# ByteHTAP: HTAP System with High Data Freshness and Strong Data Consistency

Jianjun Chen, Yonghua Ding, Ye Liu, Fangshi Li, Li Zhang, Mingyi Zhang, Kui Wei, Lixun Cao\*, Dan Zou\*, Yang Liu\*, Lei Zhang\*, Rui Shi\*, Wei Ding, Kai Wu, Shangyu Luo, Jason Sun, Yuming Liang\* ByteDance US Infrastructure System Lab, \*ByteDance, Inc

## Layout

- Introduction
- System requirements
- Architecture overview
- Consistency
- Freshness & Optimization
- Results

#### HTAP

- HTAP combines transactional and analytical processing in a single database system.
- Simplified architecture eliminates need for ETL.
- Instantly run analytical queries on fresh transactional data.
- Types
  - Single Engine vs Muti Engine
  - Single Store vs Multi Store



### System Requirements

- Large scale support scale up to petabytes.
- Real time Comparable performance to individual OLTP / OLAP systems.
- Highly fresh data changes Support OLAP querying on data as recent as 1 second delay.
- Strong data consistency Native support for strong data consistency.
- ByteDance's HTAP choices
- Separate Engine
- Shared storage

### Architecture Overview

- Unified SQL Interface API
- OLTP SQL Engine (ByteNDB)
  + Log Store + Page Store
- OLAP Custom implementation of Flink
- OLAP Store Delta Store
  + Base Store
- Metadata Service Zookeeper
- Replication Framework



## OLTP - ByteNDB

#### Similar to Amazon Aurora

- WAL Every DB action is loaded as Log. WAL is replicated across AZs
- Log Store persists redo logs and Page Store that stores versions of data pages.
- Each Log has an LSN, retained in sorted order. Proxy directs read requests via LSN.
- Quorum protocol for consistency
- Gossip protocol for replicas to fill the gaps in log sequence.



#### Figure 1: An illustration of ByteNDB architecture.

### OLAP Engine - FLINK

- Flink is a stream / batch processing framework.
- Massive parallel processing within Flink cluster is adapted to support HTAP.
- Engineering team's Familiarity is one of the reason for adaption.
- Optimization Support for Pushdown computation, Async Reads, Optimal parallelism module.



#### OLAP Store - Delta Store

- Delta Store is an in-memory, row-format store.
- The OLAP table is partitioned and each partition has 3 replicas and each partition replica has a corresponding Delta Store.
- Insertion list & deletion list Responsible for recording inserts and deletions in the order of LSN.
- Ouick delete support delete hash map maintained for efficient delete checks.
- Operations LogApply, Scan, Flush, Garbage Collection.

#### Base Store

- Durable Columnar storage
- Stored as data blocks in Partitioned Attributes Across(PAX) storage format.
- Each data block includes metadata (min-max, stats Allows for pushdown aggregation and filtering ) and encoded data.
- Soft Deletes Delete information stored in a bitmap (RocksDB).
- Uses Compaction and Garbage Collection to merge Data blocks and remove delete content via background operations.

#### Consistency

- Strong consistency is guaranteed by ordering of the LSN during operations performed on Delta and base store.
- Scan For a successful scan, the LSN of scan need's be in between the upper & lower bound of Delta store LSN.
- LogApply Appends latest LSN logs onto to the delta store – No effect on any scan operation.



### Consistency

- Flush Appends new data on to base store ranging between LSN(min) to LSN(max). Scan and flush access the shared region by locks.
- Base store, Delta store GC and compaction operation run on blocks which aren't actively scanned.



### Optimizations

- Efficient Log Replication
- Computation Pushdown Predicate and Aggregate Pushdown
- Base store Delete Optimization Delete bitmaps
- Delta scan Optimization Delete HashMap
  - Lazy All rows from base table scanned and delete applied at the end.
  - Eager Create a selection criteria from the Map and they apply the query.
  - Cost Based Choice made between the above based on *scan* cost.
- Flink Optimizations

### Results

#### OLAP Latency vs #OLTP clients

#### Scan performance vs % of Flushed Data



Figure 5: CH-benCHmark queries latency



Figure 7: Data freshness with different throughputs

### Results

#### Delete optimizations

#### **Computational Pushdown**





### Results

#### ScanTime & Compaction

#### Scan performance speedups



Table 2: Scan performance with different flush rates.

Flushed Data (%)	Scan Speedups
100%	2.90
50%	1.78
0%	1.00

# Thank You Questions ?