

CSE 444: Database Internals

Lectures 16 Transactions: Snapshot Isolation

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Spring 2012

1

Where We Are

- ACID properties of transactions
- Concept of serializability
- How to provide serializability with locking
- Lowers level of isolation with locking
- How to provide serializability with optimistic cc
 - Timestamps/Multiversion or Validation
- Today: lower level of isolation with multiversion cc
 - **Snapshot isolation**

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Spring 2012

2

Snapshot Isolation

- Not described in the book, but good overview in Wikipedia

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Fall 2010

3

Snapshot Isolation

- A type of multiversion concurrency control algorithm
- Provides yet another level of isolation
- Very efficient, and very popular
 - Oracle, PostgreSQL, SQL Server 2005
- Prevents many classical anomalies BUT...
- Not serializable (!), yet ORACLE and PostgreSQL use it even for SERIALIZABLE transactions!
 - But "serializable snapshot isolation" now in PostgreSQL

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Fall 2010

4

Snapshot Isolation Rules

- Each transactions receives a timestamp $TS(T)$
- Transaction T sees snapshot at time $TS(T)$ of the database
- When T commits, updated pages are written to disk
- Write/write conflicts resolved by "first committer wins" rule
- Read/write conflicts are ignored

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Fall 2010

5

Snapshot Isolation (Details)

- Multiversion concurrency control:
 - Versions of X: $X_{t_1}, X_{t_2}, X_{t_3}, \dots$
- When T reads X, return $X_{TS(T)}$.
- When T writes X: if other transaction updated X, abort
 - Not faithful to "first committer" rule, because the other transaction U might have committed after T. But once we abort T, U becomes the first committer ☺

Magda Balazinska - CSE 444, Fall 2010

6

What Works and What Not

- No dirty reads (Why ?)
- No inconsistent reads (Why ?)
 - A: Each transaction reads a consistent snapshot
- No lost updates (“first committer wins”)
- Moreover: no reads are ever delayed
- However: read-write conflicts not caught !

Write Skew

T1: READ(X); if X >= 50 then Y = -50; WRITE(Y) COMMIT	T2: READ(Y); if Y >= 50 then X = -50; WRITE(X) COMMIT
---	---

In our notation:

$R_1(X), R_2(Y), W_1(Y), W_2(X), C_1, C_2$

Starting with X=50, Y=50, we end with X=-50, Y=-50.
Non-serializable !!!

Write Skews Can Be Serious

- Acidicland had two viceroys, Delta and Rho
- Budget had two registers: taXes, and spendYng
- They had high taxes and low spending...

Delta: READ(taXes); if taXes = 'High' then { spendYng = 'Raise'; WRITE(spendYng) } COMMIT	Rho: READ(spendYng); if spendYng = 'Low' then { taXes = 'Cut'; WRITE(taXes) } COMMIT
--	---

... and they ran a deficit ever since.

Questions/Discussions

- How does snapshot isolation (SI) compare to repeatable reads and serializable?
 - A: SI avoids most but not all phantoms (e.g., write skew)
- Note: Oracle & PostgreSQL implement it even for isolation level SERIALIZABLE
 - But most recently: “serializable snapshot isolation”
- How can we enforce serializability at the app level ?
 - A: Use dummy writes for all reads to create write-write conflicts... but that is confusing for developers!!!

Commercial Systems

Always check documentation as DBMSs keep evolving and thus changing! Just to get an idea:

- **DB2**: Strict 2PL
- **SQL Server**:
 - Strict 2PL for standard 4 levels of isolation
 - Multiversion concurrency control for snapshot isolation
- **PostgreSQL**: Multiversion concurrency control
- **Oracle**: Multiversion concurrency control

Important Lesson

- ACID transactions/serializability make it easy to develop applications
- BUT they add overhead and slow things down
- Lower levels of isolation reduce overhead
- BUT they are hard to reason about for developers!