## NVRAM study

### Write Behind Logging. Arulraj et al., VLDB '16 박사과정 최원기

## OutLine

- Background
- Write Ahead Logging(Previous mechanism)
- Write Behind Logging
- Evaluation



- Transactional failure
  - Aborted by DBMS
  - Aborted by application
- System failure
  - Hardware failure
  - Bugs in DBMS/OS





Durability of update : Persist committed transaction







1. Write changes to data in buffer





1. Write changes to data in buffer







checksum LSN Type Tx identifier Location after image WAL record

![](_page_11_Figure_2.jpeg)

1. Write changes to data in buffer

- 2. Append WAL to WAL Buffer
- 3. Sync the WAL
- 4. Mark transaction commit

checksum LSN Type Tx identifier Location after image WAL record

![](_page_12_Figure_2.jpeg)

1. Write changes to data in buffer

- 2. Append WAL to WAL Buffer
- 3. Sync the WAL
- 4. Mark transaction commit

5. Checkpoint

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Write Ahead Logging (WAL) Recovery

Recovery

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

### Write Ahead Logging (WAL) Recovery

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

Redo

### Write Ahead Logging (WAL) Recovery

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Sequential Write vs Random Write

![](_page_17_Picture_1.jpeg)

Hard Disk Drive

In case SSD(solid state drive), because of parallelism, sequential write is faster than random write

## NVM(Non-volatile memory)

- Next Generation Storage
- Fast like DRAM, Non-Volatile unlike DRAM
- Byte-Addressable
- Gap between sequential and random write performance is small

![](_page_18_Figure_5.jpeg)

Figure 1: I/O Performance – Synchronous file write throughput obtained on different storage devices including emulated NVM, SSD, and HDD.

## Write Behind Logging (Paper's proposal)

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

checksum LSN Type Persisted Commit Timestamp Dirty Commit Timestamp WBL record

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Write Ahead Log vs Write Behind Log

LSN	WRITE AHEAD LOG
1	BEGIN CHECKPOINT
2	END CHECKPOINT (EMPTY ATT)
3	TXN 1: INSERT TUPLE 100 (NEW: X)
4	TXN 2: UPDATE TUPLE 2 (NEW: Y')
22	TXN 20: DELETE TUPLE 20
23	TXN 1, 3,, 20: COMMIT
24	TXN 2: UPDATE TUPLE 100 (NEW: X')
25	TXN 21: UPDATE TUPLE 21 (NEW: Z')
	0.00
84	TXN 80: DELETE TUPLE 80
85	TXN 2, 21,, 79: COMMIT
86	TXN 81: UPDATE TUPLE 100 (NEW: X'')
	SYSTEM FAILURE

LSN	WRITE BEHIND LOG	
1	BEGIN CHECKPOINT	
2	END CHECKPOINT (EMPTY CTG)	
3	{ (1, 100) }	
4	{ 2, (21, 120) }	
5	{ 80, (81, 180) }	
	SYSTEM FAILURE	

Figure 12: WBL Example - Contents of the WBL during recovery.

Uncommitted : Tx 80, Tx 81

Figure 7: WAL Example - Contents of the WAL during recovery.

![](_page_25_Picture_6.jpeg)

## Write Behind Logging : Recovery

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Evaluation (1)

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Result

- 1. NVM-WBL > NVM-WAL 1.3x
- 2. SSD-WAL > SSD-WBL

### Evaluation (2)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Result

- 1. WBL < WAL
- 2. WBL recovery performance is independent of the number of transactions

# Thank You

Any question?