High-Speed Query Processing over High-Speed Networks

- Aboli

Introduction

- Networks no longer a bottleneck (InfiniBand TCP, RDMA)
- Only increasing bandwidth not much benefit
- Distributed query engines should adapt



Figure 3: Simply increasing the network bandwidth is not enough; a novel RDMA-based communication multiplexer is required (HyPer, TPC-H, SF 100)





High Speed Networks

- InfiniBand (High bandwidth, low latency cluster connect)
- Large amount of data shuffled during joins and aggregations
- Tune existing protocol for analytical workloads





imgflip.com

Tuning TCP

- Use data direct I/O



(a) Classic I/O involves three memory trips at sender/receiver



(b) Data direct I/O reduces this to only one memory trip each

Figure 4: Data direct I/O significantly reduces the memory bus traffic for TCP compared to classic I/O

Tuning RDMA

- Asynchronous operation
 - Infinibands verbs API -Asynchronous
 - Work requests handled async via queue
- Kernel Bypassing
 - No copying between buffers
 -> no sys calls
 - Memory regions
 -> map virtual to physical
 - Message pools



Tuning RDMA

- Channel semantics
 - Read/write needs to have memory key
 - 2 sided operations
 - No separate exchange of memory keys
 - **Event notification**
 - Polling vs Interrupt
 - CPU use vs latency



High Speed Queries

CLASSIC EXCHANGE OPERATORS

- Introduced in Volcano Goetz Graefe (UW-Madison)
 <u>Paper link</u>
- Allows parallel query evaluation (Exchange operator)
- Parent process consumes data from child process
 (Bushy parallelism diff subtrees, Intra-operator same operator on diff data)
- Threads execute parallel copies communicate via exchange operator





Issues with classical exchange operator

- All parallel units are same local or remote
- Every exchange operator talks to other
 - (n × t) 1 for n servers and t local exchange operators per server
 - Limits use of broadcast join
 - Many connections required scalability issues

ANSWER - Hybrid Parallelism

- Decoupled exchange operator
- RDMA based, NUMA aware multiplexer
- Application level Network Scheduling



Decoupled Exchange Operators

- All parallel units only interact with the multiplexer
 - Minimizes the number of connections
- Locally units can steal work
 - Better load balancing
- Further optimizations
 - Efficient serialization/deserialization
 - Unnecessary columns pruned

NUMA

- Every CPU local memory controller
- Access remote memory via QPI slower, expensive



Query engine - CPUs must access local memory addresses as much as possible

RDMA-based, NUMA aware multiplexer

- Network thread exchange between local and remote servers via RDMA
- Multiplexers connected together
- Maintains message pools registered with HCA for RDMA
- One receive queue per NUMA socket
 - Work stealing NUMA local empty -> take from remote



Figure 7: Interaction of decoupled exchange operators with the RDMA-based, NUMA-aware multiplexer

Application level network scheduling

- All to all traffic switch contention
- Round robin algorithm
 - Send and receive from one server in each phase



(a) Round-robin scheduling with conflictfree phases; three phases for four servers (b) Application-level network scheduling improves throughput by up to $40\,\%$

Evaluations

- HyPer in-memory database, columnar storage
- TPC-H queries for different servers



Figure 11: Scalability of the individual TPC-H queries for different query execution engines (HyPer, SF 100)

Evaluations

- Distributed SQL systems comparison
- Spark SQL, Impala, MemSQL, Vectorwise



Figure 12: Comparing distributed analytical SQL systems for the TPC-H benchmark (6 servers, SF 100)

Concluding Remarks

- Full fledged query engine based on RDMA good approach
- Implementation on HyPer other databases?



THOUGHTS?