



LARGE SYNOPTIC SURVEY TELESCOPE

Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) Data Management Database Design

Jacek Becla, Daniel Wang, Serge Monkewitz, K-T Lim, John Gates,
Andy Salnikov, Andrew Hanushevsky, Douglas Smith, Bill Chickering,
Michael Kelsey, and Fritz Mueller

LDM-135

Latest Revision: 2017-07-07

This LSST document has been approved as a Content-Controlled Document by the LSST DM Change Control Board. If this document is changed or superseded, the new document will retain the Handle designation shown above. The control is on the most recent digital document with this Handle in the LSST digital archive and not printed versions. Additional information may be found in the corresponding DM RFC.

Abstract

This document discusses the LSST database system architecture.

Change Record

Version	Date	Description	Owner name
1.0	2009-06-15	Initial version.	Jacek Becla
2.0	2011-07-12	Most sections rewritten, added scalability test section	Jacek Becla
2.1	2011-08-12	Refreshed future-plans and schedule of testing sections, added section about fault tolerance.	Jacek Becla, Daniel Wang
3.0	2013-08-02	Synchronized with latest changes to the requirements [LSE-163]. Rewrote most of the "Implementation" chapter. Documented new tests, refreshed all other chapters.	Jacek Becla, Daniel Wang, Serge Monke-witz, Kian-Tat Lim, Douglas Smith, Bill Chickering
3.1	2013-10-10	Refreshed numbers based on latest LDM-141. Updated shared scans (implementation) and 300-node test sections, added section about shared scans demonstration	Jacek Becla, Daniel Wang
3.2	2013-10-10	TCT approved	R Allsman
	2016-07-18	Update with async query, shared scan, secondary index, XRootD, metadata service information.	John Gates, Andy Salnikov, Andrew Hanushevsky, Michael Kelsey, Fritz Mueller
	2017-07-05	Move historical investigations to separate documents: DMTN-046, DMTN-047, DMTN-048, DMTR-21, DMTR-12	T. Jenness
4.0	2017-07-07	Bring up to date with current status, condense requirements section, re-order sections for improved readability. Approved in RFC-358.	Fritz Mueller

Document curator: Fritz Mueller

Document source location: <https://github.com/lstt/LDM-135>



Contents

- 1 Executive Summary** **1**
- 2 Introduction** **2**
- 3 Requirements** **3**
 - 3.1 General Requirements 3
 - 3.2 Data Production Related Requirements 3
 - 3.3 Query Access Related Requirements 4
 - 3.4 Discussion 5
 - 3.4.1 Design Considerations 5
 - 3.4.2 Query complexity and access patterns 6
- 4 Baseline Architecture** **7**
 - 4.1 Alert Production and Up-to-date Catalog 7
 - 4.2 Data Release Production 10
 - 4.3 User Query Access 11
 - 4.3.1 Distributed and parallel 11
 - 4.3.2 Shared-nothing 11
 - 4.3.3 Indexing 12
 - 4.3.4 Shared scanning 13
 - 4.3.5 Clustering 14
 - 4.3.6 Partitioning 14
 - 4.3.7 Long-running queries 17
 - 4.3.8 Technology choice 17
- 5 Implementation (Qserv)** **18**
 - 5.1 Components 18
 - 5.1.1 MySQL 18
 - 5.1.2 XRootD 19
 - 5.2 Partitioning 20

The contents of this document are subject to configuration control by the LSST DM Change Control Board.



5.3	Query Generation	20
5.3.1	Processing modules	21
5.3.2	Processing module overview	22
5.4	Dispatch	23
5.4.1	Wire protocol	23
5.4.2	Frontend	24
5.4.3	Worker	25
5.5	Threading Model	25
5.6	Aggregation	26
5.7	Indexing	26
5.7.1	Secondary Index Structure	27
5.7.2	Secondary Index Loading	28
5.8	Data Distribution	28
5.8.1	Database data distribution	28
5.8.2	Failure and integrity maintenance	29
5.9	Metadata	30
5.9.1	Static metadata	30
5.9.2	Dynamic metadata	31
5.9.3	Architecture	32
5.9.4	Typical Data Flow	32
5.10	Shared Scans	33
5.10.1	Background	34
5.10.2	Implementation	34
5.10.3	Memory management	36
5.10.4	XRootD scheduling support	37
5.10.5	Multiple tables support	37
5.11	Level 3: User Tables, External Data	38
5.12	Cluster and Task Management	38
5.13	Fault Tolerance	39
5.14	Next-to-database Processing	41



- 5.15 Administration 41
 - 5.15.1 Installation 41
 - 5.15.2 Data loading 42
 - 5.15.3 Administrative scripts 44
- 5.16 Current Status and Future Plans 45
- 5.17 Open Issues 47

- 6 Risk Analysis 48**
 - 6.1 Potential Key Risks 48
 - 6.2 Risk Mitigations 50

- 7 References 51**

Data Management Database Design

1 Executive Summary

Two facets of LSST database architecture and their motivating requirements are discussed: database architecture in support of real time Alert Production, and database architecture in support of user query access to catalog data. Following this, Qserv is explored in depth as an implementation of the query access architecture.

The LSST baseline database architecture for real time Alert Production relies on horizontal time-based partitioning. To guarantee reproducibility, no-overwrite-update techniques combined with maintaining validity time for appropriate rows are employed. Two database replicas are maintained to isolate live production catalogs from user queries; the replicas are synchronized in real time using native database replication.

The LSST baseline database architecture for user query access to catalog data is an MPP (massively parallel processing) relational database composed of a single-node non-parallel DBMS, a distributed communications layer, and a master controller, all running on a shared-nothing cluster of commodity servers with locally attached spinning disk drives, capable of incremental scaling and recovering from hardware failures without disrupting running queries. All large catalogs are spatially partitioned horizontally into materialized *chunks*, and the remaining catalogs are replicated on each server; the chunks are distributed across all nodes. The Object catalog is further partitioned into *sub-chunks* with overlaps, materialized on-the-fly when needed. Chunking is handled automatically without exposure to users. Selected tables are also partitioned vertically to maximize performance of most common analysis. The system uses a few critical indexes to speed up spatial searches, time series analysis, and simple but interactive queries. Shared scans are used to answer all but the interactive queries. Such an architecture is primarily driven by the variety and complexity of anticipated queries, ranging from single object lookups to complex $O(n^2)$ full-sky correlations over billions of elements.

A prototype implementation of the baseline architecture for user query access as described above, *Qserv*, was developed during the R&D phase of LSST, and its feasibility was demonstrated in early testing. Productization was subsequently planned and resourced for the construction phase of LSST and is presently underway.

Qserv leverages two mature, open-source technologies as major components of its design: MySQL as a SQL execution engine (though any alternative SQL engine could be substituted

without undue effort if need be), and XRootD¹ [11] to provide a distributed-system framework for fault-tolerant, elastic, content-addressed messaging.

We currently maintain three running instances of Qserv at a scale of approximately 30 physical nodes each in continuous operation on dedicated hardware clusters at NCSA and CC-IN2P3. The system has been demonstrated to correctly distribute and execute both low and high volume queries, including small-area cone and object searches, region restricted queries, and full table scans including large-area near-neighbor searches. Analytic queries involving SciSQL UDFs in both filter and aggregation clauses have also been demonstrated. Scale testing has been successfully conducted on the above-mentioned clusters with datasets of up to approximately 70 TB, and we expect to cross the 100 TB mark as tests continue in 2017. To date the system is on track through a series of graduated data-challenge style tests to meet or exceed the stated performance requirements for the project.

If an equivalent open-source, community supported, off-the-shelf database system were to become available in time, it could present significant support cost advantages over a production-ready Qserv. The largest barrier preventing us from using an off-the-shelf system is lack of sufficient spherical geometry and spherical partitioning support.

To increase the chances such a system will become reality in the next few years, we closely collaborate with the MonetDB open source columnar database team – a successful demonstration of Qserv based on MonetDB instead of MySQL was done in 2012. Further, to stay current with the state-of-the-art in petascale data management and analysis, we continue a dialog with all relevant solution providers, both DBMS and Map/Reduce, as well as with data-intensive users, both industrial and scientific, through the XLDB² conference series we lead, and beyond.

2 Introduction

This document discusses the LSST database system architecture in general, and an implementation of part of that architecture (Qserv) in particular.

Section 3 summarizes LSST database-related requirements that motivate the architecture. Section 4 discusses the baseline architecture itself. Section 5 discusses Qserv as an implementation of the baseline architecture for user query access. Section 6 covers attendant risk

¹<http://xrootd.org>

²<https://xldb.org>

analysis. For some additional background, DMTN-046 covers in-depth analysis of off-the-shelf potential solutions (Map/Reduce and RDBMS) as of 2013, and DMTR-21 and DMTR-12 describe large scale Qserv tests from 2013. The full Qserv test specification is described in LDM-552. DMTN-048 discusses the original design trade-offs and decision process, including small scale tests that were run and some Qserv demonstrations.

3 Requirements

Formal DM database requirements are called out in LDM-555. For purposes of exposition, this section summarizes some of the key requirements which drive the LSST database architecture.

3.1 General Requirements

Incremental scaling. The system must scale to tens of petabytes and trillions of rows. It must grow as the data grows and as the access requirements grow. New technologies that become available during the life of the system must be able to be incorporated easily. For quantitative storage, disk and network bandwidth and I/O analyses, see LDM-141.

Reliability. The system must not lose data, and it must provide at least 98% up time in the face of hardware failures, software failures, system maintenance, and upgrades.

Low cost. It is essential to not overrun the allocated budget, thus a cost-effective, preferably open-source solution is strongly preferred.

3.2 Data Production Related Requirements

The LSST database catalogs will be generated by a small set of production pipelines:

- Data Release Production – it produces all key catalogs. Ingest rates are very modest, as DRP takes several months to complete and is dominated by CPU-intensive application jobs. Ingest can be done separately from pipeline processing, as a post-processing step.
- Nightly Alert Production – it produces difference image sources, and updates the DiaObject, SSObject, DiaSource, DiaForcedSource catalogs. Since alerts need to be generated in under a minute after data has been taken, data has to be ingested/updated in almost-

real time. The number of row updates/ingested is modest: ~40K new rows and updates occur every ~39 sec [7].

- Calibration Pipeline – it produces calibration information. Due to small data volume and no stringent timing requirements, ingest bandwidth needs are very modest.

In addition, the camera and telescope configuration is captured in the Engineering & Facility Database. Data volumes are very modest.

Further, the Level 1 live catalog will need to be updated with minimal delay. This catalog should not be taken off-line for extended periods of time.

The database system must allow for occasional schema changes for the Level 1 data, and occasional changes that do not alter query results³ for the Level 2 data after the data has been released. Schemas for different data releases are allowed to be very different.

3.3 Query Access Related Requirements

The Science Data Archive Data Release query load is defined primarily in terms of access to the large catalogs in the archive: Object, Source, and ForcedSource. Queries to image metadata, for example, though numerous, are expected to be fast. In general the following are required:

Reproducibility. Queries executed on any Level 1 and Level 2 data products must be reproducible.

Real time. A large fraction of ad-hoc user access will involve so called “low-volume” queries – queries that touch small area of sky, or request small number of objects. These queries are required to be answered in a few seconds. On average, we expect to see ~100 such queries running at any given time.

Fast turnaround. High-volume queries – queries that involve full-sky scans are expected to be answered in approximately 1 hour, while more complex full-sky spatial and temporal correlations are expected to be answered in ~8-12 hours. ~50 simultaneous high-volume queries are expected to be running at any given time.

³Example of non-altering changes including adding/removing/resorting indexes, adding a new column with derived information, changing type of a column without losing information, (e.g. FLOAT to DOUBLE would be always allowed, DOUBLE to FLOAT would only be allowed if all values can be expressed using FLOAT without losing any information)

Cross-matching with external/user data. Occasionally, LSST database catalog will need to be cross-matched with external catalogs: both large, such as SDSS, SKA, or Gaia, and small, such as small amateur data sets. Users should be able to save results of their queries, and access them during subsequent queries.

Query complexity. The system needs to handle complex queries, including spatial correlations, time series comparisons. Spatial correlations are required for the Object catalog only – this is an important observation, as this class of queries requires highly specialized, 2-level partitioning with overlaps.

Flexibility. Sophisticated end users need to be able to access all this data in a flexible way with as few constraints as possible. Many end users will want to express queries directly in SQL, so most of basic SQL92 will be required.

3.4 Discussion

3.4.1 Design Considerations

The above requirements have important implications on the LSST data access architecture.

- The system must allow rapid selection of small number of rows out of multi-billion row tables. To achieve this, efficient data indexing in both spatial and temporal dimensions is essential.
- The system must efficiently join multi-trillion with multi-billion row tables. Denormalizing these tables to avoid common joins, such as Object with Source or Object with ForcedSource, would be prohibitively expensive.
- The system must provide high data bandwidth. In order to process terabytes of data in minutes, data bandwidths on the order of tens to hundreds of gigabytes per second are required.
- To achieve high bandwidths, to enable expandability, and to provide fault tolerance, the system will need to run on a distributed cluster composed of multiple machines.
- The most effective way to provide high-bandwidth access to large amounts of data is to partition the data, allowing multiple machines to work against distinct partitions. Data partitioning is also important to speed up some operations on tables, such as index building.

- Multiple machines and partitioned data in turn imply that at least the largest queries will be executed in parallel, requiring the management and synchronization of multiple tasks.
- Limited budget implies the system needs to get most out available hardware, and scale it incrementally as needed. The system will be disk I/O limited, and therefore we anticipate attaching multiple queries to a single table scan (shared scans) will be a must.

3.4.2 Query complexity and access patterns

A compilation of representative queries provided by the LSST Science Collaborations, the Science Council, and other surveys have been captured [5]. These queries can be divided into several distinct groups: analysis of a single object, analysis of objects meeting certain criteria in a region or across entire sky, analysis of objects close to other objects, analysis that require special grouping, time series analysis and cross match with external catalogs. They give hints as to the complexity required: these queries include distance calculations, spatially localized self-joins, and time series analysis.

Small queries are expected to exhibit substantial spatial locality (refer to rows that contain similar spatial coordinates: right ascension and declination). Some kinds of large queries are expected to exhibit a slightly different form of spatial locality: joins will be among rows that have nearby spatial coordinates. Spatial correlations will be executed on the Object table; spatial correlations will *not* be needed on Source or ForcedSource tables.

Queries related to time series analysis are expected to need to look at the history of observations for a given Object, so the appropriate Source or ForcedSource rows must be easily joined and aggregate functions operating over the list of Sources must be provided.

External data sets and user data, including results from past queries may have to be distributed alongside distributed production table to provide adequate join performance.

The query complexity has important implications on the overall architecture of the entire system.

4 Baseline Architecture

This section describes the most important aspects of the LSST baseline database architecture. The choice of the architecture is driven by the project requirements (see LDM-555) as well as cost, availability, and maturity of the off-the-shelf solutions currently available on the market (see DMTN-046), and design trade-offs (see DMTN-048). The architecture is periodically revisited: we continuously monitor all relevant technologies, and accordingly fine-tune the baseline architecture.

In summary:

- The LSST baseline architecture for Alert Production is a (yet to be selected) off-the-shelf RDBMS system which uses replication for fault tolerance and which takes advantage of horizontal (time-based) partitioning;
- The baseline architecture for user access to Data Releases is an MPP (massively parallel processing) relational database running on a shared-nothing cluster of commodity servers with locally attached spinning disk drives; capable of (a) incremental scaling and (b) recovering from hardware failures without disrupting running queries. All large catalogs are spatially partitioned into materialized *chunks*, and the remaining catalogs are replicated on each server; the chunks are distributed across all nodes. The Object catalog is further partitioned into *sub-chunks* with overlaps,⁴ materialized on-the-fly when needed. Shared scans are used to answer all but low-volume user queries.

4.1 Alert Production and Up-to-date Catalog

Alert Production involves detection and measurement of difference-image-analysis sources (DiaSources). New DiaSources are spatially matched against the most recent versions of existing DiaObjects, which contain summary properties for variable and transient objects (and false positives). Unmatched DiaSources are used to create new DiaObjects. If a DiaObject has an associated DiaSource that is no more than a month old, then a forced measurement (DiaForcedSource) is taken at the position of that object, whether a corresponding DiaSource was detected in the exposure or not.

The output of Alert Production consists mainly of three large catalogs – DiaObject, DiaSource,

⁴A chunk's overlap is implicitly contained within the overlaps of its edge sub-chunks.

and DiaForcedSource - as well as several smaller tables that capture information about e.g. exposures, visits and provenance. These catalogs will be modified live every night.

Note that existing DiaObjects are never overwritten. Instead, new versions of the AP-produced and DRP-produced DiaObjects are inserted, allowing users to retrieve (for example) the properties of DiaObjects as known to the pipeline when alerts were issued against them. To enable historical queries, each DiaObject row is tagged with a validity start and end time. The start time of a new DiaObject version is set to the observation time of the DiaSource or DiaForcedSource that led to its creation, and the end time is set to infinity. If a prior version exists, then its validity end time is updated (in place) to equal the start time of the new version. As a result, the most recent versions of DiaObjects can always be retrieved with:

```
SELECT * FROM DiaObject WHERE validityEnd = infinity
```

Versions as of some time t are retrievable via:

```
SELECT * FROM DiaObject WHERE validityStart <= t AND t < validityEnd
```

Note that a DiaSource can also be re-associated to a solar-system object during day time processing. This will result in a new DiaObject version unless the DiaObject no longer has any associated DiaSources. In that case, the validity end time of the existing version is set to the time at which the re-association occurred.

Once a DiaSource is associated with a solar system object, it is never associated back to a DiaObject. Therefore, rather than also versioning DiaSources, columns for the IDs of both the associated DiaObject and solar system object, as well as a re-association time, are included. Re-association will set the solar system object ID and re-association time, so that DiaSources for DiaObject 123 at time t can be obtained using:

```
SELECT *  
FROM DiaSource  
WHERE diaObjectId = 123  
AND midPointTai <= t  
AND (ssObjectId is NULL OR ssObjectReassocTime > t)
```

DiaForcedSources are never re-associated or updated in any way.

From the database point of view then, the alert production pipeline will perform the following database operations 189 times (once per LSST CCD) per visit (every 39 seconds):

1. Issue a point-in-region query against the DiaObject catalog, returning the most recent versions of the objects falling inside the CCD.
2. Use the IDs of these diaObjects to retrieve all associated diaSources and diaForcedSources.
3. Insert new diaSources and diaForcedSources.
4. Update validity end times of diaObjects that will be superseded.
5. Insert new versions of diaObjects.

All spatial joins will be performed on in-memory data by pipeline code, rather than in the database. While Alert Production does also involve a spatial join against the Level 2 (DRP-produced) Object catalog, this does not require any database interaction: Level 2 Objects are never modified, so the Object columns required for spatial matching will be dumped to compact binary files once per Data Release. These files will be laid out in a way that allows for very fast region queries, allowing the database to be bypassed entirely.

The DiaSource and DiaForcedSource tables will be split into two tables, one for historical data and one containing records inserted during the current night. The current-night tables will be small and rely on a transactional engine like InnoDB, allowing for speedy recovery from failures. The historical-data tables will use the faster non-transactional MyISAM or Aria storage engine, and will also take advantage of partitioning. The Data Release catalogs used to seed the live catalogs will be stored in a single initial partition, sorted spatially (using the Hierarchical Triangular Mesh trixel IDs for their positions). This means that the diaSources and diaForcedSources for the diaObjects in a CCD will be located close together on disk, minimizing seeks. Every month of new data will be stored in a fresh partition, again sorted spatially. Such partitions will grow to contain just a few billion rows over the course of a month, even for the largest catalog. At the end of each night, the contents of the current-night table are sorted and appended to the partition for the current-month, then emptied. Each month, the entire current-month partition is sorted spatially (during the day), and a partition for the next month is created.

For DiaObject, the same approach is used. However, DiaObject validity end-time updates can occur in any partition, and are not confined to the current-night table. We therefore expect to use a transactional storage engine like InnoDB for all partitions. Because InnoDB clusters tables using the primary key, we will likely declare it to consist of a leading HTM ID column,

followed by disambiguating columns (`diaObjectId`, `validityStart`). The validity end time column will not be part of any index.

No user queries will be allowed on the live production catalogs. We expect to maintain a separate replica just for user queries, synchronized in real time using one-way master-slave native database replication. The catalogs for user queries will be structured identically to the live catalogs, and views will be used to hide the splits (using a “UNION ALL”).

For additional safety, we might choose to replicate the small current-night tables, all `DiaObject` partitions, and the remaining (small) changing tables to another hot stand-by replica. In case of disastrous master failure that cannot be fixed rapidly, the slave serving user queries will be used as a temporary replacement, and user queries will be disallowed until the problem is resolved.

Based on the science requirements, only short-running, relatively simple user queries will be needed on the Level 1 catalogs. The most complex queries, such as large-area near neighbor queries, will not be needed. Instead, user queries will consist mainly of small-area cone searches, light curve lookups, and historical versions of the same. Since the catalogs are sorted spatially, we expect to be able to quickly answer spatial queries using indexed HTM ID columns and the SciSQL UDFs, an approach that has worked well in data-challenges to date. Furthermore, note that the positions of `diaSources/diaForcedSources` associated with the same `diaObject` will be very close together, so that sorting to obtain good spatial locality also ends up placing sources belonging to the same light curve close together. In other words, the data organization used to provide fast pipeline query response is also advantageous for user queries.

4.2 Data Release Production

Data Release Production will involve the generation of significantly larger catalogs than Alert Production. However, these are produced over the course of several months, pipelines will not write directly to the database, and there are no pipeline queries with very low-latency execution time requirements to be satisfied. While we do expect several pipeline-related full table scans over the course of a Data Release Production, we will need to satisfy many user queries involving such scans on a daily basis. User query access is therefore the primary driver of our scalable database architecture, which is described in detail below. For a description of the data loading process, please see Section 5.15.2.

4.3 User Query Access

The user query access is the primary driver of the scalable database architecture. Such architecture is described below.

4.3.1 Distributed and parallel

The database architecture for user query access relies on a model of distributing computation among autonomous worker nodes. Autonomous workers have no direct knowledge of each other and can complete their assigned work without data or management from their peers. This implies that data must be partitioned, and the system must be capable of dividing a single user query into sub-queries, and executing these sub-queries in parallel – running a high-volume query without parallelizing it would take unacceptably long time, even if run on very fast CPU. The parallelism and data distribution should be handled automatically by the system and hidden from users.

4.3.2 Shared-nothing

Such architecture provides good foundation for incremental scaling and fault recovery: because nodes have no direct knowledge of each other and can complete their assigned work without data or management from their peers, it is possible to add node to, or remove node from such system with no (or with minimal) disruption. However, to achieve fault tolerance and provide recover mechanisms, appropriate smarts have to be build into the node management software.




FIGURE 1: Shared-nothing database architecture.

4.3.3 Indexing

Disk I/O bandwidth is expected to be the greatest bottleneck. Data can be accessed either through index, which typically translates to a random access, or a scan, which translates to a sequential read (unless multiple competing scans are involved).

Indexes dramatically speed up locating individual rows, and avoid expensive full table scans. They are essential to answer low volume queries quickly, and to do efficient table joins. Also, spatial indexes are essential. However, unlike in traditional, small-scale systems, the advantages of indexes become questionable when a larger number of rows is to be selected from a table. In case of LSST, selecting even a 0.01% of a table might lead to selecting millions of rows. Since each fetch through an index might turn into a disk seek, it is often cheaper to read sequentially from disk than to seek for particular rows via index, especially when the index itself is out-of-memory. For that reason the architecture forgoes relying on heavy indexing, only a small number of carefully selected indexes essential for answering low-volume queries, enabling table joins, and speeding up spatial searches will be maintained. For an analytical query system, it makes sense to make as few assumptions as possible about what

will be important to our users, and to try and provide reasonable performance for as broad a query load as possible, i.e. focus on scan throughput rather than optimizing indexes. A further benefit to this approach is that many different queries are likely to be able to share scan I/O, boosting system throughput, whereas caching index lookup results is likely to provide far fewer opportunities for sharing as the query count scales (for the amounts of cache we can afford).

4.3.4 Shared scanning

Now with table-scanning being the norm rather than the exception and each scan taking a significant amount of time, multiple full-scan queries would randomize disk access if they each employed their own full-scanning read from disk. Shared scanning (also called *convoy scheduling*) shares the I/O from each scan with multiple queries. The table is read in pieces, and all concerning queries operate on that piece while it is in memory. In this way, results from many full-scan queries can be returned in little more than the time for a single full-scan query. Shared scanning also lowers the cost of data compression by amortizing the CPU cost among the sharing queries, tilting the trade-off of increased CPU cost versus reduced I/O cost heavily in favor of compression.

Shared scanning will be used for all high-volume and super-high volume queries. Shared scanning is helpful for unpredictable, ad-hoc analysis, where it prevents the extra load from increasing the disk I/O cost – only more CPU is needed. On average we expect to continuously run the following scans:

- one full table scan of Object table for the latest data release only,
- one synchronized full table scan of Object, Source and ForcedSource tables every 12 hours for the latest data release only,
- one synchronized full table scan of Object and Object_Extra every 8 hours for the latest and previous data releases.

Appropriate Level 3 user tables will be scanned as part of each shared scan as needed to answer any in-flight user queries.

Shared scans will take advantage of table chunking explained below. In practice, within a single node a scan will involve fetching sequentially a chunk of data at a time and executing

on this chunk all queries in the queue. The level of parallelism will depend on the number of available cores.

Running multiple shared scans allows relatively fast response time for Object-only queries, and supporting complex, multi-table joins: synchronized scans are required for two-way joins between different tables. For self-joins, a single shared scan will be sufficient, however each node must have sufficient memory to hold 2 chunks at any given time (the processed chunk and next chunk). Refer to the sizing model [LDM-141] for further details on the cost of shared scans.

Low-volume queries will be executed ad-hoc, interleaved with the shared scans. Given the number of spinning disks is much larger than the number of low-volume queries running at any given time, this will have very limited impact on the sequential disk I/O of the scans, as shown in LDM-141.

4.3.5 Clustering

The data in the Object Catalog will be physically clustered on disk spatially – that means that objects collocated in space will be also collocated on disk. All Source-type catalogs (Source, ForcedSource, DiaSource, DiaForcedSource) will be clustered based on their corresponding objectId – this approach enforces spatial clustering and collocates sources belonging to the same object, allowing sequential read for queries that involve time series analysis.

SSObject catalog will be unpartitioned, because there is no obvious fixed position that we could choose to use for partitioning. The associated diaSources (which will be intermixed with diaSources associated with static diaSources) will be partitioned, according to their position. For that reason the SSObject-to-DiaSource join queries will require index searches on all chunks, unlike DiaObject-to-DiaSource queries. Since SSObject is small (low millions), this should not be an issue.

4.3.6 Partitioning

Data must be partitioned among nodes in a shared-nothing architecture. While some *sharding* approaches partition data based on a hash of the primary key, this approach is unusable for LSST data since it eliminates optimizations based on celestial objects' spatial nature.

4.3.6.1 Sharded data and sharded queries All catalogs that require spatial partitioning (Object, Source, ForcedSource, DiaSource, DiaForcedSource) as well as all the auxiliary tables associated with them, such as Object_Extra, will be divided into spatial partitions of roughly the same area by partitioning then into *declination* zones, and chunking each zone into *RA* stripes. Further, to be able to perform table joins without expensive inter-node data transfers, partitioning boundaries for each partitioned table must be aligned, and chunks of different tables corresponding to the same area of sky must be co-located on the same node. To ensure chunks are appropriately sized, the two largest catalogs, Source and ForcedSource, are expected to be partitioned into finer-grain chunks. Since objects occur at an approximately-constant density throughout the celestial sphere, an equal-area partition should spread a load that is uniformly distributed over the sky.

Smaller catalogs that can be partitioned spatially, such as Alert and exposure metadata will be partitioned spatially. All remaining catalogs, such provenance or SDQA tables will be replicated on each node. The size of these catalogs is expected to be only a few terabytes.

With data in separate physical partitions, user queries are themselves fragmented into separate physical queries to be executed on partitions. Each physical query's result can be combined into a single final result.

4.3.6.2 Two-level partitions Determining the size and number of data partitions may not be obvious. Queries are fragmented according to partitions so an increasing number of partitions increases the number of physical queries to be dispatched, managed, and aggregated. Thus a greater number of partitions increases the potential for parallelism but also increases the overhead. For a data-intensive and bandwidth-limited query, a parallelization width close to the number of disk spindles should minimize seeks and maximize bandwidth and performance.

From a management perspective, more partitions facilitate re-balancing data among nodes when nodes are added or removed. If the number of partitions were equal to the number of nodes, then the addition of a new node would require the data to be re-partitioned. On the other hand, if there were many more partitions than nodes, then a set of partitions could be assigned to the new node without re-computing partition boundaries.

Smaller and more numerous partitions benefit spatial joins. In an astronomical context, we are interested in objects near other objects, and thus a full $O(n^2)$ join is not required—a localized

spatial join is more appropriate. With spatial data split into smaller partitions, an SQL engine computing the join need not even consider (and reject) all possible pairs of objects, merely all the pairs within a region. Thus a task that is $O(n^2)$ naively becomes $O(kn)$ where k is the number of objects in a partition.

In consideration of these trade-offs, two-level partitioning seems to be a conceptually simple way to blend the advantages of both extremes. Queries can be fragmented in terms of coarse partitions (“chunks”), and spatial near-neighbor joins can be executed over more fine partitions (“sub-chunks”) within each partition. To avoid the overhead of the sub-chunks for non-join queries, the system can store chunks and generate sub-chunks on-demand for spatial join queries. On-the-fly generation for joins is cost-effective due to the drastic reduction of pairs, which is true as long as there are many sub-chunks for each chunk.

4.3.6.3 Overlap A strict partitioning eliminates nearby pairs where objects from adjacent partitions are paired. To produce correct results under strict partitioning, nodes need access to objects from outside partitions, which means that data exchange is required. To avoid this, each partition can be stored with a precomputed amount of overlapping data. This overlapping data does not strictly belong to the partition but is within a preset spatial distance from the partition’s borders. Using this data, spatial joins can be computed correctly within the preset distance without needing data from other partitions that may be on other nodes.

Overlap is needed only for the Object Catalog, as all spatial correlations will be run on that catalog only. Guided by the experience from other projects including SDSS, we expect to preset the overlap to ~ 1 arcmin, which results in duplicating approximately 30% of the Object Catalog.

4.3.6.4 Spherical geometry Support for spherical geometry is not common among databases and spherical geometry-based partitioning was non-existent in other solutions when we decided to develop Qserv. Since spherical geometry is the norm in recording positions of celestial objects (right-ascension and declination), any spatial partitioning scheme for astronomical objects must account for its complexities.

4.3.6.5 Data immutability It is important to note that user query access operates on read-only data. Not having to deal with updates simplifies the architecture and allows us to add

extra optimizations not possible otherwise. The Level 1 data which is updated is small enough and will not require the scalable architecture – we plan to handle all Level 1 data set with out-of-the box MySQL as described in Section 4.1.

4.3.7 Long-running queries

Many of the typical user queries may need significant time to complete, at the scale of hours. To avoid re-submission of those long-running queries in case of various failures (networking or hardware issues) the system will support asynchronous query execution mode. In this mode users will submit queries using special options or syntax and the system will dispatch a query and immediately return to user some identifier of the submitted query without blocking user session. This query identifier will be used by user to retrieve query processing status, query result after query completes, or a partial query result while query is still executing.

The system should be able to estimate the time which user query will need to complete and refuse to run long queries in a regular blocking mode.

4.3.8 Technology choice

As explained in DMTN-046, no off-the-shelf solution meets the above requirements today, and an RDBMS seems a much better fit than a Map/Reduce-based system primarily due to features such as indexes, schema, and speed. For that reason, our baseline architecture consists of *custom* software built on two production components: an open source, “simple”, single-node, non-parallel DBMS (MySQL) and XRootD. To ease potential future DBMS migrations, the communication with the underlying DBMS relies on *basic* DBMS functionality only, and avoids vendor-specific features and additions.




FIGURE 2: Component connections in Qserv.

5 Implementation (Qserv)

A prototype implementation of the baseline architecture for user query access described above, *Qserv*, was developed during the R&D phase of LSST, and its feasibility was demonstrated in early testing (DMTR-21, DMTR-12). Productization was subsequently planned and resourced for the construction phase of LSST and is presently underway. The system as currently implemented is described here.

5.1 Components

5.1.1 MySQL

To control the scope of effort, *Qserv* uses an existing SQL engine, MySQL, to perform as much query processing as possible. MySQL is a good choice because of its active development community, mature implementation, wide client software support, simple installation, lightweight execution, and low data overhead. MySQL's large development and user community means that expertise is relatively common, which could be important during *Qserv*'s development or long-term maintenance in the years ahead. MySQL's MyISAM storage engine is also lightweight and well-understood, giving predictable I/O access patterns without an ad-

vanced storage layout that may demand more capacity, bandwidth, and IOPS from a tightly constrained hardware budget.

It is worth noting, however, that Qserv's design and implementation do not depend on specifics of MySQL beyond glue code facilitating results transmission. Loose coupling is maintained in order to allow the system to leverage a more advanced or more suitable database engine in the future.

5.1.2 XRootD

The XRootD distributed file system is used to provide a distributed, data-addressed, replicated, fault-tolerant communication facility for Qserv. Re-implementing these features would have been non-trivial, so we wanted to leverage an existing system. XRootD has provided scalability, fault-tolerance, performance, and efficiency for over 10 years to the high-energy physics community. Its relatively flexible API enabled its use in our application as more of a general communication routing system. Since it was designed to serve large data sets, we were confident that it could mediate not only query dispatch communication, but also bulk transfer of results.

A XRootD cluster is implemented as a set of data servers and redirectors. A client connects to a redirector, which acts as a caching namespace lookup service that redirects clients to appropriate data servers. In Qserv, XRootD data servers become Qserv workers by implementing plug-ins within the XRootD framework which advertise partitioned data chunks as addressable resources within the XRootD cluster. The Qserv master then dispatches work and receives results as an XRootD client by dispatching messages to these resources.




FIGURE 3: XRootD.

5.2 Partitioning

In Qserv, large spatial tables are fragmented into spatial pieces in a two-level partitioning scheme. The partitioning space is a spherical space defined by two angles ϕ (right ascension/ α) and θ (declination/ δ). For example, the Object table is fragmented spatially, using a coordinate pair specified in two columns: right-ascension and declination. On worker nodes, these fragments are represented as tables named *Object_CC* and *Object_CC_SS* where *CC* is the “chunk id” (first-level fragment) and *SS* is the “sub-chunk id” (second-level fragment of the first larger fragment). Sub-chunk tables are built on-the-fly to optimize performance of spatial join queries. Large tables are partitioned on the same spatial boundaries where possible to enable joining between them.

5.3 Query Generation

Qserv is unusual (though not unique) in processing a user query into one or more query fragments that are subsequently distributed to and executed by off-the-shelf single-node RDBMS software. This is done in the hopes of providing a distributed parallel query service while avoiding a full re-implementation of common database features. However, we have found that it is necessary to implement a query processing framework much like one found in a

more standard database, with the exception that the resulting query plans contain SQL statements as the intermediate language.

A significant amount of query analysis not unlike a database query optimizer is required in order to generate a distributed execution plan that accurately and efficiently executes user queries. Incoming user queries are first parsed into an intermediate representation using a modified SQL92-compliant grammar (Lubos Vnuk's anltr-based SqlSQL2). The resulting query representation is equivalent to the original user query, and does not include any stateful interpretation, but may not completely reflect the original syntax. The purpose of this representation is to provide a semantic representation that may be operated upon by query analysis and transformation modules without the complexity of a parse tree containing every node in the original EBNF grammar.

Once the intermediate representation has been created, it is processed by two sequences of modules. The first sequence operates on the query as a single statement. A transformation step occurs to split the single representation into a "plan" involving multiple phases of execution, one to be executed per-data-chunk, and one to be executed to combine the distributed results into final user results. A second sequence is then applied on this plan to apply the necessary transformations for an accurate result.

We have found that regular expressions and parse element handlers are insufficient to analyze and manipulate queries for anything beyond the most basic query syntax constructions.

5.3.1 Processing modules

The processing modules perform most of the work in transforming the user query into statements that can produce a faithful result from a Qserv cluster. These include:

- Identify spatial indexing opportunities. This allows Qserv to dispatch spatially-restricted queries on only a subset of the available chunks constituting a table. Spatial restrictions given in Qserv-specific syntax are rewritten as boolean SQL clauses.
- Identify secondary index opportunities. Qserv databases designate one column (more are under consideration) as a key column whose values are guaranteed to exist in exactly one spatial location. Identification allows Qserv to convert point queries on this column into spatial restrictions.
- Identify table joins and generate syntax to perform distributed join results. Qserv pri-

marily supports “near-neighbor” spatial joins for limited distances defined in the partitioning coordinate space. Arbitrary joins between distributed tables are only supported using the key column. Queries are classified according to data coverage and table scanning. By identifying tables scanned in a query, Qserv is able to mark queries for execution using shared scanning, which greatly increases efficiency.

5.3.2 Processing module overview




FIGURE 4: Processing modules.

This figure illustrates the query preparation pipeline that generates physical queries from an input query string. User query strings are parsed (1) into a structured query representation that is passed through a sequence of processing modules (2) that operate on that representation in-place. Then, it is broken up (3) into pieces that are explicitly intended for parallel

execution on table partitions and pieces intended to merge parallel results into user results. Another processing sequence (4) operates on this new representation, and then finally, concrete query strings are generated (5) for execution.

The two sequences of processing modules provide an extensible means to implement query analysis and manipulation. Earlier prototypes performed analysis and manipulation during parsing, but this led to a practically unmaintainable code base and the functionality has been ported the processing module model. Processing is split into two sequences to provide the flexibility to modules that manipulate the physical structures while offering the simpler single-query representation to modules that do not require the complexity. The clear separation between parsing, whose only goal is to provide a intelligible and modifiable query representation, and the Qserv-specific analysis and manipulation is a key factor in the overall flexibility, maintainability, and extensibility of the system and should help the system adapt to current and future LSST needs.

5.4 Dispatch

Qserv uses XRootD as a distributed, highly-available communications system to allow Qserv frontends to communicate with data workers. Up until 2015, Qserv used a synchronous client API with named files as communication channels. The current baseline system utilizes a general two-way named-channeling system which eliminates explicit file abstractions in favor of generalized protocol messages that can be flexibly streamed. The scheme is called Scalable Service Interface (SSI) and is built on top of XRootD.

5.4.1 Wire protocol

Qserv encodes query dispatches in Google Protobuf messages, which contain SQL statements to be executed by the worker and annotations that describe query dependencies and characteristics. Transmitting query characteristics allows Qserv workers to optimize query execution under changing CPU and disk loads as well as memory considerations. The worker need not re-analyze the query to discover these characteristics or guess at conditions that cannot be determined by query inspection.

Query results are also returned via Protobuf messages. Initial implementations transmitted table dumps to avoid logic to encode and decode data values, but experience with the prototype MonetDB worker backend proved that data encoding and marshalling were constrained problems whose solution could significantly improve overall query latency by avoiding mu-

tating metadata operations on worker and frontend DBMS systems. The system presently encodes results in protobuf messages containing schema and row-by-row encoded data values. Streaming results directly from worker DBMS instances into frontend DBMS instances is a technique under consideration, as is a custom aggregation engine for results that would likely ease the implementation of providing partial query results to end users.

5.4.2 Frontend

In 2012, a new XRootD client API was developed to address our concerns over the older version's scalability (uncovered during a 150 node, 30TB scalability test [DMTR-21]). The new client API began production use for the broader XRootD community in late 2012. Subsequently, work began under our guidance towards an XRootD Qserv client API that was based on request-response interaction over named channels, instead of opening, reading, and writing files. A production version of this API, the Scalable Service Interface (SSI) became available in early 2015 and Qserv has since been ported to use this interface. The port eliminated a significant body of code that mapped dispatching and result-retrieval to file operations. The SSI API now resides in the XRootD code base, where it may be exercised by other projects.

The SSI API provides Qserv with a fully asynchronous interface that eliminates nearly all blocking threads used by the Qserv frontend to communicate with its workers. This eliminated one class of problems we encountered during large-scale testing. The SSI API has defined interfaces that integrate smoothly with the Protobufs-encoded messages used by Qserv. Two novel features were specifically added to improve Qserv performance. The streaming response interface enables reduced buffering in transmitting query results from a worker mysqld to a the frontend, which lowers end-to-end query latency and reduces storage requirements on workers. The out-of-band meta-data response which arrives prior to the data results can be used to map out the Protobufs encoding and significantly simplify handling response memory buffers.

The fully asynchronous API is crucial on the master because of the large number of concurrent chunk queries in flight expected in normal operation. For example, with the sky split into 10k pieces, having 10 full-scanning queries running concurrently would have 100k concurrent chunk queries – too large a number of threads to allow on a single machine. Hence, an asynchronous API to XRootD is crucial. Threads are used to parallelize multiple CPU-bound tasks. While it does not seem to be important to parse/analyze/manipulate a single user query in parallel (and such a task would be a research topic), the retrieval and processing of results could be done in parallel if some portion of the aggregation/merging were done in Qserv

code rather than loaded into the frontend's MySQL instance and merged via SQL queries. Thus results processing should be parallelized among results from individual chunks, and query parsing/analysis/manipulation can be parallelized among independent user queries.

5.4.3 Worker

The Qserv worker uses both threads and asynchronous calls to provide concurrency and parallelism. To service incoming requests from the XRootD API, an asynchronous API is used to receive requests and enqueue them for action. Specifically, the Scalable Service Interface (SSI) is used on Qserv workers as well. The interface provides a mirror image of the actions taken on the front-end making the logic relatively easy to follow and the implementation less error prone.

Threads are maintained in a thread pool to perform incoming queries and wait on calls into the DBMS's API (currently, the apparently synchronous MySQL C-API). Threads are allowed to run in observance of the amount of parallel resources available. The worker estimates the I/O dependency of each incoming chunk query in terms of the chunk tables involved and disk resources involved, and attempts to ensure that disk access is almost completely sequential. Thus if there are many queries that access the same table chunk, the worker allows as many of them to run as there are CPU cores in the system, but if it has many queries that involve different chunk tables, it allows fewer simultaneous chunk queries in order to ensure that only one table scan per disk spindle occurs. Further discussion of this "shared scanning" feature is described below.

5.5 Threading Model

Nearly every portion of Qserv is written using a combination of threaded and asynchronous execution.

Qserv heavily relies on multi-threading to take advantage of all available CPU cores when executing queries, as an example, to complete one full table scan on a table consisting of 1,000 chunks, 1,000 queries (processes) will be executed. To efficiently handle the large number of processes that are executed on each worker, we ended up rewriting the XRootD client and switching from a thread-per-request model to a thread-pool model. The new client is completely asynchronous, with real call-backs.

mysqlproxy	Single-threaded Lua code driving non-blocking mysql client API
Frontend-C++	Processing thread per user-query for preparation; Results-merging thread-per-user-query on-demand;
Frontend-XRootD	Callback threads perform query transmission and results retrieval
Frontend-XRootD internal	Threads for maintaining worker connections (< 1 per host)
XRootD, cmsd	Small thread pools for managing live network connections and performing lookups
Worker-XRootD plug-in	Small thread pool $O(\#cores)$ to make blocking mysql C-API calls into local mysqld; callback threads from XRootD perform admission/scheduling of tasks from frontend and transmission of results

5.6 Aggregation

Qserv supports several SQL aggregation functions: AVG(), COUNT(), MAX(), MIN(), and SUM(), and SQL92 level GROUP BY.

5.7 Indexing

Qserv eschews heavy indexing in general, due to the prohibitive overhead costs it would incur as a result of the scale of the hosted data. Nevertheless, queries constrained by Object primary key are anticipated to be a very common use case and are important to execute efficiently. To that end, the current implementation admits one special-case global index on master nodes, which can be used to map queries restricted by Object primary key to the chunks and subchunks which contain those Objects. Query fragments can then be dispatched directly to just the set of involved workers, where in-memory subchunk caching allows the fragments to be efficiently executed. This special-case global index from Object primary key to chunk/subchunk is referred to as the “secondary index”.⁵

The secondary index utilizes one or more tables using the InnoDB storage engine on each master node to perform lookups. Performance tests (Figure 5) on a single, dual-core host

⁵It is acknowledged that the name “secondary index” was poorly chosen, given its usual meaning in the database literature. This name will probably be changed in the near future.

with 1 TB hard disk storage (not SSD) have shown that this configuration will support a full load of 40 billion rows in about 400,000 seconds (110 hours). A more realistic configuration with multiple cores and SSD storage is expected to meet the requirement of fully loading in less than 48 hours.




FIGURE 5: Performance tests of MySQL-based secondary index.

To improve the performance of the InnoDB storage engine for queries, the secondary index may be split across a small number (dozens) of tables, each containing a contiguous range of keys. This splitting, if done, will be independent of the partitioning of the database itself. The contiguity of key ranges will allow the secondary index service to identify the appropriate split table arithmetically via an in-memory lookup.

5.7.1 Secondary Index Structure

The secondary index consists of three columns: the Object primary key (objectId), the chunk where all data with that key are located (chunkId), and the subchunk within that chunk where data with the key are located (subChunkId). The objectId is assigned by the science pipelines as a 64-bit integer value; the chunkId and subChunkId are both 16-bit integers which identify spatial regions on the sky.

5.7.2 Secondary Index Loading

The InnoDB storage engine loads tables most efficiently if it is provided input data which has been presorted according to the table's primary key. When the secondary index information is collected for loading (from each worker node handling a collection of chunks), it is sorted by objectId, and may be divided into roughly equal "splits". Each of those splits is loaded into a table *en masse*.

To fully optimize the loading and table splitting, the entire index should be collected from all workers and presorted in memory on the master. This is not reasonable for 40 billion entries (requiring a minimum of 480 GB memory, plus overhead). Instead, the index data from a single worker can be assumed to be a "representative sample" from the full range of objectIds, so table splitting can be done using the first worker's index data. The remaining workers will be split and loaded according to those defined tables.

5.8 Data Distribution

LSST will maintain the released data store both on tape media and on a database cluster. The tape archive is used for long-term archival. Three copies of the compressed catalog data will be kept. The database cluster will maintain 3 online copies of the data. Because computer clusters of reasonable size failure regularly, the cluster must maintain replicas in order to provide continuous data access. A replication factor of 3 is needed in order to determine data integrity by majority rule when one replica is corrupt.

If periodic unplanned downtime is acceptable, an on-tape replica may function as one of the three. However, the use of tape dramatically increases the cost of recovering from a failure. This may be acceptable for some tables, particularly those that are large and lesser-used, although allowing service disruption may make it difficult to make progress on long-running analysis on those large tables.

5.8.1 Database data distribution

The baseline database system will provide access for at least two database releases: latest and previous . Data for each release will be spread out among all nodes in the cluster.

Data releases are partitioned spatially, and spatial pieces (chunks) are distributed in a round-robin fashion across all nodes. This means that area queries involving multiple chunks are

almost guaranteed to involve resources on multiple nodes.

Each node should maintain at least 20% free space of its data storage allocation. The remaining free space is then available to be “borrowed” when another node fails. This will be a temporary use of storage capacity until more server resources can be put online, until the 80% storage use is returned.

5.8.2 Failure and integrity maintenance

There will be failures in any large cluster of nodes, in the nodes themselves, in data storage volumes, in network access and so on. These failures will remove access to data that is resident on those nodes, but this loss of data access should not affect that ability of scientists to analyze the dataset as a whole. We need to set a data availability time over 99.5% to ensure confidence of the community in the stability of the system. To ensure this level of data access, and to allow acceptable levels of node failures in a cluster, there will be replication of data on a table level throughout the cluster.

The replication level will be that each table in the database will exist 3 times, each on separate nodes. A monitoring layer to the system will check on the availability of each table every few hours, although this time will be tuned in practice. When this layer sees that a table has less than three replicas available, this will initiate a replication of that table to another node, not currently hosting that table. The times for the checking, and speed of replication will be tuned to the stability of the cluster, such that about 5% of all tables at any given time will only have 1 or 2 replicas. Three replicas will ensure that tables will be available even in cases of large failures, or when nodes need to be migrated to new hardware in bulk.

Should an entire node fail, replicating that data to another single node would be fairly expensive in terms of time (on the order of hours). We plan on having free space on each node, filling local storage to 80%. The free space will be used for temporary storage of tables on failures, where replicas can take place in parallel between nodes into this free space. When new nodes with free storage are added to the cluster, then this data can be copied off this free space into the drive, potentially taking several hours, but there will still be 3 replicas of data during this time. Once this is complete, this data will have 4 replicas for the short period of time until these tables can be removed from the temporary storage, returning each node to 80% usage.

5.9 Metadata

Qserv needs to track various metadata information, static (not changing or changing very infrequently), and dynamic (run-time) in order to maintain schema and data integrity and optimize the cluster usage.

5.9.1 Static metadata

Qserv typically works with databases and tables distributed across many different machines: it breaks individual large tables into smaller chunks and distributes them across many nodes. All chunks that belong to the same logical table must have the same schema and partitioning parameters. Different tables often need to be partitioned differently; for example some tables might be partitioned with overlap (such as the Object table), some might be partitioned with no overlap (for example the Source table), and some might not need partitioning at all (e.g. a tiny Filter table). All this information about schema and partitioning for all Qserv-managed databases and tables needs to be tracked and kept consistent across the entire Qserv cluster.

Implementation of the static metadata in Qserv is based on hierarchical key-value storage which uses a regular MySQL database as a storage backend. This database is shared between multiple masters and it must be served by a fault-tolerant MySQL server instance, e.g. using a master-master replication solution like MariaDB Galera cluster. Database consistency is critical for metadata and it should be implemented using one of the transactional database engines in MySQL.

Static metadata may contain following information:

- Per-database and per-table partitioning and scan scheduling parameters.
- Table schema for each table, used to create database tables in all worker and master instances; the schema in the master MySQL instance can be used to obtain the same information when a table is already created.
- Database and table state information, used primarily by the process of database and table creation or deletion.
- Definitions for the set of worker and master nodes in a cluster including their availability status.

The main clients of the static metadata are:

- Administration tools (command-line utilities and modules) which allow one to define or modify metadata structures.
- Qserv master(s), mostly querying partitioning parameters but also allowed to modify table/database status when deleting/creating new tables and databases. Master(s) should not depend on node definitions in metadata; the XRootD facility is used to communicate with workers.
- A special “watcher” service which implements distributed processes of database and table management.
- An initial implementation of the data loading application which will use the node definitions and will create/update database and table definitions. This initial implementation will eventually be replaced by a distributed loading mechanism which may be based on separate mechanisms.

5.9.2 Dynamic metadata

In addition to static metadata, a Qserv cluster also needs to track its current state, and keep various statistics about query execution. This sort of data is updated frequently, several times per query execution, and is called dynamic metadata.

The implementation of the dynamic metadata is based on the MySQL database. Like static metadata it needs to be shared between all master instances and is served via a single fault-tolerant MySQL instance which is shared with static metadata database.

Dynamic metadata contains the following information:

- Definition of every master instance in a Qserv cluster.
- Record of every SELECT-type query processed by cluster. This record includes query processing state and some statistical/timing information.
- Per-query list of table names used by the asynchronous queries; this information is used to delay table deletion while async queries are in progress.

- Per-query worker information, which includes chunk id and identifying information for the worker processing that chunk id. This information will be used to transparently restart the master or migrate query processing to a different master in case of master failure.

The most significant use of the dynamic metadata is to track execution of asynchronous queries. When an async query is submitted it is registered in the dynamic metadata and its ID is returned to the user immediately. Later users can request status information for that query ID which is obtained from dynamic metadata. When query processing is finished, users can request results and the master can obtain the location of the result data from dynamic metadata.

Additionally, dynamic metadata can be used to collect statistical information about queries that were executed in the past which may be an important tool in understanding and improving system performance.

5.9.3 Architecture

The Qserv metadata system is implemented based on master/server architecture: the metadata is centrally managed by a *Qserv Metadata Server* (qms). The information kept on each worker is kept to a bare minimum: each worker only knows which databases it is supposed to handle, and all remaining information can be fetched from the qms as needed. This follows our philosophy of keeping the workers as simple as possible.

The real-time metadata is managed inside qms in in-memory tables, periodically synchronized with disk-based table. Such configuration allows reducing qms latency – important to avoid delaying query execution time. Should a qms failure occur, the in-flight queries for which the information was lost will be restarted. Since the synchronization to disk-based table will occur relatively frequently (e.g. at least once per minute), the lost time is insignificant. To avoid overloading the qms, only the high-level information available from Qserv-master is stored in qms; all worker-based information is cached in a scratch space local to each worker in a simple, raw form (e.g. key-value, ASCII file), and can be fetched on demand as needed.

5.9.4 Typical Data Flow

Static metadata:

1. Parts of the static metadata known before data is partitioned/loaded are loaded by the administration scripts responsible for loading data into the database, then these scripts start data partitioner.
2. The data partitioner reads static metadata loaded by the administration scripts, loads remaining information.
3. When Qserv starts, it fetches all static metadata and caches it in memory in a special, in-memory optimized C++ structure.
4. The contents of the in-memory metadata cache inside Qserv can be refreshed on demand if the static metadata changes (for example, when a new database or a table is added).

Dynamic-metadata:

1. Master loads the information for each query (when it starts, when it completes).
2. Detailed statistics are dumped by each worker into a scratch space kept locally. This information can be requested from each worker on demand. A typical use case: if all chunk-queries except one completed, qms would fetch statistics for the still-running chunk-query to estimate when the query might finish, whether to restart this query etc.

5.10 Shared Scans

Arbitrary full-table scanning queries must be supported in LSST's baseline catalog, and in order to provide this support cost-effectively and efficiently, Qserv implements shared scans. Shared scans effectively reduce the I/O cost of executing multiple scanning queries concurrently, reducing the require system hardware and purchasing costs.

Shared scans reduce overall I/O costs by forcing incoming queries to share. When multiple queries scan the same table, theoretically, they can completely share I/O and incur only the I/O cost of a single query rather than the sum of their individual costs. In general, it is difficult for queries to share I/O because their arrival times are random and uncorrelated. Each query begins scanning at different times, and because LSST's catalog tables will be so large, general system caching is ineffective. In Qserv, scanning queries are broken up into many parts, and shared scanning forces each query to operate on the same portion of data at the same time by reordering and sequencing the query fragments.

5.10.1 Background

Historically, shared scanning has been a research topic that has very few real-world implementations. We know of only one implementation in use (Teradata). Most database implementations assume OS or database caching is sufficient, encouraging heavy use of indexing to reduce the need of table scans. However, our experiments have shown that when tables are large enough (by row count) and column access sufficiently variable (cannot index enough columns when there are hundreds to choose from), indexes are insufficient. With large tables, indexes no longer fit in memory, and even when they do fit in memory, the seek cost to retrieve each row is dominant when the index selects a percentage of rows, rather than some finite number (thousands or less).

5.10.2 Implementation

The implementation of shared scans in Qserv is in two parts. The first part is a basic classification of incoming queries as scanning queries or non-scanning queries. A query is considered to scan a table if it depends on non-indexed column values and involves more than k chunks (where k is a tunable constant). Note that involving multiple chunks implies that the query selects from at least one partitioned table. This classification is performed during query analysis on the front-end and leverages table metadata. The metadata includes a “scan rating”, which is set by hand. Higher scan ratings indicate larger tables that take longer to read from disk. The identified “scan tables” and their ratings are marked and passed along to Qserv workers, which use the information in scheduling the fragments of these scanning queries.

The second part of the shared scans implementation is a scheduling algorithm that orders query fragment execution to optimize cache effectiveness. Because Qserv relies on individual off-the-shelf DBMS instances on worker nodes, it is not allowed to modify those instances to implement shared scans. Instead, it issues query fragments ordered to maximize locality of access in data and time, and tries to lock the files associated with the tables in memory as much as possible. Using the identified scan tables and their ratings, the worker places them on the appropriate scheduler. There will be at least three schedulers. One for queries expected to complete in under an hour, which are expected to be related to the Object table. One for queries expected to take less than eight hours, expected to be related to Object_Extra. And one for scans expected to take eight to twelve hours for ForcedSource and/or Source tables. The reasoning being that a single slow query can impede the progress of a shared scan and all the other user queries on that scan. There may be a need for another scheduler to handle queries taking more than 12 hours.

Each scheduler places incoming chunk queries into one of two priority queues sorted by chunk id then scan rating of the individual tables. If the query is for a chunk after the currently scanning chunk id, it is placed on the active priority queue, otherwise it is placed on the pending priority queue. After chunk id, the priority queue is sorted by the table with highest scan rating to ensure that the largest tables in the chunk are grouped together.

Once the query is on the appropriate scheduler, the algorithm proceeds as follows: When a dispatch slot is available, it checks the highest priority scheduler. If that scheduler has a query fragment (hereafter called a task), and it is not at its quota limit, it is allowed to start its next task, otherwise the worker checks the next scheduler. It continues doing this until a task has been started or all the schedulers have been checked.

Each scheduler is only allowed to start a task under certain circumstances. There must be enough threads available from the pool so that none of the other schedulers are starved for threads as well as enough memory available to lock all the tables for the task in memory. If the scheduler has no tasks running, it may start one task and have memory reserved for the tables in that task. This should prevent any scheduler from hanging due to memory starvation without requiring complicated logic, but it could incur extra disk I/O.

Schedulers check for tasks by first checking the top of the active priority queue. If the active priority queue is empty, and the pending priority queue is not, then the active and pending queues are swapped with the task being taken from the top of the “new” active queue.

Since the queries are being run by a separate DBMS instance of which there is little control over how it goes about running queries, the worker can only control when queries are sent to the DBMS and also lock files in memory. Files in memory are among the most likely items to be paged out when memory resources are low, which would increase disk I/O. Locking files in memory prevents this from happening. However, care must be taken in choosing how much memory can be used for locking files. Use too much and there will be a significant impact on DBMS performance. Set aside too little, and schedulers will not make optimum use of the resources available and may be forced to run tasks without actually locking the files in memory.

The memory manager controls which files are locked in memory. When a scheduler tries to run a task, the task asks the memory manager to lock all the shared scan tables it needs. The memory manager determines which files are associated with the tables. If the files are already locked in memory and there is enough memory available to lock the files which are

not already locked, the task is given a handle and allowed to run. When the task completes, it hands the handle back to the memory manager. If it was the last task using any particular table, the memory for the files used by that table is freed.

When the memory manager locks a file, it does not read the file. It only sets aside memory for the file to occupy when it is read by the DBMS. In the special case where a task can run even though there is not enough memory available, those tables that cannot fit are put on a list of reserved tables and their size is subtracted from the quota until they can be locked or freed. When memory is freed, the memory manager will try to lock the reserved tables.

Because Qserv processes interactive, short queries concurrently with scanning queries, its query scheduler should be able to allow for those queries to complete without waiting for a query scan. To achieve this, Qserv worker nodes choose between the scan scheduler described above and a simpler *grouping* scheduler. Incoming queries with identified scan tables are admitted to the scan scheduler, and all other queries are admitted to the grouping scheduler. The grouping scheduler is a simple scheduler that is a simple variant of a plain FIFO (first-in-first-out) scheduler. Like a FIFO scheduler, it maintains a queue of queries to execute, and operates identically to a FIFO scheduler with one exception – queries are grouped by chunk id. Each incoming query is inserted into the queue behind another query on the same chunk, and at the back if no queued query matches. The grouping scheduler assumes that the queue will never get very long, because it is intended to only handle short interactive queries lasting fractions of seconds, but groups its queue according to chunk id in order to provide a minimal amount of access locality to improve throughput at a limited cost to latency. Some longer queries will be admitted to the grouping scheduler even though they are scanning queries, provided that they have been determined to only scan a single chunk. Although these non-shared scan query will disrupt performance of the overall scan on the particular disk on a worker, the impact is thought to be small because each of these represents all (or a large fraction of) the work for a single user query, and the impact is amortized among all disks on all workers.

For discussion about the performance of the current implementation, refer to DMTR-16.

5.10.3 Memory management

To minimize system paging when multiple threads are scanning the same table, we implemented a memory manager called memman. When a shared scan is about to commence, the shared scan scheduler informs memman about the tables the query will be using and

how important it is to keep those tables in memory during the course of the query. When directed to keep the tables in memory, memman opens each data base table file, maps it into memory, and then locks the pages to prevent the kernel from stealing the pages for other uses. Thus, once a file page is faulted in, it stays in memory and allows other threads to scan the contents of the page without incurring additional page faults. Once the shared scan of the table completes, memman is told that the tables no longer need to remain in memory. memman frees up the pages by unlocking them and deleting the mapping.

This type of management is necessary to satisfy system paging requirements because the prime paging pool is the set of unlocked file system pages.

5.10.4 XRootD scheduling support

When the front-end dispatches a query, XRootD normally picks the least used server in an attempt to spread the load across all of the nodes holding the required table. While this works well for interactive queries, it is hardly ideal for shared scan queries. In order to optimize memory and I/O usage, queries for the same table in a shared scan should all be targeted to the same node. A new scheduling mode was added to the XRootD cmsd called affinity scheduling. The front-end can tell XRootD whether or not a particular query has affinity to other queries using the same table. Queries that have affinity are always sent to the same node relative to the table they will be using. This allows the back-end scheduler to minimize paging by running the maximum number of queries against the same table in parallel. Should that node fail, XRootD assigns another working node that has the table as the target node for queries that have affinity.

5.10.5 Multiple tables support

Handling multiple tables in shared scans requires an additional level of management. The scheduler will aim to satisfy a throughput yielding average scan latencies as follows:

- Object queries: 1 hour
- Object, Source queries (join): 12 hours
- Object, ForcedSource queries (join): 12 hours
- Object_Extras⁶ queries (join): 8 hours.

⁶This includes all Object-related tables, e.g., Object_Extra, Object_Periodic, Object_NonPeriodic, Object_APMean

There are separate schedulers for queries that are expected to take one hour, eight hours, or twelve hours. The schedulers group the tasks by chunk id and then the highest scan rating of the all tables in the task. The scan ratings are meant to be unique per table and indicative of the size of the table, so this sorting places scans using the largest table from the same chunk next to each other in the queue. Using scan rating allows flexibility to work with data sets with schemas different than that of LSST.

Since scans are not limited to specific tables, complicated joins could occur in user queries that could take more than twelve hours to process. The worker monitors query progress, and if particular queries appear to be too slow for their current scheduler, they are removed and placed on a dedicated "snail scan" so the rest of the queries on the original scheduler are not overly delayed.

5.11 Level 3: User Tables, External Data

Level 3 tables including tables generated by users, and data catalogs brought from outside, depending on their type and size, will be either partitioned and distributed across the production database servers, or kept unpartitioned in one central location. While the partitioned and distributed Level 3 data will share the nodes with Level 2 data, it will be kept on dedicated disks, independent from the disks serving Level 2 data. This will simplify maintenance and recoverability from failures.

Level 3 tables will be tracked and managed through the Qserv Metadata System (qms), described in Section 5.9. This includes both the static, as well as the dynamic metadata.

5.12 Cluster and Task Management

Qserv delegates management of cluster nodes to XRootD. The XRootD system manages cluster membership, node registration/deregistration, address lookup, replication, and communication. Its Scalable Service Interface (SSI) API provides data-addressed communication channels to the rest of Qserv, hiding details like node count, the mapping of data to nodes, the existence of replicas, and node failure. The Qserv master focuses on dispatching queries to endpoints and Qserv workers focus on receiving and executing queries on their local data.

Cluster management performed outside of XRootD does not directly affect query execution, but includes coordinating data distribution, data loading, and node arrival/departure, and is discussed in Section 5.15. The SSI API includes methods that allow dynamic updates to the

data view of an XRootD cluster so that when new tables appear or disappear, the XRootD system can incorporate that information for future scheduling decisions. Thus, clusters can dynamically change without the need to restart the XRootD system.

5.13 Fault Tolerance

Qserv approaches fault tolerance in several ways. The design exploits the immutability of the underlying data by replicating and distributing data chunks across a cluster such that in the event of a node failure, the problem can be isolated and all subsequent queries re-routed to nodes maintaining duplicate data. Moreover, this architecture is fundamental to Qserv's incremental scalability and parallel performance. Within individual nodes, Qserv is highly modularized with minimal interdependence among its components, which are connected via narrow interfaces. Finally, individual components contain specialized logic for minimizing, handling, and recovering from errors.

The components that comprise Qserv include features that independently provide failure-prevention and failure-recovery capabilities. The MySQL proxy is designed to balance its load among several underlying MySQL servers and provide automatic fail-over in the event a server fails. The XRootD system provides multiple managers and highly redundant servers to provide high bandwidth, contend with high request rates, and cope with unreliable hardware. And the Qserv master itself contains logic that works in conjunction with XRootD to isolate and recover from worker-level failures.

A worker-level failure denotes any failure mode that can be confined to one or more worker nodes. In principle, all such failures are recoverable given the problem nodes are identified and alternative nodes containing duplicate data are available. Examples of such failures include a disk failure, a worker process or machine crashing, or network problems that render a worker unreachable.

Consider the event of a disk failure. Qserv's worker logic is not equipped to manage such a failure on localized regions of disk and would behave as if a software fault had occurred. The worker process would therefore crash and all chunk queries belonging to that worker would be lost. The in-flight queries on its local mysqld would be cleaned up and have resources freed. The Qserv master's requests to retrieve these chunk queries via XRootD would then return an error code. The master responds by re-initializing the chunk queries and re-submits them to XRootD. Ideally, duplicate data associated with the chunk queries exists on other nodes. In this case, XRootD silently re-routes the request(s) to the surviving node(s) and all associated

queries are completed as usual. In the event that duplicate data does not exist for one or more chunk queries, XRootD would again return an error code. The master will re-initialize and re-submit a chunk query a fixed number of times (determined by a parameter within Qserv) before giving up, logging information about the failure, and returning an error message to the user in response to the associated query.

Error handling in the event that an arbitrary hardware or software bug (perhaps within the Qserv worker itself) causes a worker process or machine to crash proceeds in the same manner described above. The same is true in the event that network loss or transient sluggishness/overload has the limited effect of preventing XRootD from communicating with one or more worker nodes. As long as such failures are limited to a finite number of workers and do not extend to the Qserv master node, XRootD is designed to record the failure and return an error code. Moreover, if duplicate data exists on other nodes, this will be registered within XRootD, which will successfully route any subsequent chunk queries.

In the event of an unrecoverable error, the Qserv master is equipped with a status/error messaging mechanism designed to both log detailed information about the failure and to return a human-readable error message to the user. This mechanism includes C++ exception handling logic that encapsulates all of the master's interactions with XRootD. If an unrecoverable exception occurs, the master gracefully terminates the query, frees associated resources, logs the event, and notifies the user. Qserv's internal status/error messaging system also generates a status message and timestamp each time an individual chunk query achieves a milestone. Such milestones include: chunk query dispatch, written to XRootD, results read from XRootD, results merged, and query finalized. This real-time status information provides useful context in the event of an unrecoverable error.

Building upon the existing fault-tolerance and error handling features described above, future work includes introducing a heartbeat mechanism on worker nodes that periodically pings the worker process and will restart it in the event it becomes unresponsive. Similarly, a master monitoring process could periodically ping worker nodes and restart a worker machine if necessary. We are also considering managing failure at a per-disk level, but this would require research since application-level treatment of disk failure is relatively rare. It should also be possible to develop an interface for checking the real-time status of queries currently being processed by Qserv by leveraging its internally used status/error messaging mechanism.

5.14 Next-to-database Processing

We expect some data analyses will be very difficult, or even impossible to express through SQL language; e.g. time-series analyses. For these types of analyses, we wish to allow users to execute their algorithms in a procedural language, such as Python, on hardware resources co-located with the production database data.

One approach being investigated is to allow users to run pre-filter queries on the production database, with the results streamed to the user processing cluster where their custom code may run without directly endangering the production database. This would allow incurred database I/O needs to be satisfied using the database system's shared scanning infrastructure.

Another approach being investigated would involve keeping one set of replicas of the catalog data files external to the database system, in a storage format optimized for an off-the-shelf MR processing framework. This framework would then be deployed and run on the user processing cluster independent of the database system. The data replication system would then be responsible for transforming files between database and MR framework formats during data ingest and/or recovery.

5.15 Administration

5.15.1 Installation

Qserv as a service requires a number of components that all need to be running, and configured together. On the master node we require mysqld, mysql-proxy, XRootD, cmsd, Qserv metadata service, and the Qserv master process. On each of the worker nodes there will also be the mysqld, cmsd, and XRootD service. These major components come from the MySQL, XRootD, and Qserv distributions. But to get these to work together we also require many more software packages, such as protobuf, Lua, expat, libevent, python, zope, boost, Java, antlr, and so on. And many of these require more recent versions than are provided in most system distributions.

To manage both the complexity of deployment and the diversity of possible installation environments, we have adopted the use of Linux containers via Docker. Service binaries and their user-space dependencies are bundled within containers which can then be deployed uniformly to any host running Docker with a recent enough Linux kernel, regardless of oper-

ating system distribution, package profile, patch levels, etc.

We have experimented with several container orchestration technologies during development. Of these, Kubernetes seems to be emerging as a clear leader, and is our current orchestration solution of choice.

5.15.2 Data loading

As previously mentioned, Data Release Production will not write directly to the database. Instead, the DRP pipelines will produce binary FITS tables and image files that are reliably archived as they are produced. Data will be loaded into Qserv in bulk for every table, so that tables are either not available, or complete and immutable from the user query access perspective.

For replicated tables, these FITS files are converted to CSV (e.g. by harvesting FITS image header keyword value pairs, or by translating binary tables to ASCII), and the resulting CSV files are loaded directly into MySQL and indexed. For partitioned tables like Object and Source, FITS tables are fed to the Qserv partitioner, which assigns partitions based on sky coordinates and converts to CSV.

In particular, the partitioner divides the celestial sphere into latitude angle “stripes” of fixed height H . For each stripe, a width W is computed such that any two points in the stripe with longitudes separated by at least W have angular separation of at least H . The stripe is then broken into an integral number of chunks of width at least W , so that each stripe contains a varying number of chunks (e.g. polar stripes will contain just a single chunk). Chunk area varies by a factor of about π over the sphere. The same procedure is used to obtain subchunks: each stripe is broken into a configurable number of equal-height “substripes”, and each substripe is broken into equal-width subchunks. This scheme is preferred over the Hierarchical Triangular Mesh for its speed (no trigonometry is required to locate the partition of a point given in spherical coordinates), simplicity of implementation, and the relatively fine control it offers over the area of chunks and sub-chunks.

The boundaries of subchunks constructed as described are boxes in longitude and latitude - the overlap region for a subchunk is defined as the spherical box containing all points outside the subchunk but within the overlap radius of its boundary.

The task of the partitioner is to find the IDs of the chunk and subchunk containing the par-

tioning position of each row, and to store each row in the output CSV file corresponding to its chunk. If the partitioning parameters include overlap, then the row's partitioning position might additionally fall inside the overlap regions of one or more subchunks. In this case, a copy of the row is stored for each such subchunk (in overlap CSV files).

Tables that are partitioned in Qserv must be partitioned identically within a Qserv database. This means that chunk tables in a database share identical partition boundaries and identical mappings of chunk id to spatial partition. In order to facilitate table joining, a single table's columns are chosen to define the partitioning space and all partitioned tables (within a related set of tables) are either partitioned according that pair of columns, or not partitioned at all. Our current plan chooses the Object table's `ra_PS` and `dec1_PS` columns, meaning that rows in the Source and ForcedSource tables will be partitioned according to the Objects they reference.

There is one exception: we allow for precomputed spatial match tables. As an example, such a table might provide a many-to-many relationship between the LSST Object catalog and a reference catalog from another survey, listing all pairs of LSST Objects and reference objects separated by less than some fixed angle. The reference catalog cannot be partitioned by associated Object, as more than one Object might be matched to a reference object. Instead, the reference catalog must be partitioned by reference object position. This means that a row in the match table might refer to an Object and reference object assigned to different chunks stored on different Qserv worker nodes.

We avoid this complication by again exploiting overlap. We mandate (and verify at partitioning time) that no match pair is separated by more than the overlap radius. When partitioning match tables, we store a copy of each match in the chunk of both positions referenced by that match. When joining Objects to reference objects via the match table then, we are guaranteed to find all matches to Objects in chunk C by joining with all match records in C and all reference objects in C or in the overlap region of C.

All Qserv worker nodes will partition subsets of the pipeline output files in parallel – we expect partitioning to achieve similar aggregate I/O rates to those of full table scans for user query access, so that partitioning should complete in a low factor (2-3x) of the table scan time. Once it does, each Qserv worker will gather all output CSV files for its chunks and load them into MySQL. The structure of the resulting chunk tables is then optimized to maximize performance of user query access (chunk tables will likely be sorted, and will certainly be compressed), and appropriate indexes are built. Since chunks are sized to fit in memory, all

of these steps can be performed using an in-memory file-system. I/O costs are incurred only when reading the CSV files during the load and when copying finalized tables (i.e. .MYD/.MYI files) to local disk.

The last phase of data loading is to replicate each chunk to one other Qserv worker node. We will rely on table checksum verification rather than a majority rule to determine whether a replica is corrupt or not.

The partitioner has been prototyped as a multi-threaded C++ program. It uses an in-memory map-reduce implementation internally to scale across cores, and can read blocks of one or more input CSV files in parallel. It does not currently understand FITS table files. CSV file writes are also parallelized - each output chunk is processed by a single reducer thread and can be written to in parallel with no application level locking. In preliminary testing, our partitioner was able to sustain several hundred MB/s of both read and write bandwidth when processing a CSV dump of the PT1.2 Source table.

We are investigating a pair of data loading optimizations. One is to have pipeline processes either integrate the partitioning code or feed data directly to the partitioner, rather than communicating via persistent storage. The other is to write out tables in the native database format (e.g. as .MYD files, ideally using the MySQL/MariaDB server code to do so), allowing the CSV database loading step to be bypassed.

5.15.3 Administrative scripts

The Qserv design originally had a somewhat complicated set of custom scripts and tools used to coordinate and sequence service launch and shutdown on a cluster, to monitor and report on service status, to automatically relaunch failed services, and to coordinate rolling software upgrades out onto a cluster. We have recently found that all of these needs are directly met by container orchestration frameworks such as Kubernetes, and so we are currently in to process of removing this now-redundant tooling in order to simplify and standardize the design.

Data ingest still tends to be a slightly detailed process, beyond just data preparation. Up to now, data preparation produces text files in CSV format which are then loaded into the MySQL layer as a MyISAM table. The schema for these tables then needs to be elaborated in places with columns for chunk and subchunk number. Loading is done with index-creation suspended, and indices and table statistics for the query planner need to be explicitly generated on each worker after the load. Additionally, a list of chunks on the sky for which no data

has been loaded must be generated to aid in efficient query dispatch. All of these activities are currently coordinated by a Python qserv-loader script.

5.16 Current Status and Future Plans

As of now (July 2017) we have implemented a basic version of Qserv end-to-end, and maintain three running instances at a scale of approximately 30 physical nodes each in continuous operation on dedicated hardware clusters at NCSA and CC-IN2P3.

The system has been demonstrated to correctly distribute and execute both low and high volume queries, including small-area cone and object searches, region restricted queries, and full table scans including large-area near-neighbor searches. Analytic queries involving SciSQL UDFs in both filter and aggregation clauses have also been demonstrated.

Scale testing has been successfully conducted⁷ on the above-mentioned clusters with datasets of up to approximately 70 TB, and we expect to cross the 100 TB mark as tests continue in 2017. To date the system is on track through a series of graduated data-challenge style tests [LDM-552] to meet or exceed the stated performance requirements for the project [LDM-555].

The shared-scan implementation is substantially complete, and functions per design to enable high levels of concurrency without degraded full-scan query performance.

The metadata system, as described above, for both static and dynamic metadata is in place, and basic query management facilities (query cancellation and monitoring) have been implemented.

The system includes a comprehensive set of unit and regression tests that are integrated with the build and CI systems.

In addition to background ongoing effort to improve query performance and extend query coverage, implementation work ahead includes:

- automatic data distribution and replication;
- improved query management and monitoring tools;
- demonstrating cross-match with external catalogs;

⁷See Qserv test reports DMTR-21, DMTR-12, DMTR-13, and DMTR-16 (most recent).

- implementing support for Level 3 data;
- next-to-data processing framework;
- improvements to administration procedures and scripts;
- authentication and authorization;
- resource management;
- security;
- early engagement with astronomy users.

Automatic data distribution and replication. We have experimented successfully with static replication of data at ingest time, but for production a system which will automatically place data and dynamically respond dynamically to node arrivals and departures will be required. This is currently under active development.

Improved query management and monitoring tools. The facility to enable clients to temporarily disconnect from long-running queries and later rendezvous to check query progress and/or collect results is currently under active development. Facilities to return partial results and estimate completion times and data sizes for long-running queries remain to be implemented.

Demonstrating cross-match with external catalogs. One of the use cases involves cross matching with external catalogs. In cases where the catalog to cross-match with is small, it will be replicated. For cross-matching with larger catalogs, the catalog to be cross-matched with will need to be partitioned and distributed to the worker nodes.

Implementing support for Level 3 data. Users should be able to maintain their own tables to store their own data or results from previous queries. They should be able to create, drop, and replace their own tables within the system.

Next to data processing framework. A facility to stream query results to dedicated nodes where user-submitted code can run against those streams has yet to be implemented.

Improvements to administration procedures and scripts. To further automate common tasks related to database management, table management, partition management, data distribution, and others we need to implement various improvements to our administration procedures and scripts.

Authentication and authorization. A production database system should provide some facility for user or role-based access so that usage can be controlled and resources can be shared. This is in particular needed for Level-3 data products.

Resource management. A production system should have some way to manage/restrict resource usage and provide quality-of-service controls. This includes a monitoring facility that can track each node's load and per-user-query resource usage.

Security. The system needs to be secure and resilient against denial of service attacks.

Early engagement with astronomy users. It is important that we engage early enough members of our target user-community, so we can have time to on their feedback about what we are building. Does the system have the capabilities they need and expect? Is the query syntax usable and practical for them? We have begun some work in this area through activities in the PDAC (Prototype Data Access Center) cluster at NCSA with a very limited audience, and plan to expand that audience in upcoming months.

5.17 Open Issues

What follows is a (non-exhaustive) list of issues, technical and scientific, that are still being discussed and where changes are possible.

- **Row updates.** Currently, all rows once ingested into a Qserv instance are treated as immutable, and row updates are not supported. This simplification of design is possible because the motivating use case for Qserv (annually released, authoritative, LSST catalogs) is primarily read-only. The apparent need for update of Level 3 products within a Qserv instance can be worked around by treating Level 3 products as immutable once ingested; should changes to a Level 3 product be required, that product would be dropped and re-ingested/regenerated rather than updated in place. If it were deemed necessary that Qserv support row updates and/or transactions directly, some considerable changes to the Qserv architecture would likely be required.
- **Very large objects.** Some objects (e.g. large galaxies) are much larger than our overlap region; in some cases their footprint will span multiple chunks. Currently we are working with the object center, neglecting the actual footprint. While there are some science use cases that would benefit from a system that tracks objects based on their footprint, this is currently not a requirement. A potential solution would involve adding a custom index

similar to the r-tree-based indexes such as the TOUCH [15].

- **Very large results.** Currently, the front-end that dispatches a query is also responsible for assembling its eventual results. In general, this is not a scalable approach as the resources required to process the results may be several orders of magnitude greater than those needed to dispatch the query. One potential solution is to replicate the front-end to the extent necessary to handle query results. Alternatively, the XRootD SSI interface could be augmented to itself allow running disconnected queries. That is, once a particular front-end dispatches a query it can get a handle to that query and disconnect from it. A different server could, using that handle, reconnect to the query and process the results. This would be a more flexible model as it would allow independent scaling of query dispatch and result processing. It would also have the benefit of not requiring cancellation of in-progress queries dispatched from a particular front-end should that front-end die.
- **Sub-queries.** Qserv does not currently support SQL sub-queries. Since there is evidence that such a capability might be useful to users, we should formulate a few possible designs and understand how easy/difficult they might be to implement. Some potential approaches here might be to split sub-queries into multiple queries and/or use session variables. A naïve implementation that involves dumping all sub-query results to disk and then rereading them, similar to a multi-stage map/reduce, should also be tractable.

6 Risk Analysis

6.1 Potential Key Risks

Insufficient **database performance and scalability** is one of the major stated major risks for DM [Document-7025].

Qserv as an implementation of the baseline architecture meeting the requirements referenced above is already well on its way, and is currently resourced and scheduled for completion on time and within budget.

A viable alternative might be to use an off-the-shelf system. In fact, an off-the-shelf solution could present significant support cost advantages over a production-ready Qserv, especially if it is a system well supported by a large user and developer community. It is likely that an open source, scalable solution will be available on the time scale needed by LSST (for the beginning

of production scalability approaching few hundred terabytes would be sufficient). Database systems larger than the largest single LSST data set have been successfully demonstrated in production today. There is a growing demand for large scale systems and growing competition in that area (Hadoop, Greenplum, InfiniDB, MonetDB, Caché and others). Greenplum, which was a closed-source project at the outset of LSST, is now available as open-source.

Finally, a third alternative would be to use a closed-source, non free software, such as Caché or InfiniDB (Teradata is too expensive). Some of these systems are very reasonably priced. We believe the largest barrier preventing us from using an off-the-shelf DBMS such as InfiniDB is poorly developed spherical geometry and spherical partitioning support.

Potential **problems with off-the-shelf database software** used, such as MySQL is another potential risk. MySQL has recently been purchased by Oracle, leading to doubts as to whether the MySQL project will be sufficiently supported in the long-term. Since the purchase, several independent forks of MySQL software have emerged, including MariaDB (supported by one of the MySQL founders) and Percona. Should MySQL disappear, these open-source, MySQL-compatible systems are a solid alternative. Should we need to migrate to a different DBMS, we have taken multiple measures to minimize the impact:

- our schema does not contain any MySQL-specific elements and we have successfully demonstrated using it in other systems such as MonetDB;
- we do not rely on any MySQL specific extensions, with the exception of MySQL Proxy, which can be made to work with non-MySQL systems if needed;
- we minimize the use of stored functions and stored procedures which tend to be DBMS-specific, and instead use user defined functions, which are easier to port (only the interface binding part needs to be migrated).

Complex data analysis. The most complex analysis we identified so far include spatial and temporal correlations which exhibit $O(n^2)$ performance characteristics, searching for anomalies and rare events, as well as searching for unknown are a risk as well – in most cases industrial users deal with much simpler, well defined access patterns. Also, some analysis will be ad-hoc, and access patterns might be different than these we are anticipating. Recently, large-scale industrial users have started to express strong need for similar types of analyses; understanding and correlating user behavior (time-series of user clicks) run by web companies, searching for abnormal user behavior to detect fraud activities run by banks and web

companies, analyzing genome sequencing data run by biotech companies, and what-if market analysis run by financial companies are just a few examples. Typically these analyses are ad-hoc and involve searching for unknowns, similar to scientific analyses. As the demand (by rich, industrial users) for this type of complex analyses grows, the solution providers are rapidly starting to add needed features into their systems.

The complete list of all database-related risks maintained in the LSST risk registry:

- DM-014: Database performance insufficient for planned load
- DM-015: Unexpected database access patterns from science users
- DM-016: Unexpected database access patterns from DM productions
- DM-032: LSST DM hardware architecture becomes antiquated
- DM-060: Dependencies on external software packages
- DM-061: Provenance capture inadequate
- DM-065: LSST DM software architecture incompatible with de facto community standards
- DM-070: Archive sizing inadequate
- DM-074: LSST DM software architecture becomes antiquated
- DM-075: New SRD requirements require new DM functionality

6.2 Risk Mitigations

To mitigate the insufficient performance/scalability risk, we developed Qserv, and demonstrated scalability and performance. In addition, to increase chances an equivalent open-source, community supported, off-the-shelf database system becomes available we have closely collaborated with the MonetDB open source columnar database team – building on our Qserv lessons-learned, they are trying to add missing features and turn their software into a system capable of supporting LSST needs. Further, to stay current with the state-of-the-art in petascale data management and analysis, we continue a dialog with all relevant solution providers, both DBMS and Map/Reduce, as well as with data-intensive users, both industrial and scientific, through the XLDB conference and workshop series we lead, and beyond.

To understand query complexity and expected access patterns, we are working with LSST Science Collaborations and the LSST Science Council to understand the expected query load and query complexity. We have compiled a set of common queries [5] and distilled this set into a smaller set of representative queries we use for various scalability tests – this set represents each major query type, ranging from trivial low volume, to complex correlations [2]. We have also talked to scientists and database developers from other astronomical surveys, including SDSS, 2MASS, Gaia, DES, LOFAR and Pan-STARRS.

To deal with unpredictability of analysis, we will use shared scans. With shared scans, users will have access to all the data, all the columns, even these very infrequently used, at a predictable cost – with shared scans increasing complexity does not increase the expensive disk I/O needs, it only increases the CPU needs.

To keep query load under control, we will employ throttling to limit individual query loads.

7 References

- [1] **[DMTR-12]**, Becla, J., 2013, *Qserv 300 node test*, DMTR-12, URL <https://ls.st/DMTR-12>
- [2] Becla, J., 2013, *Queries Used for Scalability & Performance Tests*, URL <https://dev.lsstcorp.org/trac/wiki/db/queries/ForPerfTest>
- [3] **[DMTR-13]**, Becla, J., 2015, *Qserv Summer 15 Large Scale Tests*, DMTR-13, URL <https://ls.st/DMTR-13>
- [4] **[LDM-555]**, Becla, J., 2017, *Data Management Database Requirements*, LDM-555, URL <https://ls.st/LDM-555>
- [5] Becla, J., Lim, K.T., 2013, *Common Queries*, URL <https://dev.lsstcorp.org/trac/wiki/db/queries>
- [6] **[LDM-141]**, Becla, J., Lim, K.T., 2013, *Data Management Storage Sizing and I/O Model*, LDM-141, URL <https://ls.st/LDM-141>
- [7] Becla, J., Lim, K.T., Monkewitz, S., Nieto-Santisteban, M., Thakar, A., 2008, In: Argyle, R.W., Bunclark, P.S., Lewis, J.R. (eds.) *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XVII*, vol. 394 of *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, 114, ADS Link

- [8] **[DMTN-048]**, Becla, J., Lim, K.T., Wang, D., 2011, *Qserv design prototyping experiments*, DMTN-048, URL <https://dmtn-048.lsst.io>, LSST Data Management Technical Note
- [9] **[DMTN-046]**, Becla, J., Lim, K.T., Wang, D., 2013, *An investigation of database technologies*, DMTN-046, URL <https://dmtn-046.lsst.io>, LSST Data Management Technical Note
- [10] **[DMTR-21]**, Becla, J., Lim, K.T., Wang, D., 2013, *Early (pre-2013) Large-Scale Qserv Tests*, DMTR-21, URL <https://ls.st/DMTR-21>
- [11] Dorigo, A., Elmer, P., Furano, F., Hanushevsky, A., 2005, *WSEAS Transactions on Computers*, 4, 348, URL http://xrootd.org/presentations/xpaper3_cut_journal.pdf
- [12] **[LSE-163]**, Jurić, M., et al., 2017, *LSST Data Products Definition Document*, LSE-163, URL <https://ls.st/LSE-163>
- [13] **[Document-7025]**, Kantor, J., Krabbendam, V., 2011, *DM Risk Register*, Document-7025, URL <https://ls.st/Document-7025>
- [14] **[LDM-552]**, Mueller, F., 2017, *Qserv Software Test Specification*, LDM-552, URL <https://ls.st/LDM-552>
- [15] Nobari, S., Tauheed, F., Heinis, T., et al., 2013, In: *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD '13*, 701–712, ACM, New York, NY, USA, doi:10.1145/2463676.2463700
- [16] **[DMTR-16]**, Thukral, V., 2017, *Qserv Fall 16 Large Scale Tests/KPMs*, DMTR-16, URL <https://ls.st/DMTR-16>
- [17] **[DMTN-047]**, Tommaney, J., Becla, J., Lim, K.T., Wang, D., 2011, *Tests with InfiniDB*, DMTN-047, URL <https://dmtn-047.lsst.io>, LSST Data Management Technical Note