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Database maintenance downtime

We're currently performing maintenance on your account. You won't be able to log in while maintenance is underway, but your account data and messages are safe. Unfortunately, we can't predict exactly how long this will take.

If this maintenance lasts more than 24 hours, please contact us at gmail-maintenance@google.com.

Can functional languages solve this?
Example: Changing a database table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>postal_num</th>
<th>postal_alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>6382</td>
<td>ZB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>9832</td>
<td>KW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Diagram showing the transformation of data]
Ideally, in SQL we do the following:

BEGIN TRANSACTION;
ALTER TABLE users ADD COLUMN postal;
UPDATE users SET postal = postal_num + " " + postal_alpha;
ALTER TABLE users DROP COLUMN postal_num;
ALTER TABLE users DROP COLUMN postal_alpha;
UPDATE STORED PROCEDURE create_user ... 
UPDATE STORED PROCEDURE get_user_details ... 
COMMIT;
Transactions

A transaction declaratively guarantees:

● Atomicity
● Consistency
● Isolation
  ○ Serializability
  ○ Recoverability
● Durability (for persistent systems)
Source of the downtime problem

Transactions can be aborted at any time:
- By choice of the client
- Due to concurrency conflicts
- Hardware failures

Recoverability:
- A client may not commit if it has read any data of an uncommitted transaction.
Our approach

- Send database programs to the database.
- A program can commit before it is executed.
- Optimize transaction execution to avoid or minimize downtime using techniques from functional languages.
Persistent Functional Language

System featuring a persistent state that can be accessed through functional transactions, and that can be used to:

- Implement database management systems
- Implement database programs
- Ad-hoc query and update databases
Functional Transactions

Transaction:
DB -> (DB, Result)

Transaction manager:
DB -> [Transaction] -> [Result]
Example

data User = User String String Integer

type DB = [User]

add_user :: User -> DB -> (DB, ()
add_user u db = (u : db, ())

count_users :: DB -> (DB, Boolean)
count_users db = (db, length db)
Database states

- States are constructed from bulk data types, and can implement many kinds of data models.

- Copies can be created cheaply through sharing
  - Updates create new versions of the database
  - Reads have a stable snapshot
  - Allows experimenting with changes
Lazy evaluation of database states

Uses

● Postpone computing parts of database updates
● Effects of updates can be visible immediately
● Don’t do unnecessary work in queries

Limitations

● Blocks when there are data dependencies
● Transactions can not abort
● Memory requirements
Memoization

Uses

- Keep views up to date cheaply
- Share work between transactions
- Reduce cost of retrying failed transactions

Limitations

- Only works for divide-and-conquer functions
- Potentially a large amount of memory is required
Persistent Functional Language

A state consists of a set of named bindings:

```latex
users = [“alice”, “bob”]
length = \text{\_\_\_list \_\_\_ -> ...}
```

Transaction can read and update bindings:

```latex
users’ = “eve” : users
result = length users
```
Simplified Example

Assuming the state:
\[
\text{data User = User String Int String} \\
\text{users = [User “alice” 6382 “ZB”, …]}
\]

We can change the structure of users:
\[
\text{data User’ = User’ String String} \\
\text{users’ = map users} \\
\quad (\text{User n pn pa -> User’ n (pn + “ “ + pa)})
\]
Future Work

- Language support for optimization strategies
- More optimization strategies
- Modelling a relational database
- Benchmark based on TPC-C