





Natan Lidukhover



Overview

- DBMS-integrated FaaS platform
- Physically and logically co-locates function execution and data management
- Strong transactional guarantees
- Exactly-once semantics
- Fault-tolerant
- Has tracing layer for observability
- Reduces communication overhead
- Designed for short-lived data-centric applications
- Relational





Interface

Workflow Interface

createWorkflow(List[Func], Spec) groupFunctions(List[Func])

Function Interface

execUpdate(Query, List[Arg]) execQuery(Query, List[Arg]) → Result returnOutput(Name, Object) retrievelnput(Name) → Object Retrieve a named input.

Create a workflow from functions and a spec mapping named inputs and outputs. Group multiple functions into one transaction.

Execute a database update. Execute a database guery, return its results.

Return a named output.

- Functions stored as stored procedures in distributed DBMS
- Functions take in and return serializable objects
- SQL queries static
- **Eunctions deterministic**
- Service calls idempotent
- Workflows directed acyclic graph



```
i def checkAvail():
    query = new SQL("SELECT numAvail FROM HotelAvail
       WHERE hotelID=? AND date=?")
    inp = retrieveInput("availIn")
    avail = true;
    for (dt = inp.start; dt < inp.end; dt++);</pre>
      num = execQuery(query, inp.hotelID, dt)
      if (num < inp.numRooms):
        avail = false
        break
    returnOutput("availOut", avail)
10
11 // Omit reserve and sendEmail due to space limit.
12 w = createWorkflow([checkAvail, reserve, sendEmail],
    {"in": "availIn", "availOut": "reserveIn",
13
    "reserveOut": "emailIn", "emailOut": "out"})
14
15 w.groupFunctions([checkAvail, reserve])
```

Fault Tolerance

- Handles DBMS machine failures using DMBS
 - Replica fail-over
 - Data recovery from logs
- Handles workflow failures by recording function outputs
 - \circ \quad Associated with client workflow invocation using ID
 - Outputs recorded selectively using SFR algorithm (minimize overhead)
- Does not handle dispatcher failures





Algo	rithm 1 SFR: Selective Function Recording
1: f	unction SFR(W) ▷ Input W: the workflow grap
2:	$\{f_1,,f_n\} = \text{topoSort}(W) \qquad \triangleright f_1 \text{ is source, } f_n \text{ is sim}$
3:	$Recorded = \{\}$
4:	for $f_i \in \{f_n \dots f_1\}$ do \triangleright Traverse from sink back to source
5:	if hasWrite (f_i) then
6:	Recorded.add (f_i)
7:	else
	 BFS search all recorded functions (or the sink) reachable without traversing a recorded function
8:	$RF = BFSFindReachable(f_i, Recorded \cup \{f_n\})$
9:	if RF .size() > 1 then
10:	$Recorded.add(f_i)$
11:	return Recorded

Observability

- Manual logging is expensive
- Tracing layer collects workflow information
- Collects function invocations per application
- Collects table operations within functions

FunctionInvocations (func_id, timestamp, function_name, workflow_name, workflow_id)

• Exported to external analytical database (Vertica)



DBMS

VOLTDB

• Uses VoltDB for implementation

- ACID
- Stored procedures support non-SQL
- Change data capture for observability
- Cluster resizing



Workload	Operation	Ratio	Read- Only?	Access Rows	RPCs for µServices	# of Txns.	# of SQL Queries
3 	Browsing	80%	Yes	8	2	1	1
Shop	CartUpdate	10%	No	1	2	1	2
	Checkout	10%	No	5	6	3	5
	Search	60%	Yes	30	4	6	22
Hotel	Recommend	39%	Yes	1	2	1	1
	Reservation	1%	No	5	2	2	5
Detector	GetTimeline	90%	Yes	550	3	51	51
Retwis	Post	10%	No	1	2	1	1

Evaluation

- Workloads as depicted
- OpenWhisk Java runtime has application logic for FaaS, queries external VoltDB
 - Workflows simplified to one big function
 - Apiary outperforms due to scheduling, container initialization cost, and message passing overhead
- RPC has microservice containers with application logic separate from DBMS machines
 - Apiary outperforms due to less RTT communication per DB operation
- Non-linear scaling explained away as VoltDB overhead maintaining large network





Evaluation





- SFR fault-tolerance guarantees barely affect performance
 - o **<5%**
- Boki non-local reads when write means relatively worse when not read-heavy
- Cloudburst performance difference from more efficient local cache reads
 - Paper blames Python
 - Also no batched reads



Cost

- Low load relatively higher cost from "keeping the lights on"
- Higher load cost excels due to minimized
 - Less communication, fewer resources

System	Low Load 10 QPS	Mid Load 1K QPS	High Load 100K QPS	Mixed Load	
OW + VoltDB	\$1,221	\$4,422	\$153,956	\$6,732	
GCF + Firestore	\$22	\$2,679	\$268,380	\$4,008	
Apiary + VoltDB	\$917	\$917	\$6,099	\$3,383	

Questions?

Platform	Transactional Functions	Multi-Func. Txns.	Exactly-Once Semantics	Run-to- Completion Yes Yes	Data Locality No No
Step Functions [7] Durable Functions [31]	No No	No No	At-Least-Once At-Least-Once		
Cloudburst [42] FaaSTCC [27] Hydrocache [45]	CC TCC TCC	CC TCC TCC	No At-Least-Once At-Least-Once	No Yes Yes	Caching Caching Caching
StateFun-Txns [15] Beldi [47] Boki [22]	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	Yes Yes Yes	No No Caching
Apiary	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Co-locatio