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Q: What if access patterns rarely, if ever, conflict?

Be optimistic!

- Goal: Low overhead for non-conflicting txns
- Assume success!
  - Process transaction as if would succeed
  - Check for serializability only at commit time
  - If fails, abort transaction
- Optimistic Concurrency Control (OCC)
  - Higher performance when few conflicts vs. locking
  - Lower performance when many conflicts vs. locking

OCC: Three-phase approach

- Begin: Record timestamp marking the transaction's beginning
- Modify phase:
  - Txn can read values of committed data items
  - Updates only to local copies (versions) of items (in db cache)
- Validate phase
- Commit phase
  - If validates, transaction's updates applied to DB
  - Otherwise, transaction restarted
  - Care must be taken to avoid "TOCTTOU" issues
OCC: Why validation is necessary

When transaction commits, create new versions at some timestamp t.

- New txn creates shadow copies of P and Q
- P and Q's copies at inconsistent state

OCC: Validate Phase

- Transaction is about to commit.
  System must ensure:
  - Initial consistency: Versions of accessed objects at start consistent
  - No conflicting concurrency: No other txn has committed an operation at object that conflicts with one of this txn’s invocations

OCC: Validate Phase

- Validation needed by transaction T to commit:
  - For all other txns O either committed or in validation phase, one of following holds:
    A. O completes commit before T starts modify
    B. T starts commit after O completes commit, and ReadSet T and WriteSet O are disjoint
    C. Both ReadSet T and WriteSet T are disjoint from WriteSet O, and O completes modify phase.
  - When validating T, first check (A), then (B), then (C).
    If all fail, validation fails and T aborted

2PL & OCC = strict serialization

- Provides semantics as if only one transaction was running on DB at time, in serial order
  + Real-time guarantees

- 2PL: Pessimistically get all the locks first
- OCC: Optimistically create copies, but then recheck all read + written items before commit
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Multi-version concurrency control

- Maintain multiple versions of objects, each with own timestamp. Allocate correct version to reads.

- Prior example of MVCC:

Multi-version concurrency control

- Maintain multiple versions of objects, each with own timestamp. Allocate correct version to reads.

- Unlike 2PL/OCC, reads never rejected

- Occasionally run garbage collection to clean up
**MVCC Intuition**

- Split transaction into read set and write set
  - All reads execute as if one “snapshot”
  - All writes execute as if one later “snapshot”

- Yields snapshot isolation < serializability

**Serializable vs. Snapshot isolation**

- Intuition: Bag of marbles: ½ white, ½ black

- Transactions:
  - T1: Change all white marbles to black marbles
  - T2: Change all black marbles to white marbles

- Serializability (2PL, OCC)
  - T1 → T2 or T2 → T1
  - In either case, bag is either ALL white or ALL black

- Snapshot isolation (MVCC)
  - T1 → T2 or T2 → T1 or T1 || T2
  - Bag is ALL white, ALL black, or ½ white ½ black

**Timestamps in MVCC**

- Transactions are assigned timestamps, which may get assigned to objects those txns read/write

- Every object version O_v has both read and write TS
  - ReadTS: Largest timestamp of txn that reads O_v
  - WriteTS: Timestamp of txn that wrote O_v

**Executing transaction T in MVCC**

- Find version of object O to read:
  - # Determine the last version written before read snapshot time
  - Find O_v s.t. max { WriteTS(O_v) | WriteTS(O_v) <= TS(T) }
  - ReadTS(O_v) = max(TS(T), ReadTS(O_v))
  - Return O_v to T

- Perform write of object O or abort if conflicting:
  - Find O_v s.t. max { WriteTS(O_v) | WriteTS(O_v) <= TS(T) }
  - # Abort if another T’ exists and has read O after T
  - If ReadTS(O_v) > TS(T)
    - Abort and roll-back T
  - Else
    - Create new version O_w
    - Set ReadTS(O_v) = WriteTS(O_w) = TS(T)
Consider partitioned data over servers

- Why not just use 2PL?
  - Grab locks over entire read and write set
  - Perform writes
  - Release locks (at commit time)

Consider partitioned data over servers

- How do you get serializability?
  - On single machine, single COMMIT op in the WAL
  - In distributed setting, assign global timestamp to txn (at sometime after lock acquisition and before commit)
    - Centralized txn manager
    - Distributed consensus on timestamp (not all ops)

Strawman: Consensus per txn group?

- Single Lamport clock, consensus per group?
  - Linearizability composes!
  - But doesn’t solve concurrent, non-overlapping txn problem