1. Introduction

- Replication - using multiple copies of a server (called replicas) for better availability and performance.
- If you’re not careful, replication can lead to:
  - worse performance - updates must be applied to all replicas and synchronized
  - worse availability - some algorithms require multiple replicas to be operational for any of them to be used

Replicated Server

- Can replicate servers on a common resource
- Data sharing - DB servers communicate with shared disk

Replicated Resource

- To get more improvement in availability, replicate the resources (too)
- Also increases potential throughput
- This is what’s usually meant by replication
- It’s the scenario we’ll focus on

Synchronous Replication

- Replicas function just like non-replicated servers
- Synchronous replication - transaction updates all replicas of every item it updates

Issues

- Too expensive for most applications, due to heavy distributed transaction load (2-phase commit)
- Can’t control when updates are applied to replicas
Synchronous Replication - Issues
- If you just use transactions, availability suffers.
- For high-availability, the algorithms are complex and expensive, because they require heavy-duty synchronization of failures.
- \[ x_A \] fails
- \[ y_D \] fails
- Not equivalent to a one-copy execution, even if \( x_A \) and \( y_D \) never recover!
- DBMS products support it only in special situations

Asynchronous Replication
- Asynchronous replication
  - Each transaction updates one replica.
  - Updates are propagated later to other replicas.
- Primary copy: All transactions update the same copy
- Multi-master: Transactions update different copies
  - Useful for disconnected operation, partitioned network
- Both approaches ensure that
  - Updates propagate to all replicas
  - If new updates stop, replicas converge to the same state
- Only primary copy ensures serializability
  - Details later ...

Asynchronous Update Propagation
- Collect updates at primary using triggers or the log
- Triggers (Oracle, Rdb, SQL Server, DB2, …)
  - On every update at the primary, a trigger fires to store the update in the update propagation table.
- Post-process ("sniff") the log to generate update propagations (SQL Server, DB2, Tandem Non-Stop SQL)
  - Off-line, so saves trigger and triggered update overhead, though R/W log synchronization also has a cost
  - Requires admin (what if the log sniffer fails?)
- Optionally identify updated fields to compress log
- Most DB systems support this today.
  - First in IBM IMS, Tandem NS SQL, DEC/Rdb, & ad hoc

Products
- All major DBMS products have a rich primary-copy replication mechanism
- Differences are in detailed features
  - performance
  - ease of management
  - richness of filtering predicates
  - push vs. pull propagation
  - stored procedure support
  - transports (e.g. Sybase SQLanywhere can use email!)
  - ...
- The following summary is an incomplete snapshot of products as of July 1999.
SQL Server 7.0
• Publication - a collection of articles to subscribe to
• Article – a horiz/vertical table slice or stored proc
  – Customizable table filter (WHERE clause or stored proc)
  – Stored proc may be transaction protected (replicate on commit).
  Replicates the requests instead of each update.
• Snapshot replication makes a copy
• Transactional replication maintains the copy by propagating updates from publisher to subscribers
  – Post-processes log to store updates in Distribution DB
  – Distribution DB may be separate from the publisher DB
  – Updates can be pushed to or pulled from subscriber
  – Can customize propagated updates using stored procs

SQL Server 7.0 (cont’d)
• Immediate updating subscriber
  – Can update data, synchronizing with publisher via 2PC
  – Uses triggers to capture updates (Not For Replication disables trigger for updates from the publisher)
  – Subscriber sends before/after row timestamp. Publisher checks row didn’t change since subscriber’s current copy
  – Publisher then forwards updates to other subscribers
• Access control lists protect publishers from unauthorized subscribers
• Merge replication- described later

Oracle 8i
• Like SQL Server, can replicate updates to table fragments or stored proc calls at the master copy
• Uses triggers to capture updates in a deferred queue
  – Updates are row-oriented, identified by primary key
  – Can optimize by sending keys and updated columns only
• Group updates by transaction, which are propagated:
  – Either serially in commit order or in parallel with some dependent transaction ordering; each read reads the “commit number” of the data item; updates are ordered by dependent commit number
• Snapshots are updated in a batch refresh.
  – Pushed from master to snapshots, using queue scheduler

DB2
• Very similar feature set to SQL Server and Oracle
• Filtered subscriber (no stored proc replication (?))
  – Create snapshot, then update incrementally (push or pull)
• Captures DB2 updates from the DB2 log
  – For other systems, captures updates using triggers
• Many table type options:
  – Read-only snapshot copy, optionally with timestamp
  – Aggregates, with cumulative or incremental values
  – Consistent change data, optionally with row versions
  – “Replica” tables, for multi-master updating
• Interoperates with many third party DBMS’s

Failure Handling
• Secondary failure - nothing to do till it recovers
  – At recovery, apply the updates it missed while down
  – Needs to determine which updates it missed, just like log-based recovery
  – If down for too long, it may be faster to get a whole copy
• Primary failure – Products just wait till it recovers
  – Can get higher availability by electing a new primary
  – A secondary that detects primary’s failure announces a new election by broadcasting its unique replica identifier
  – Other secondaries reply with their replica identifier
  – The largest replica identifier wins

Failure Handling (cont’d)
• Primary failure (cont’d)
  – All replicas must now check that they have the same updates from the failed primary
  – During the election, each replica reports the id of the last log record it received from the primary
  – The most up-to-date replica sends its latest updates to (at least) the new primary
  – Could still lose an update that committed at the primary and wasn’t forwarded before the primary failed … but solving it requires synchronous replication (2-phase commit to propagate updates to replicas)
Communications Failures

- Secondaries can’t distinguish a primary failure from a communication failure that partitions the network.
- If the secondaries elect a new primary and the old primary is still running, there will be a reconciliation problem when they’re reunited. This is multi-master.
- To avoid this, one partition must know it’s the only one that can operate, and can’t communicate with other partitions to figure this out.
- Could make a static decision. The partition that has the primary wins.
- Dynamic solutions are based on Majority Consensus

Majority Consensus

- Whenever a set of communicating replicas detects a replica failure or recovery, they test if they have a majority (more than half) of the replicas.
- If so, they can elect a primary
- Only one set of replicas can have a majority.
- Doesn’t work well with even number of copies.
  - Useless with 2 copies
- Quorum consensus
  - Give a weight to each replica
  - The replica set that has a majority of the weight wins
  - E.g. 2 replicas, one has weight 1, the other weight 2

3. Multi-Master Replication

- Some systems must operate when partitioned.
  - Requires many updatable copies, not just one primary
  - Conflicting updates on different copies are detected late
- Classic example - salesperson’s disconnected laptop
  - Customer table (rarely updated)
  - Orders table (insert mostly)
  - Customer log table (append only)
  - So conflicting updates from different salespeople are rare
- Use primary-copy algorithm, with multiple masters
  - Each master exchanges updates (“gossips”) with other replicas when it reconnects to the network
  - Conflicting updates require reconciliation (i.e. merging)
- In Lotus Notes, Access, SQL Server, Oracle, …

Example of Conflicting Updates

A Classic Race Condition

Replica 1
- Initially x=0
- T1: X=1
  - Send (X=1)
  - X=1
  - Send (X=2)

Replica 2
- Initially x=0
- T2: X=2
  - Send (X=2)

Primary
- Initially x=0
- Send (X=1)
  - X=1
- Send (X=2)
  - X=2

Replicas end up in different states

Thomas’ Write Rule

- To ensure replicas end up in the same state
  - Tag each data item with a timestamp
  - A transaction updates the value and timestamp of data items (timestamps monotonically increase)
  - An update to a replica is applied only if the update’s timestamp is greater than the data item’s timestamp
  - You only need to keep timestamps of data items that were recently updated (where an older update could still be floating around the system)
- All multi-master products use some variation of this
- Robert Thomas, ACM TODS, June ’79
  - Same article that invented majority consensus

Thomas Write Rule ≠ Serializability

Replica 1
- T1: read x=0 (TS=0)
- T1: X=1, TS=1
  - Send (X=1, TS=1)
  - X=1, TS=1
  - Send (X=2, TS=2)
- T2: X=2, TS=2

Replica 2
- T1: read x=0 (TS=0)
- T2: X=2, TS=2
  - Send (X=2, TS=2)
  - X=2, TS=2

Primary
- Initially x=0, TS=0
- Send (X=1, TS=1)
  - X=1, TS=1
- Send (X=2, TS=2)
  - X=2, TS=2

- Replicas end in the same state, but neither T1 nor T2 reads the other’s output, so the execution isn’t serializable.
**Multi-Master Performance**

- The longer a replica is disconnected and performing updates, the more likely it will need reconciliation
- The amount of propagation activity increases with more replicas
  - If each replica is performing updates, the effect is quadratic

**Microsoft Access and SQL Server**

- Multi-master replication without a primary
- Each row R of a table has 4 additional columns
  - globally unique id (GUID)
  - generation number, to determine which updates from other replicas have been applied
  - version number = the number of updates to R
  - array of [replica, version number] pairs, identifying the largest version number it got for R from every other replica
- Uses Thomas’ write rule, based on version numbers
  - Access uses replica id to break ties. SQL Server 7 uses subscriber priority or custom conflict resolution.

**Generation Numbers (Access/SQL cont’d)**

- Each replica has a current generation number
- A replica updates a row’s generation number whenever it updates the row
- A replica knows the generation number it had when it last exchanged updates with R’, for every replica R’.
- A replica increments its generation number every time it exchanges updates with another replica.
- So, when exchanging updates with R’, it should send all rows with a generation number larger than what it had when last exchanging updates with R’.

**Duplicate Updates (Access/SQL cont’d)**

- Some rejected updates are saved for later analysis
- To identify duplicate updates to discard them -
  - When applying an update to x, replace x’s array of [replica, version#] pairs by the update’s array.
  - To avoid processing the same update via many paths, check version number of arriving update against the array
- Consider a rejected update to x at R from R’, where
  - [R’, V] describes R’ in x’s array, and
  - V’ is the version number sent by R’.
  - If V ≥ V’, then R saw R’’s updates
  - If V < V’, then R didn’t see R’’s updates, so store it in the conflict table for later reconciliation

**Oracle 8i (revisited)**

- Masters replicate entire tables
  - Updates are pushed from master to masters and to snapshots (synchronous or asynchronous)
  - Updates include before values (you can disable if conflicts are impossible)
  - They recommend masters should always be connected
- Snapshots are updatable ⇒ “multi-master”
  - Each propagation transaction updates its queue entry (instead of update-oriented generation numbers)
- Conflict detection
  - Before-value at replica is different than in update
  - Uniqueness constraint is violated
  - Row with the update’s key doesn’t exist

**Oracle 8i Conflict Resolution**

- Built-in resolution strategies (defined per column-group)
  - Add difference between the old and new values of the originating site to the destination site
  - Average the value of the current site and the originating site
  - Min or max of the two values
  - The one with min or max timestamp
  - The site or value with maximum priority
  - Can apply methods in sequence: e.g., by time, then by priority.
- Can call custom procs to log, notify, or resolve the conflict
  - Parameters - update’s before/after value and row’s current value
- For a given update, if no built-in or custom conflict resolution applies, then the entire transaction is logged.
4. Other Approaches

- Non-transactional replication using timestamped updates and variations of Thomas’ write rule
  - directory services are managed this way
- Quorum consensus per-transaction
  - Read and write a quorum of copies
  - Each data item has a version number and timestamp
  - Each read chooses a replica with largest version number
  - Each write increments version number one greater than any one it has seen
  - No special work needed during a failure or recovery

Other Approaches (cont’d)

- Read-one replica, write-all-available replicas
  - Requires careful management of failures and recoveries
- E.g., Virtual partition algorithm
  - Each node knows the nodes it can communicate with, called its view
  - Transaction T can execute if its home node has a view including a quorum of T’s readset and writeset (i.e. the data it can read or write)
  - If a node fails or recovers, run a view formation protocol (much like an election protocol)
  - For each data item with a read quorum, read the latest version and update the others with smaller version #.

Summary

- State-of-the-art products have rich functionality.
  - It’s a complicated world for app designers
  - Lots of options to choose from
- Most failover stories are weak
  - Fine for data warehousing
  - For 24x7 TP, need better integration with cluster node failover