Recovery

Context

• ACID properties:
  • We have talked about Isolation and Consistency
  • How do we guarantee Atomicity and Durability?
    • Atomicity: Two problems
      • Part of the transaction is done, but we want to cancel it
        • ABORT/ROLLBACK
      • System crashes during the transaction. Some changes made it to the disk, some didn’t.
    • Durability:

• Essentially similar solutions
Reasons for crashes

- **Transaction failures**
  - **Logical errors**: transaction cannot complete due to some internal error condition
  - **System errors**: the database system must terminate an active transaction due to an error condition (e.g., deadlock)
- **System crash**
  - Power failures, operating system bugs etc
  - **Fail-stop assumption**: non-volatile storage contents are assumed to not be corrupted by system crash
    - Database systems have numerous integrity checks to prevent corruption of disk data
- **Disk failure**
  - Head crashes; *for now we will assume*
    - **STABLE STORAGE**: Data never lost. Can approximate by using RAID and maintaining geographically distant copies of the data

Approach, Assumptions etc..

- **Approach**:
  - Guarantee A and D:
    - by controlling how the disk and memory interact,
    - by storing enough information during normal processing to recover from failures
    - by developing algorithms to recover the database state
- **Assumptions**:
  - System may crash, but the *disk is durable*
  - The only *atomicity* guarantee is that a *disk block write* is *atomic*
- **Once again, obvious naïve solutions exist that work, but that are too expensive.**
  - E.g. The shadow copy solution we saw earlier
    - Make a copy of the database; do the changes on the copy; do an atomic switch of the *dbpointer* at commit time
  - Goal is to do this as efficiently as possible
Data Access

- Physical blocks are those residing on the disk.
- Buffer blocks are those temporarily in main memory.
- Block movements between disk and main memory are initiated through the following two operations:
  - \text{input}(B) transfers the physical block \( B \) to main memory.
  - \text{output}(B) transfers the buffer block \( B \) to the disk, and replaces the appropriate physical block there.
- We assume, for simplicity, that each data item fits in, and is stored inside, a single block.

Example of Data Access

![Diagram](https://example.com/diagram.png)
Data Access (Cont.)

- Each transaction \( T_i \) has its private work-area in which local copies of all data items accessed and updated by it are kept.
  - \( T_i \)'s local copy of a data item \( X \) is called \( x_i \).
- Transferring data items between system buffer blocks and its private work-area done by:
  - read\( (X) \) assigns the value of data item \( X \) to the local variable \( x_i \).
  - write\( (X) \) assigns the value of local variable \( x_i \) to data item \( \{X\} \) in the buffer block.
  - Note: output\( (B_X) \) need not immediately follow write\( (X) \). System can perform the output operation when it deems fit.
- Transactions
  - Must perform read\( (X) \) before accessing \( X \) for the first time (subsequent reads can be from local copy)
  - write\( (X) \) can be executed at any time before the transaction commits

STEAL vs NO STEAL, FORCE vs NO FORCE

- STEAL:
  - The buffer manager can steal a (memory) page from the database
    - ie., it can write an arbitrary page to the disk and use that page for something else from the disk
    - In other words, the database system doesn't control the buffer replacement policy
  - Why a problem?
    - The page might contain dirty writes, ie., writes/updates by a transaction that hasn't committed
  - But, we must allow steal for performance reasons.
- NO STEAL:
  - Not allowed. More control, but less flexibility for the buffer manager.
STEAL vs NO STEAL, FORCE vs NO FORCE

- **FORCE:**
  - The database system *forces* all the updates of a transaction to disk before committing
  - Why?
    - To make its updates permanent before committing
  - Why a problem?
    - Most probably random I/Os, so poor response time and throughput
    - Interferes with the disk controlling policies

- **NO FORCE:**
  - Don’t do the above. Desired.
  - Problem:
    - Guaranteeing durability becomes hard
    - We might still have to *force* some pages to disk, but minimal.

```
+-----------+----------+          +-----------+----------+
| Force     | No Force |          | Force     | No Force  |
|           |          | Desired  |           |          |
| No Steal  | Steel    |          | No Steal  | Steel    |
|           |          | Trivial  |           |          |
|           |          |          |           |          |
```
What if NO STEAL, FORCE?

- Only updates from committed transaction are written to disk (since no steal)
- Updates from a transaction are forced to disk before commit (since force)
  - A minor problem: how do you guarantee that all updates from a transaction make it to the disk atomically?
    - Remember we are only guaranteed an atomic block write
    - What if some updates make it to disk, and other don’t?
    - Can use something like shadow copying/shadow paging

- No durability problems.
- Slow

What if STEAL, NO FORCE?

- After crash:
  - Disk might have DB data from uncommitted transactions
  - Disk might not have DB data from committed transactions

- How to recover?

  “Log-based recovery”
Log-based Recovery

- Most commonly used recovery method
- A log is a record of everything the database system does
  - the “DB” are the files where relations are stored

- For every operation done by the database, a log record is generated and stored typically on a different disk
  - `<T1, START>`
  - `<T2, COMMIT>`
  - `<T3, ABORT>`
  - `<T1, A, 100, 200>`
    - T1 modified A; old value = 100, new value = 200

Log

- Example transactions $T_0$ and $T_1$ ($T_0$ serialized before $T_1$):

  $T_0$:
  
  - read (A)
  - $A = A - 50$
  - write (A)
  - read (B)
  - $B = B + 50$
  - write (B)

  $T_1$:
  
  - read (C)
  - $C = C - 100$
  - write (C)

- Possible Logs:
  - `<T_0, start>`
  - `<T_0, A, 950, 900>`
  - `<T_0, B, 2000, 2050>`
  - `<T_0, commit>`
  - `<T_1, start>`
  - `<T_1, C, 500, 400>`
  - `<T_1, commit>`

(a) (b) (c)
Log-based Recovery

- **Starting assumptions:**
  1. Log records are immediately pushed to the disk as soon as they are generated
  2. Log records are written to disk in the order generated
  3. A log record is generated *before* the actual data value is updated
  4. **Strict two-phase locking**
     - The first assumption can be relaxed
     - *A transaction T1 is considered committed only after record <T1, COMMIT> has been pushed to the disk*

- **Also:**
  - Log writes are *sequential*
  - They are also often on a different disk (why important?)
  - File systems:
    - LFS == log-structured file system
    - *journaling* file systems

Recovery

*STEAL is allowed, so changes of a transaction may have made it to the disk*

- **UNDO(T1):**
  - Procedure executed to *rollback/undo* the effects of a transaction
  - E.g.
    - <T1, START>
    - <T1, A, 200, 300>
    - <T1, B, 400, 300>
    - <T1, A, 300, 200>  
      - *[note: second update of A]*
    - T1 decides to abort

- Any of the changes might have made it to the disk
Using the log to *abort/rollback*

- **UNDO(T1):**
  - Go *backwards* in the *log* looking for log records belonging to T1
  - Restore the values to the old values
  - NOTE: Going backwards is important.
    - A was updated twice
  - In the example, we simply:
    - Restore A to 300
      - Write <T1, CLR, A, 300> record
    - Restore B to 400
      - Write <T1, CLR, B, 400> record
    - Restore A to 200
      - Write <T1, CLR, A, 200> record
      - Write <T1, ABORT> *(abort comes after CLR records)*
  - Note: No other transaction could have changed A or B in the meantime
    - *Strict two-phase locking*

| T1, START |
| T1, A, 200, 300 |
| T1, B, 400, 300 |
| T1, A, 300, 200 |

---

Using the log to *recover*

- We don’t require FORCE, so a change made by the committed transaction may not have made it to the disk before the system crashed
  - BUT, the log record did (recall our assumptions)
- **REDO(T1):**
  - Procedure executed to recover a committed transaction
  - E.g.
    - <T1, START>
    - <T1, A, 200, 300>
    - <T1, B, 400, 300>
    - <T1, A, 300, 200>  *[note: second update of A]*
    - <T1, COMMIT>
  - By our assumptions, all the log records made it to the disk (since the transaction committed)
  - But any or none of the changes to A or B might have made it to disk
Using the log to recover

- **REDO(T1):**
  - Go *forward* in the log looking for log records belonging to T1
  - Set the values to the new values
  - NOTE: Going forward is important.
  - In the example, we simply:
    - Set A to 300
    - Set B to 300
    - Set A to 200

Idempotency

- Both redo and undo are required to be *idempotent*
  - *F is idempotent, if F(x) = F(F(x)) = F(F(F(F(...)F(x)))))*
- Multiple applications shouldn’t change the effect
  - This is important because *we don’t know* exactly what made it to the disk, and we can’t keep track of that
  - E.g. consider a log record of the type
    - `<T1, A, incremented by 100>`
    - Old value was 200, and so new value was 300
  - But the on disk value might be 200 or 300 (since we have no control over the buffer manager)
  - So we have no idea whether to apply this log record or not
  - Hence, we use *value based logging* (**physical logging**), not operation based (**logical logging**)
Log-based recovery

- Log is maintained

- If during the normal processing, a transaction needs to abort
  - UNDO() is used for that purpose

- If the system crashes, then we need to do recovery using both UNDO() and REDO()
  - Some transactions that were going on at the time of crash may not have completed, and must be aborted/undone
  - Some transactions may have committed, but their changes didn’t make it to disk, so they must be redone
  - Called restart recovery

Restart Recovery (after a crash)

1. Initialize the undo-list to the transactions in the last checkpoint, or the empty list if no checkpoint.

2. Starting from the last checkpoint, roll forward through the log re-executing everything
   a. Add transaction STARTs to the undo-list as you go
   b. Remove transactions from the undo-list if a corresponding commit record is found

3. Roll back from end of log undo-ing the effects of transactions in your undo-list
Checkpointing

- How far should we go back in the log while recovering??
  - It is possible that a transaction made an update at the very beginning of the system, and that update never made it to disk
    - very very unlikely, but possible (because we don’t do force)
  - For correctness, we have to go back all the way to the beginning of the log
    - Bad idea !!

- Checkpointing is a mechanism to reduce this

Checkpointing

- Periodically, the database system writes out everything in the memory to disk
  - Goal is to get the database in a state that we know (not necessarily consistent state)

- Steps:
  - Stop all other activity in the database system
  - Write out the entire contents of the memory to the disk
    - Only need to write updated pages, so not so bad
    - Entire === all updates, whether committed or not
  - Write out all the log records to the disk
  - Write out a special log record to disk
    - \(<\text{CHECKPOINT LIST_OF_ACTIVE_TRANSACTIONS}>\)
    - The second component is the list of all active transactions in the system right now
  - Continue with the transactions again
Restart Recovery w/ checkpoints

- implement the *redo* phase of Section 19.4
  - Roll forward from the last checkpoint or the beginning of the log: keep track of active transactions, taking into account any information from the checkpoint
  - redo any UPDATE and CLR records encountered
- implement the *undo* phase of Section 19.4
  - roll back from the end of the log: reversing the effects of any encountered UPDATE records of active transactions by
    - changing the data in the relation back to the original, and
    - appending CLR records
  - add abort records when encountering the START record for any active transaction
- Finish
  - push all changes to the relation file (using BufferPool.writeAllToDisk)
  - write a checkpoint record to the log at the end.
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Recap so far …

- **Log-based recovery**
  - Uses a *log* to aid during recovery
- **UNDO()**
  - Used for normal transaction abort/rollback, as well as during restart recovery
- **REDO()**
  - Used during restart recovery
- **Checkpoints**
  - Used to reduce the restart recovery time
Other issues

- **ARIES**: Considered the canonical description of log-based recovery
  - Used in most systems
  - Has many other types of log records that simplify recovery significantly

- **Loss of disk**:
  - Can use a scheme similar to checkpointing to periodically dump the database onto tapes or optical storage
  - Techniques exist for doing this while the transactions are executing (called fuzzy dumps)

- **Shadow paging**:
  - Read up

Write-ahead logging

- So far assumed that log records are written to disk as soon as generated
  - Too restrictive

- **Write-ahead logging**:
  - Before an update on a data item (say A) makes it to disk, the log records referring to the update must be forced to disk
  - How?
    - Each log record has a log sequence number (LSN)
      - Monotonically increasing
    - For each page in the memory, we maintain the LSN of the last log record that updated a record on this page
      - pageLSN
    - If a page $P$ is to be written to disk, all the log records till $\text{pageLSN}(P)$ are forced to disk first
Write-ahead logging

- Write-ahead logging (WAL) is sufficient for all our purposes
  - All the algorithms discussed before work

- Note the special case:
  - A transaction is not considered committed unless the \( \langle T, \text{commit} \rangle \) record is on disk

Other issues

- The system halts during checkpointing
  - Not acceptable
  - Advanced recovery techniques allow the system to continue processing while checkpointing is going on

- System may crash during recovery
  - Our simple protocol is actually fine
  - In general, this can be painful to handle

- B+-Tree and other indexing techniques
  - Strict 2PL is typically not followed (we didn’t cover this)
  - So physical logging is not sufficient; must have logical logging (section 19.7)
Recap

- **STEAL vs NO STEAL, FORCE vs NO FORCE**
  - We studied how to do STEAL and NO FORCE through log-based recovery scheme

![Diagram showing the comparison between desired and force conditions with steal and no steal options.](image)