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1. Vertica Basics: Storage Format
Design Goals

- SQL (for the ecosystem and knowledge pool)
- Clusters of commodity hardware (for cost)
  - Linux, x86, Ethernet
- Software-only solution (for flexibility)
  - Special purpose hardware has poor track record in databases
- Shared Nothing MPP
  - Cheaper, but puts more complexity in the software
- Analytics: Run large queries many times faster than a legacy DB, load as fast, but feel free to snarl and growl at small UPDATEs and DELETEs
- Work smart, and work hard.
  - Robust algorithms, query optimizer, vectorize, JIT, etc.
Start from how data is stored on disk...

- `SELECT SUM(volume) FROM trades WHERE symbol = 'HPQ' AND date = '5/13/2011'`

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>ETC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:02 PM</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>171.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:04 PM</td>
<td>524.03</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:05 PM</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>524.02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Sorted Data

- **Sort by Symbol, Date, and Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>ETC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:04 PM</td>
<td>524.03</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>524.02</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:02 PM</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:05 PM</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>171.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Column Files

- **Split into columns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
<th>ETC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPL</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>338.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:04 PM</td>
<td>524.03</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:07 PM</td>
<td>524.02</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:02 PM</td>
<td>40.01</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:05 PM</td>
<td>39.97</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>05/13/11</td>
<td>01:02:03 PM</td>
<td>171.22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Compression + RLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOG (x18M)</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x150K)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ (x22M)</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x220K)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM (x19M)</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x150K)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Position Index (NOT Row ID)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Last P Size</th>
<th>Comp Sz</th>
<th>CRC</th>
<th>Min/Max</th>
<th>Null Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram] (A diagram showing the structure of the position index is included.)
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2. Vertica Basics: Updates & Deletes
Q: How do you update this?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>VOLUME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOG</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x150K)</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPQ</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x220K)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM</td>
<td>05/13/2011 (x150K)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A: You Do Not!

- Multiple sets of sorted files loaded
  - Or keep things in memory for a while
- Update is INSERT+DELETE
- Delete is just a mark – nice sorted list of positions
It’ll Get Dirty....

So you need to compaction, or whatever. We call ours the tuple mover.
How Do You Judge a Tuple Mover?

Not by glamour, etc.

- Magical: no problems, no backlogs, no errors
- Latency and freshness: How much batching is needed?
- Sustained load rate (consider machine capacity + retention interval)

- Efficiency will be required
3. Vertica Basics: Transactions & Recovery
Transactions

- Vertica offers full ACID (just at low TPS)
- Queries take a snapshot of the relevant list of files, and need no locks at READ COMMITTED isolation
  - Tuple Mover (etc.) doesn’t interfere
- Loads do not conflict with each other
  - COMMIT – keep the new files
  - ROLLBACK – discard them
- Table level locks for SERIALIZABLE
- All Operations are On-Line
- Database is essentially its own undo / redo log
  - Recovery can be as simple as file copies
a) All nodes up

Node 1
- 1A
- 2B

Node 2
- 1B
- 2C

Node 3
- 1C
- 2D

Node 4
- 1D
- 2A
a) All nodes up

All data still available, in several combinations:
- 2A, 2B, 1C, 1D (shown)
- 1A, 2B, 1C, 1D
- 2A, 2B, 1C, 2D
- 1A, 2B, 1C, 2D (never chosen)

b) Node 2 down
a) All nodes up

b) Node 2 down

c) Recovery

All data still available, in several combinations:
- 2A, 2B, 1C, 1D (shown)
- 1A, 2B, 1C, 1D
- 2A, 2B, 1C, 2D
- 1A, 2B, 1C, 2D (never chosen)
4. Mistake: Execution Engine Design
Simple Design

• Use iterators
  – open
  – getNext
  – close

• If there’s trouble, use a temp relation
Too Slow!

(You have to vectorize. And do JIT compiling.)
“Push Model” DAG Executor

You might even get parallelism for free 😊
“Push Model” DAG Executor
“Push Model” DAG Executor
“Push Model” DAG Executor
“Push Model” DAG Executor
“Push Model” DAG Executor
Problems with DAG Execution

• Free-for-all
  – And that parallelism thing didn’t pan out after all
• Resource usage: could do better
• Diamond problem
• Need to give clues to upstream operations
  – Imagine subqueries?
End Result?

We threw it away, and went back to the “pull” model

• Block iterators
  – open
  – getNextBatch (w/ optimizations to avoid tuple copies)
  – close
  – Also, send information back upstream
• When it gets tricky, use coroutines or other tactics
• We still push data when there are multiple targets
  – Such as loading multiple projections, UPDATEs, etc.
Early Materialized Joins

a) No SIPS, EMJ

```
SELECT SUM(sv) FROM fact WHERE fk IN (SELECT pk FROM d)
```
Late Materialized Joins

a) No SIPS, EMJ

- Scan all columns
- Pre-SUM 'sv' data Against 'fk' join key (optional)
- Perform Join of 'fk' against 'pk' IN list
- Final 'sv' SUM

b) No SIPS, LMJ

- Scan 'fk' key column
- Perform Join of 'fk' against 'pk' IN list
- Materialize columns from rows that joined
- SUM 'sv' from rows

SELECT SUM(sv) FROM fact WHERE fk IN (SELECT pk FROM d)
Sideways Information Passing (SIPS)
Late Materialized Joins

SELECT SUM(sv) FROM fact WHERE fk IN (SELECT pk FROM d)
### Outcome?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th>Neither Feature</th>
<th>LMJ only</th>
<th>SIPS only</th>
<th>SIPS+LMJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1222</td>
<td>1724</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Robustness to Join Order Errors

a) Good join order, no SIPS
Robustness to Join Order Errors

b) Bad join order, no SIPS
Robustness to Join Order Errors

c) Good join order, w/ SIPS

d) Bad join order, w/ SIPS
6. Mistake: Partitioned Hash Join
Partitioned Hash Join vs. Sort Merge Join

• (There are papers about these)
• PHJ was the first one tried
• SMJ was simpler to implement
• Sometimes one relation is sorted already
• Sometimes, you need to sort for other reasons
• Much more compatible with SIPS
Also, There’s Performance
7. Good Idea: Data Collection
Big Data Mentality

A database that doesn’t self-collect is hypocrisy at its worst

• How busy is the machine compared to historical trends?
• What have my users been doing?
• How long will this job take to finish?
• What is the most common error?
• When was the last time we made a backup?
• My request’s run-time changed... why?

• Have there been changes from the standard configuration?
• Are there problems that the customer hasn’t called about?

• Which features have been used?
• Where do customer machines burn the most CPU cycles?
Unexpected Questions
Don’t Compromise on the Design

• Data collector can’t kill the system
• Like a log, lots of little appends
• Shouldn’t accidentally monitor itself
• Should be able to analyze off-line

• Result: Separate data management scheme
8. Good Idea: Dynamic Workload Management
Static (Known) Workload Management

Don't want reports to take over the entire system, preventing loads or tactical queries

Keep some resources (e.g. memory) reserved so that high-priority queries can always begin

Apply run-time prioritization to manage CPU and I/O
Unpredictable Workload: Short Query Bias

Independent: A=60s, B=1s

Sequential

A  60  B  31

“Linear” Interleave

A  61  B  2

Short Query Bias

A  61  B  1
Dynamic Prioritization

Q: Are optimizer cost model estimates really that bad?
Q: Are optimizer cost model estimates really that bad?
A: Doesn’t matter!

Dynamic Prioritization

![Graph showing comparison between Unprioritized and Dynamic Priority in terms of cumulative completion over time. The graph demonstrates that Dynamic Priority achieves a higher cumulative completion percentage earlier than Unprioritized.]
Thank you

Please come visit our development team in:
Boston (Cambridge and Andover), MA
Pittsburgh, PA
Sunnyvale, CA