# **TPCC-UVa**

#### An Open-Source TPC-C Implementation for Parallel and Distributed Systems

#### Diego R. Llanos, Belén Palop



Universidad deValladolid

Computer Science Department University of Valladolid, Spain

PMEO-PDS 06, Rhodes Island, April 29th, 2006

< ロ > < 同 > < 三 > .

- There are many benchmarks available to measure CPU performance:
  - SPEC CPU2000, NAS, Olden...
- To measure global system performance, vendors use TPC-C benchmark
- However, only TPC-C specifications are freely available
- TPCC-UVa is an (unofficial) implementation of the TPC-C benchmark, intended for research purposes

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回> < 三> < 三>

- TPC-C simulates the execution of a set of both interactive and deferred transactions: OLTP-like environment
- A number of terminals request the execution of different database transactions, simulating a wholesale supplier
- Five different transaction types are executed during a 2- to 8-hours period:
  - New Order enters a complete order
  - Payment enters the customer's payment
  - Order Status queries the status of a customer's last order
  - Delivery processes a batch of ten new orders
  - Stock Level determines the number of recently sold items

ヘロト ヘ戸ト ヘヨト ヘヨト

- TPC-C simulates the execution of a set of both interactive and deferred transactions: OLTP-like environment
- A number of terminals request the execution of different database transactions, simulating a wholesale supplier
- Five different transaction types are executed during a 2- to 8-hours period:
  - New Order enters a complete order
  - Payment enters the customer's payment
  - Order Status queries the status of a customer's last order
  - Delivery processes a batch of ten new orders
  - Stock Level determines the number of recently sold items

<ロト <回 > < 注 > < 注 > 、

- TPC-C simulates the execution of a set of both interactive and deferred transactions: OLTP-like environment
- A number of terminals request the execution of different database transactions, simulating a wholesale supplier
- Five different transaction types are executed during a 2- to 8-hours period:
  - New Order enters a complete order
  - Payment enters the customer's payment
  - Order Status queries the status of a customer's last order
  - Delivery processes a batch of ten new orders
  - Stock Level determines the number of recently sold items

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三油

- TPC-C simulates the execution of a set of both interactive and deferred transactions: OLTP-like environment
- A number of terminals request the execution of different database transactions, simulating a wholesale supplier
- Five different transaction types are executed during a 2- to 8-hours period:
  - New Order enters a complete order
  - Payment enters the customer's payment
  - Order Status queries the status of a customer's last order
  - Delivery processes a batch of ten new orders
  - Stock Level determines the number of recently sold items

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三油

TPCC-UVa is *not* an official implementation. Our performance number, tpmC-uva, should not be compared with tpm-C given by any vendor

#### • Why not?

- We have not implemented price-per-tpmC metrics
- Our Transaction Monitor is not "commercially available"
- Therefore, the implementation does not have TPC approval

イロン 不得 とくほ とくほ とう

- TPCC-UVa is written entirely in C language, and uses the PostgreSQL database engine
- To ensure fairness, we distribute TPCC-UVa together with the toolchain that should be used to compile it

TPCC-UVa is *not* an official implementation. Our performance number, tpmC-uva, should not be compared with tpm-C given by any vendor

- Why not?
  - We have not implemented price-per-tpmC metrics
  - Our Transaction Monitor is not "commercially available"
  - Therefore, the implementation does not have TPC approval

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三連

- TPCC-UVa is written entirely in C language, and uses the PostgreSQL database engine
- To ensure fairness, we distribute TPCC-UVa together with the toolchain that should be used to compile it

TPCC-UVa is *not* an official implementation. Our performance number, tpmC-uva, should not be compared with tpm-C given by any vendor

- Why not?
  - We have not implemented price-per-tpmC metrics
  - Our Transaction Monitor is not "commercially available"
  - Therefore, the implementation does not have TPC approval

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三油

- TPCC-UVa is written entirely in C language, and uses the PostgreSQL database engine
- To ensure fairness, we distribute TPCC-UVa together with the toolchain that should be used to compile it

TPCC-UVa is *not* an official implementation. Our performance number, tpmC-uva, should not be compared with tpm-C given by any vendor

- Why not?
  - We have not implemented price-per-tpmC metrics
  - Our Transaction Monitor is not "commercially available"
  - Therefore, the implementation does not have TPC approval

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回> < 三> < 三>

- TPCC-UVa is written entirely in C language, and uses the PostgreSQL database engine
- To ensure fairness, we distribute TPCC-UVa together with the toolchain that should be used to compile it



 The Benchmark Controller interacts with the user, populating database and launching experiments

イロン 不得 とくほ とくほう 一座



 The Remote Terminal Emulators, one por terminal, request transactions according with TPC-C specifications

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 一座



 The Transaction Monitor receives all the requests for RTEs and execute queries to the database system

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 一座



 The Checkpoints Controller performs checkpoints periodically and registers timestamps

イロン 不得 とくほ とくほう 一座



• The Vacuums Controller avoids the degradation produced by the continuous flow of operations in the database

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト



 IPCs are carried out using shared-memory structures and system signals → suitable for SMPs

# The Transactions Monitor



- The TM receives the transaction requests from all RTEs, passing them to the database engine and returning the results
- The TPC-C clause that forces the use of a "commercially available TM" avoids the use of tailored TMs to artificially increase performance
- We do not use a "commercially available TM"; instead, we simple queue the requests and pass them to the database

# The Transactions Monitor



- The TM receives the transaction requests from all RTEs, passing them to the database engine and returning the results
- The TPC-C clause that forces the use of a "commercially available TM" avoids the use of tailored TMs to artificially increase performance
- We do not use a "commercially available TM"; instead, we simple queue the requests and pass them to the database

# The Transactions Monitor



- The TM receives the transaction requests from all RTEs, passing them to the database engine and returning the results
- The TPC-C clause that forces the use of a "commercially available TM" avoids the use of tailored TMs to artificially increase performance
- We do not use a "commercially available TM"; instead, we simple queue the requests and pass them to the database

# Running an experiment

• The TPC-C benchmark should be executed during a given period (2 or 8 hours), with a workload chosen by the user

- To be considered valid, the results of the test should meet some response time requirements (that is, the test may fail)
- Our implementation, TPCC-UVa, checks these requirements and reports the performance metrics, including tpmC-uva obtained
- Results given in the paper shows the performance of an Intel Xeon system with two processors, with a value for tpmC-uva = 107.882 for 9 warehouses

ヘロト ヘアト ヘビト ヘビト

- The TPC-C benchmark should be executed during a given period (2 or 8 hours), with a workload chosen by the user
- To be considered valid, the results of the test should meet some response time requirements (that is, the test may fail)
- Our implementation, TPCC-UVa, checks these requirements and reports the performance metrics, including tpmC-uva obtained
- Results given in the paper shows the performance of an Intel Xeon system with two processors, with a value for tpmC-uva = 107.882 for 9 warehouses

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三油

- The TPC-C benchmark should be executed during a given period (2 or 8 hours), with a workload chosen by the user
- To be considered valid, the results of the test should meet some response time requirements (that is, the test may fail)
- Our implementation, TPCC-UVa, checks these requirements and reports the performance metrics, including tpmC-uva obtained
- Results given in the paper shows the performance of an Intel Xeon system with two processors, with a value for tpmC-uva = 107.882 for 9 warehouses

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回> < 三> < 三>

- The TPC-C benchmark should be executed during a given period (2 or 8 hours), with a workload chosen by the user
- To be considered valid, the results of the test should meet some response time requirements (that is, the test may fail)
- Our implementation, TPCC-UVa, checks these requirements and reports the performance metrics, including tpmC-uva obtained
- Results given in the paper shows the performance of an Intel Xeon system with two processors, with a value for tpmC-uva = 107.882 for 9 warehouses

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回> < 三> < 三>

Test results accounting performed on 2004-18-10 at 17:58:57 using 9 warehouses.

Start of measurement interval: 20.003233 m End of measurement interval: 140.004750 m COMPUTED THROUGHPUT: **107.882 tpmC-uva using 9 warehouses**. 29746 Transactions committed.

#### NEW-ORDER TRANSACTIONS:

12946 Transactions within measurement time (15035 Total).
Percentage: 43.522%
Percentage of "well done" transactions: 90.854%
Response time (min/med/max/90th): 0.006 / 2.140 / 27.930 / 4.760
Percentage of rolled-back transactions: 1.012% .
Average number of items per order: 9.871 .
Percentage of remote items: 1.003% .
Think time (min/avg/max): 0.000 / 12.052 / 120.000

#### PAYMENT TRANSACTIONS:

12919 Transactions within measurement time (15042 Total).
Percentage: 43.431%
Percentage of "well done" transactions: 90.858%
Response time (min/med/max/90th): 0.011 / 2.061 / 27.387 / 4.760
Percentage of remote transactions: 14.862% .
Percentage of customers selected by C\_ID: 39.601% .
Think time (min/avg/max): 0.000 / 12.043 / 120.000

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ● ● ●

#### ORDER-STATUS TRANSACTIONS:

1296 Transactions within measurement time (1509 Total). Percentage: 4.357% Percentage of "well done" transactions: 91.435% Response time (min/med/max/90th): 0.016 / 2.070 / 27.293 / 4.640 Percentage of customers chosen by C\_ID: 42.284%. Think time (min/avg/max): 0.000 / 9.998 / 76.000

#### DELIVERY TRANSACTIONS:

1289 Transactions within measurement time (1502 Total).
Percentage: 4.333%
Percentage of "well done" transactions: 100.000%
Response time (min/med/max/90th): 0.000 / 0.000 / 0.001 / 0.000
Percentage of execution time < 80s : 100.000%
Execution time min/avg/max: 0.241/2.623/27.359
No. of skipped districts: 0.024/2.623/27.359
Percentage of skipped districts: 0.000%.
Think time (min/avg/max): 0.000 / 4.991 / 38.000</pre>

#### STOCK-LEVEL TRANSACTIONS:

1296 Transactions within measurement time (1506 Total). Percentage: 4.357% Percentage of "well done" transactions: 99.691% Response time (min/med/max/90th): 0.026 / 2.386 / 26.685 / 5.120 Think time (min/avg/max): 0.000 / 5.014 / 38.000

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Longest checkpoints: Start time Elapsed time (s) Execution time (s) Mon Oct 18 20:19:56 2004 8459.676000 27.581000 Mon Oct 18 18:49:10 2004 3013.506000 21.514000 Mon Oct 18 19:19:32 2004 4835.039000 14.397000 Mon Oct 18 18:18:57 2004 1200.238000 13.251000

No vacuums executed.

» TEST PASSED

 If the test fails because of response time requirements have not met, the workload chosen was too high: The experiment should be repeated with less warehouses

三 🕨 👘

```
Longest checkpoints:

Start time Elapsed time (s) Execution time (s)

Mon Oct 18 20:19:56 2004 8459.676000 27.581000

Mon Oct 18 18:49:10 2004 3013.506000 21.514000

Mon Oct 18 19:19:32 2004 4835.039000 14.397000

Mon Oct 18 18:18:57 2004 1200.238000 13.251000

No vacuums executed.

» TEST PASSED
```

 If the test fails because of response time requirements have not met, the workload chosen was too high: The experiment should be repeated with less warehouses

### **Experimental results: Plots**

 According with clause 5.6.1 of TPC-C, some performance plots should be generated after a test run



Response time distribution of some transaction types for a 2-hours execution on the system under test

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

3

# Experimental results: Need of vacuums

 If the experiment is longer than 8 hours, vacuums should be executed periodically in order to keep performance



Throughput of the New-Order transaction for a 2-hours execution on the system under test With (a) hourly vacuum operations, and (b) no vacuums.

- TPCC-UVa is an implementation of TPC-C benchmark that allows the performance measurement of parallel and distributed systems
- TPCC-UVa is open-source, making easy to instrument it in order to use it with simulation environments such as Simics
- TPCC-UVa can be downloaded from

http://www.infor.uva.es/~diego/tpcc-uva.html

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト 三油

- TPCC-UVa is an implementation of TPC-C benchmark that allows the performance measurement of parallel and distributed systems
- TPCC-UVa is open-source, making easy to instrument it in order to use it with simulation environments such as Simics
- TPCC-UVa can be downloaded from

http://www.infor.uva.es/~diego/tpcc-uva.html

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回> < 三> < 三>

- TPCC-UVa is an implementation of TPC-C benchmark that allows the performance measurement of parallel and distributed systems
- TPCC-UVa is open-source, making easy to instrument it in order to use it with simulation environments such as Simics
- TPCC-UVa can be downloaded from

http://www.infor.uva.es/~diego/tpcc-uva.html

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 ののの

# **TPCC-UVa**

#### An Open-Source TPC-C Implementation for Parallel and Distributed Systems

#### Diego R. Llanos, Belén Palop



Universidad deValladolid

Computer Science Department University of Valladolid, Spain

PMEO-PDS 06, Rhodes Island, April 29th, 2006

< ロ > < 同 > < 三 > .