify concurrency control schemes for use in distributed environment.
- We assume that each site participates in the execution of a commit protocol to ensure global transaction atomicity.
- We assume all replicas of any item are updated
 - Will see how to relax this in case of site failures later



Single-Lock-Manager Approach

- System maintains a *single* lock manager that resides in a *single* chosen site, say S_i
- When a transaction needs to lock a data item, it sends a lock request to S_i and lock manager determines whether the lock can be granted immediately
 - If yes, lock manager sends a message to the site which initiated the request
 - If no, request is delayed until it can be granted, at which time a message is sent to the initiating site



Single-Lock-Manager Approach (Cont.)

- The transaction can read the data item from *any* one of the sites at which a replica of the data item resides.
- Writes must be performed on all replicas of a data item
- Advantages of scheme:
 - Simple implementation
 - Simple deadlock handling
- Disadvantages of scheme are:
 - Bottleneck: lock manager site becomes a bottleneck
 - Vulnerability: system is vulnerable to lock manager site failure.



Distributed Lock Manager

- In this approach, functionality of locking is implemented by lock managers at each site
 - Lock managers control access to local data items
 - ▶ But special protocols may be used for replicas
- Advantage: work is distributed and can be made robust to failures
- Disadvantage: deadlock detection is more complicated
 - Lock managers cooperate for deadlock detection
 - ▶ More on this later
- Several variants of this approach
 - Primary copy
 - Majority protocol
 - Biased protocol
 - Quorum consensus



Primary Copy

- Choose one replica of data item to be the **primary copy**.
 - Site containing the replica is called the **primary site** for that data item
 - Different data items can have different primary sites
- When a transaction needs to lock a data item Q , it requests a lock at the primary site of Q .
 - Implicitly gets lock on all replicas of the data item
- Benefit
 - Concurrency control for replicated data handled similarly to unreplicated data - simple implementation.
- Drawback
 - If the primary site of Q fails, Q is inaccessible even though other sites containing a replica may be accessible.



Majority Protocol

- Local lock manager at each site administers lock and unlock requests for data items stored at that site.
- When a transaction wishes to lock an unreplicated data item Q residing at site S_i , a message is sent to S_i 's lock manager.
 - If Q is locked in an incompatible mode, then the request is delayed until it can be granted.
 - When the lock request can be granted, the lock manager sends a message back to the initiator indicating that the lock request has been granted.



Majority Protocol (Cont.)

- In case of replicated data
 - If Q is replicated at n sites, then a lock request message must be sent to more than half of the n sites in which Q is stored.
 - The transaction does not operate on Q until it has obtained a lock on a majority of the replicas of Q .
 - When writing the data item, transaction performs writes on *all* replicas.
- Benefit
 - Can be used even when some sites are unavailable
 - ▶ details on how handle writes in the presence of site failure later
- Drawback
 - Requires $2(n/2 + 1)$ messages for handling lock requests, and $(n/2 + 1)$ messages for handling unlock requests.
 - Potential for deadlock even with single item - e.g., each of 3 transactions may have locks on 1/3rd of the replicas of a data.



Biased Protocol

- Local lock manager at each site as in majority protocol, however, requests for shared locks are handled differently than requests for exclusive locks.
- **Shared locks.** When a transaction needs to lock data item Q , it simply requests a lock on Q from the lock manager at one site containing a replica of Q .
- **Exclusive locks.** When transaction needs to lock data item Q , it requests a lock on Q from the lock manager at all sites containing a replica of Q .
- Advantage - imposes less overhead on **read** operations.
- Disadvantage - additional overhead on writes




Quorum Consensus Protocol

- A generalization of both majority and biased protocols
- Each site is assigned a weight.
 - Let S be the total of all site weights
- Choose two values **read quorum** Q_r and **write quorum** Q_w
 - Such that $Q_r + Q_w > S$ and $2 * Q_w > S$
 - Quorums can be chosen (and S computed) separately for each item
- Each read must lock enough replicas that the sum of the site weights is $\geq Q_r$
- Each write must lock enough replicas that the sum of the site weights is $\geq Q_w$
- For now we assume all replicas are written
 - Extensions to allow some sites to be unavailable described later



Timestamping

- Timestamp based concurrency-control protocols can be used in distributed systems
- Each transaction must be given a unique timestamp
- Main problem: how to generate a timestamp in a distributed fashion
 - Each site generates a unique local timestamp using either a logical counter or the local clock.
 - Global unique timestamp is obtained by concatenating the unique local timestamp with the unique identifier.





Timestamping (Cont.)

- A site with a slow clock will assign smaller timestamps
 - Still logically correct: serializability not affected
 - But: “disadvantages” transactions
- To fix this problem
 - Define within each site S_i a **logical clock** (LC_i), which generates the unique local timestamp
 - Require that S_i advance its logical clock whenever a request is received from a transaction T_i with timestamp $\langle x, y \rangle$ and x is greater than the current value of LC_i .
 - In this case, site S_i advances its logical clock to the value $x + 1$.



Replication with Weak Consistency

- Many commercial databases support replication of data with weak degrees of consistency (i.e., without a guarantee of serializability)
- E.g.: **master-slave replication**: updates are performed at a single “master” site, and propagated to “slave” sites.
 - Propagation is not part of the update transaction: it is decoupled
 - ▶ May be immediately after transaction commits
 - ▶ May be periodic
 - Data may only be read at slave sites, not updated
 - ▶ No need to obtain locks at any remote site
 - Particularly useful for distributing information
 - ▶ E.g. from central office to branch-office
 - Also useful for running read-only queries offline from the main database



Replication with Weak Consistency (Cont.)

- Replicas should see a **transaction-consistent snapshot** of the database
 - That is, a state of the database reflecting all effects of all transactions up to some point in the serialization order, and no effects of any later transactions.
- E.g. Oracle provides a **create snapshot** statement to create a snapshot of a relation or a set of relations at a remote site
 - snapshot refresh either by recomputation or by incremental update
 - Automatic refresh (continuous or periodic) or manual refresh



Multimaster and Lazy Replication

- With multimaster replication (also called update-anywhere replication) updates are permitted at any replica, and are automatically propagated to all replicas
 - Basic model in distributed databases, where transactions are unaware of the details of replication, and database system propagates updates as part of the same transaction
 - ▶ Coupled with 2 phase commit
- Many systems support **lazy propagation** where updates are transmitted after transaction commits
 - Allows updates to occur even if some sites are disconnected from the network, but at the cost of consistency



Deadlock Handling

Consider the following two transactions and history, with item X and transaction T_1 at site 1, and item Y and transaction T_2 at site 2:

T_1 : write (X)
 write (Y)

T_2 : write (Y)
 write (X)

X-lock on X write (X)	X-lock on Y write (Y) wait for X-lock on X
Wait for X-lock on Y	

Result: deadlock which cannot be detected locally at either site




Centralized Approach


- A global wait-for graph is constructed and maintained in a *single* site; the deadlock-detection coordinator
 - *Real graph*: Real, but unknown, state of the system.
 - *Constructed graph*: Approximation generated by the controller during the execution of its algorithm .
- the global wait-for graph can be constructed when:
 - a new edge is inserted in or removed from one of the local wait-for graphs.
 - a number of changes have occurred in a local wait-for graph.
 - the coordinator needs to invoke cycle-detection.
- If the coordinator finds a cycle, it selects a victim and notifies all sites. The sites roll back the victim transaction.




Local and Global Wait-For Graphs



site S_1



site S_2




Global




Example Wait-For Graph for False Cycles


Initial state:



S_1



S_2



coordinator



False Cycles (Cont.)

- Suppose that starting from the state shown in figure,
 1. T_2 releases resources at S_1
 - ▶ resulting in a message remove $T_1 \rightarrow T_2$ message from the Transaction Manager at site S_1 to the coordinator)
 2. And then T_2 requests a resource held by T_3 at site S_2
 - ▶ resulting in a message insert $T_2 \rightarrow T_3$ from S_2 to the coordinator
- Suppose further that the insert message reaches before the **delete** message
 - this can happen due to network delays
- The coordinator would then find a false cycle
$$T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow T_1$$
- The false cycle above never existed in reality.
- False cycles cannot occur if two-phase locking is used.



Unnecessary Rollbacks

- Unnecessary rollbacks may result when deadlock has indeed occurred and a victim has been picked, and meanwhile one of the transactions was aborted for reasons unrelated to the deadlock.
- Unnecessary rollbacks can result from false cycles in the global wait-for graph; however, likelihood of false cycles is low.