

Chapter 25

Data–Centric Benchmarking

Jérôme Darmont

Université de Lyon, Lyon 2, ERIC EA3083, France

ABSTRACT

In data management, both system designers and users casually resort to performance evaluation. Performance evaluation by experimentation on a real system is generally referred to as benchmarking. The aim of this chapter is to present an overview of the major past and present state-of-the-art data-centric benchmarks. This review includes the TPC standard benchmarks, but also alternative or more specialized benchmarks. Surveyed benchmarks are categorized into three families: transaction benchmarks aimed at on-line transaction processing (OLTP), decision-support benchmarks aimed at on-line analysis processing (OLAP), and big data benchmarks. Issues, tradeoffs, and future trends in data-centric benchmarking are also discussed.

INTRODUCTION

In data management, both system designers and users casually resort to performance evaluation. On one hand, designers need to test architectural features and hypotheses regarding the actual (vs. theoretical) behavior of a system, especially in terms of response and scalability. Performance tuning also necessitates accurate performance evaluation. On the other hand, users are also keen on comparing the efficiency of different technologies before selecting a software solution. Thence, performance measurement tools are of premium importance in the data management domain.

Performance evaluation by experimentation on a real system is generally referred to as benchmarking. It consists in performing a series of tests on a given system to estimate its performance in a given setting. Typically, a data-centric benchmark is constituted of two main elements: a data model (conceptual schema and extension) and a workload model (set of read and write operations) to apply on this dataset, with respect to a predefined protocol. Both models may be parameterized. Most benchmarks also include a set of simple or composite performance metrics such as response time, throughput, number of input/output operations, disk or memory usage, etc.

The Transaction Processing Performance Council (TPC), a non-profit organization founded in 1988, plays a preponderant role in data-centric benchmarking. Its mission is to issue standard benchmarks, to

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7598-6.ch025

verify their correct application by the industry, and to publish performance test results. TPC members include all the major industrial actors from the database field.

The aim of this chapter is to present an overview of the major past and present state-of-the-art data-centric benchmarks. Our review includes the TPC standard benchmarks, but also alternative or more specialized benchmarks. We survey benchmarks from three families: transaction benchmarks aimed at On-Line Transaction Processing (OLTP), decision-support benchmarks aimed at On-Line Analysis Processing (OLAP) and big data benchmarks. Eventually, we discuss the issues, tradeoffs and future trends in data-centric benchmarking.

BACKGROUND

Transaction Processing Benchmarks

The first TPC benchmark for relational, transactional databases, TPC-C (TPC, 2010), has been in use since 1992. TPC-C features a complex business database (a classical customer-order-product-supplier model with nine types of tables bearing various structures and sizes) and a workload of diversely complex transactions that are executed concurrently. The performance metric in TPC-C is transaction throughput. As all TPC benchmarks, TPC-C's only parameter is a scale factor SF that determines data size. TPC-C was complemented in 2007 by TPC-E (TPC, 2015a), which simulates a brokerage firm with the aim of being representative of more modern OLTP systems. In its principles and features, TPC-E is otherwise very similar to TPC-C.

There are few alternatives to TPC-C and TPC-E for relational applications. Yet, some benchmarks fit niches where there is no standard benchmark. For instance, OO7 (Carey et al., 1993) and OCB (Darmont & Schneider, 2000) are object-oriented database benchmarks modeling engineering applications, e.g., computer-aided design or software engineering. However, their complexity makes both these benchmarks hard to understand and implement. Moreover, with objects in databases being more commonly managed in object-relational systems nowadays, object-relational benchmarks such as BUCKY (Carey et al., 1997) and BORD (Lee et al., 2000) now seem more relevant. Such benchmarks focus on queries implying object identifiers, inheritance, joins, class and object references, multivalued attributes, query unnesting, object methods, and abstract data types. However, typical object navigation is considered already addressed by object-oriented benchmarks and is not taken into account. Moreover, object-relational database benchmarks have not evolved since the early 2000's, whereas object-relational database systems have.

Similarly, XML benchmarks aim at comparing the various XML storage and querying solutions developed since the late nineties. From the early so-called XML application benchmarks that implement a mixed XML database that is either data-oriented (structured data) or document-oriented (in general, random texts built from a dictionary), XBench (Yao et al., 2004) stands out. XBench is indeed the only benchmark proposing a true mixed dataset (i.e., data *and* document-oriented) and helping evaluate all the functionalities offered by XQuery. FlexBench (Vranec & Mlýnková, 2009) also tests a large set of data characteristics and proposes query templates that allow modeling multiple types of applications. Finally, Schmidt et al. (2009) and Zhang et al. (2011) propose benchmarks that are specifically tailored for testing logical XML model-based systems, namely native XML and XML-relational database management systems, respectively.

10 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/data-centric-benchmarking/214626

Related Content

Personal Health in My Pocket: Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Research Directions in Mobile Personal Health Records

Helen Monkman, Andre Kushniruk and Elizabeth Borycki (2014). *Social Media and Mobile Technologies for Healthcare* (pp. 281-303).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/personal-health-in-my-pocket/111591

Mobile Edge Computing to Assist the Online Ideological and Political Education

Dan Wang and Jian Zhao (2022). *International Journal of Mobile Computing and Multimedia Communications* (pp. 1-11).

www.irma-international.org/article/mobile-edge-computing-to-assist-the-online-ideological-and-political-education/293747

A Novel Software Protection Approach for Code Obfuscation to Enhance Software Security

Pratiksha Gautam and Hemraj Saini (2017). *International Journal of Mobile Computing and Multimedia Communications* (pp. 34-47).

www.irma-international.org/article/a-novel-software-protection-approach-for-code-obfuscation-to-enhance-software-security/179563

Using Mobile Communication Technology in Student Mentoring

Jonna Häkkinen and Jenine Beekhuizen (2009). *Mobile Computing: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications* (pp. 1351-1358).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/using-mobile-communication-technology-student/26593

A Cloud Trusting Mechanism Based on Resource Ranking

Ajai K. Daniel (2020). *Handling Priority Inversion in Time-Constrained Distributed Databases* (pp. 130-155).

www.irma-international.org/chapter/a-cloud-trusting-mechanism-based-on-resource-ranking/249428