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Abstract—This paper studies the effectiveness of pushing parts of DBMS analytics queries into the Simple Storage Service (S3) of Amazon Web Services (AWS), using a recently released capability called S3 Select. We show that some DBMS primitives (filter, projection, and aggregation) can always be cost-effectively moved into S3. Other more complex operations (join, top-K, and group-by) require reimplementation to take advantage of S3 Select and are often candidates for pushdown. We demonstrate these capabilities through experimentation using a new DBMS that we developed, PushdownDB. Experimentation with a collection of queries including TPC-H queries shows that PushdownDB is on average 30% cheaper and 6.7× faster than a baseline that does not use S3 Select.

I. INTRODUCTION

Clouds offer cheaper and more flexible computing than “on-prem”. Not only can one add resources on the fly, the large cloud vendors have major economies of scale relative to “on-prem” deployment. Modern clouds employ an architecture where the computation and storage are disaggregated — the two components are independently managed and connected using a network. Such an architecture allows for independent scaling of computation and storage, which simplifies the management of storage and reduces its cost. A number of data warehousing systems have been built to analyze data on disaggregated cloud storage, including Presto [1], Snowflake [2], Redshift Spectrum [3], among others.

In a disaggregated architecture, the network that connects the computation and storage layers can be a major performance bottleneck. Two intuitive solutions are caching and computation pushdown. With caching, a compute server loads data from the remote storage and caches it in main memory or local storage, amortizing the network transfer cost. Caching has been implemented in Snowflake [2] and Redshift Spectrum [3], [4]. With computation pushdown, a database management system (DBMS) pushes its functionality as close to storage as possible. Previous research [5] and systems (e.g., Britton-Lee IDM 500 [6], Oracle Exadata server [7], and IBM Netezza machine [8]) have shown that this can significantly improve performance.

Recently, Amazon Web Services (AWS) introduced a feature called “S3 Select”, through which limited computation can be pushed onto their shared cloud storage service called S3 [9]. This provides an opportunity to revisit the question of how to divide query processing tasks between S3 storage nodes and normal computation nodes. The question is nontrivial as the limited computational interface of S3 Select allows only certain simple query operators to be pushed into the storage layer, namely selections, projections, and simple aggregations. Other operators require new implementations to take advantage of S3 Select. In addition, S3 Select pricing can be more expensive than computing on normal EC2 nodes.

In this paper, we set our goal to understand the performance of computation pushdown when running queries in a cloud setting with disaggregated storage. Specifically, we consider filter (with and without indexing), join, group-by, and top-K as candidates. We implement these operators to take advantage of computation pushdown through S3 Select and study their cost and performance. We show dramatic performance improvement and cost reduction, even with the relatively high cost of S3 Select. In addition, we analyze queries from the TPC-H benchmark and show similar benefits of performance and cost. We point out the limitations of the current S3 Select service and provide several suggestions based on the lessons we learned from this project. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first extensive study of pushdown computing for database operators in a disaggregated architecture. A more detailed description of this work can be found in [10].

II. DATA MANAGEMENT IN THE CLOUD

Cloud providers such as AWS offer a wide variety of computing instances (i.e., EC2: Elastic Compute Cloud) and storage services (i.e., EBS: Elastic Block Store, EFS: Elastic File System, and S3: Simple Storage Service). Compared to other storage services, S3 is a highly available object store that provides virtually infinite storage capacity for regular users with relatively low cost, and is supported by many popular cloud databases, including Presto [1], Hive [11], Spark SQL [12], Redshift Spectrum [3], and Snowflake [2]. The storage nodes in S3 are separate from compute nodes. Hence, a DBMS uses S3 as a storage system and transfers needed data over a network for query processing.

To reduce network traffic and the associated processing on compute nodes, AWS released a new service called S3 Select [9] in 2018 to push limited computation to the storage nodes. At the current time, S3 Select supports only selection,
projection, and aggregation without group-by for tables using
the CSV or Parquet [13] format; the storage nodes scan rows
in the table and return only qualifying rows to the compute
node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$0.022/GB/month</th>
<th>free within same region; $0.09/GB out of AWS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S3 Select</td>
<td>$0.002/GB; return: $0.0007/GB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network request</td>
<td>$0.0004 per 1000 requests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computation</td>
<td>$2.128 per hour (r4.8xlarge)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I: S3 query cost breakdown (region us-east-1).

The dollar cost of queries is a crucial factor, since it is
one of the main reasons to migrate an application from “on-
prem” to the cloud. Table I shows the typical value of five
cost components when using S3. Since the storage cost does
not depend on the frequency of access, we exclude it when
calculating query cost in this paper. Servers in our experiments
are within the same region as the S3 data. Therefore, we do
not pay any data transfer cost. The S3 Select cost is paid
based on the amount of data scanned and returned only when
S3 Select is used. Network requests cost are charged by the
number of HTTP requests; computation cost is charged based
on the instance type and how long the virtual machine runs.
Data scan and transfer and computation are typically the major
components in overall query cost for S3 Select.

A. PushdownDB

In order to explore how a database can leverage S3 Select
to improve performance and/or reduce cost, we implemented
a bare-bone row-based parallel DBMS tested, called Push-
downDB. PushdownDB represents a query plan as a directed
acyclic graph of operators and executes in a pipelined fashion
using multiple Python processes. A few performance optimiza-
tions are implemented, including disabling SSL as we expect
analytics workloads are typically run in a secure environment
and using the Pandas library [14] to represent tuples as
data frames. While we could not match the performance of
the more mature Presto system on all queries, we obtained
competitive performance. The source code of PushdownDB is
available on GitHub at https://github.com/yxymit/s3filter.git,
and is implemented in a mixture of C++ and Python.

Experimental Setup. Experiments in this paper are per-
formed on an r4.8xlarge EC2 instance, which contains 32
physical cores, 244 GB of main memory, and a 10 GigE net-
work. The machine runs Ubuntu 16.04.5 LTS. PushdownDB is
executed using Python version 2.7.12.

Unless otherwise stated, all experiments use the same 10 GB
TPC-H dataset in CSV format. To facilitate parallel processing,
each table is partitioned into multiple objects in S3. The tech-
tiques discussed in this paper do not make any assumptions
about how the data is partitioned.

III. SQL OPERATORS IN S3 SELECT

This section discusses how PushdownDB accelerates SQL
operators using S3 Select. Specifically, we discuss four oper-
ators: filter, join, group by, and top-K.

A. Filter

Both hash indexes and tree-based indexes are widely used
in database systems. Neither implementation, however, is a
good fit for a cloud storage environment because a single index
lookup requires multiple accesses to S3 incurring long network
delays. To avoid this problem, we designed an index table that
contains the values of the columns to be indexed, as well as
the byte offsets of indexed records in that table. Specifically,
an index table has the following schema (assuming the index
is built on a single column).

```
| value | first_byte_offset | last_byte_offset |
```

Accessing an indexed table comprises two phases. In phase
1, an S3 Select request with the lookup predicate is used to
retrieve the byte offsets from the index. In phase 2, the returned
byte offsets are used to directly load the corresponding rows
from the data table, by sending regular S3 requests for
individual rows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>selectivity=10^{-5}</th>
<th>selectivity=10^{-3}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server-side</td>
<td>21.7s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3-side</td>
<td>1.38s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indexing</td>
<td>1.74s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II: Runtime and cost of filter algorithms.

Table II shows the runtime and cost of different filtering
algorithms for two selectivities, 10^{-5} and 10^{-3}. Server-side
filter loads all the data from S3 into the compute node and
performs the filter there. S3-side filter pushes the predicate to
S3 using S3 select. S3-side filter is 10× faster than server-side
filter with a small increase in cost. S3-side indexing has similar
performance as S3-side filter but 4× lower price when the filter
is highly selective; the performance of indexing degrades when
the filter is less selective due to the cost of S3 requests for
individual rows.

B. Join

PushdownDB supports three hash join algorithms: Baseline
Join, Filtered Join, and Bloom Join. Baseline join performs
the query logic in the compute node without S3 Select. Filtered
join pushes down selection and projection using S3 Select to
the storage side. In the following we focus on Bloom join.
After the hash build phase, a Bloom filter is constructed based
on the join keys in the first table and is sent as an S3 Select
request to load a filtered version of the second table.

The Bloom filter [15] in PushdownDB contains a bit array
of length m and k different hash functions. To add an element,
the k hash functions are applied to the element. The output
of each hash function is a position in the bit array, which is
then set to 1. To query an element, the same k hash functions
are applied and the element may be in the set if all the
corresponding bits are set. We use universal hashing [16] to
implement our hash functions, which can be generalized as:

```
h_{a,b}(x) = [(a \times x + b) \mod n] \mod m
```
Where \( n \) is a prime \( \geq m \), \( a \) and \( b \) are random integers between 0 and \( n-1 \), where \( a \neq 0 \).

In order to push the Bloom filter logic into S3, in PushdownDB, we use strings of 1’s and 0’s to represent the bit array. The following example shows what an S3 Select query containing a Bloom filter would look like.

```sql
SELECT ...
FROM S3Object
WHERE SUBSTRING('1000011...111101101',
((69 + CAST(attr as INT) + 52) % 97) % 68 + 1, 1) = '1'
```

We evaluate the performance of different join algorithms using the following SQL query. We change `upper_bal` to vary selectivity on the `CUSTOMER` table. The false positive rate for the Bloom filter is 0.01.

```sql
SELECT SUM(O_TOTALPRICE)
FROM CUSTOMER, ORDER
WHERE O_CUSTKEY = C_CUSTKEY AND
C_ACCTBAL <= upper_bal
```

We evaluate the performance of different join algorithms using the following SQL query. We change `upper_bal` to vary selectivity on the `CUSTOMER` table. The false positive rate for the Bloom filter is 0.01.

```sql
SELECT SUM(O_TOTALPRICE)
FROM CUSTOMER, ORDER
WHERE O_CUSTKEY = C_CUSTKEY AND
C_ACCTBAL <= upper_bal
```

We evaluate the performance of different join algorithms using the following SQL query. We change `upper_bal` to vary selectivity on the `CUSTOMER` table. The false positive rate for the Bloom filter is 0.01.

We evaluate the performance of different join algorithms using the following SQL query. We change `upper_bal` to vary selectivity on the `CUSTOMER` table. The false positive rate for the Bloom filter is 0.01.

```sql
SELECT SUM(O_TOTALPRICE)
FROM CUSTOMER, ORDER
WHERE O_CUSTKEY = C_CUSTKEY AND
C_ACCTBAL <= upper_bal
```

### TABLE III: Runtime and cost of join algorithms.

|                | Time | Cost | Cost
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline join</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>0.864</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered join</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloom join</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV: Runtime and cost of group-by algorithms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Server-side</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtered</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3-side</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE V: Runtime and cost of top-K algorithms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>K=1</th>
<th>K=10^2</th>
<th>K=10^4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server-side</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3-side</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V compares the performance of the sampling-based top-K with the baseline that loads the entire table and performs top-K at the server side. \( K \) is swept from 1 to \( 10^4 \). For the sampling-based algorithm, the sample size is calculated following the analysis above. We observe that both runtime and cost increase as \( K \) increases. This is because a larger \( K \) requires a bigger heap and also more computation at the server.
side. The sampling-based top-K algorithm is consistently faster than the server-side top-K due to the reduction in the amount of data loaded from S3.

E. TPC-H Results

Figure 1 shows the performance and cost of representative queries for each individual operator discussed above, as well as a subset of the TPC-H queries. We compare the performance of server-side execution (baseline) vs. computation pushdown using S3 Select (optimized). The last set of bars shows the geometric mean of all the previous bars. On average, the optimized PushdownDB outperforms the baseline PushdownDB by 6.7x and reduces the cost by 30%, demonstrating great performance potential of computation pushdown in cloud databases.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF S3 SELECT

We have demonstrated substantial performance improvement on common database operators by leveraging S3 Select. In this section, we present a list of limitations of the current S3 Select features and describe our suggestions for improvement.

Suggestion 1: Multiple byte ranges for GET requests.

The indexing algorithm discussed in Section III-A sends an HTTP GET request to load each record from the table, causing an excessive number of GET requests and thus performance degradation. Allowing a single GET request to contain multiple byte ranges can mitigate the problem.

Suggestion 2: Index inside S3. A more thorough solution to the problem above is to build the index structure inside S3. This can avoid multiple network messages between S3 and the server which can improve performance.

Suggestion 3: More efficient Bloom filters. Ideally, a Bloom filter should be represented using a bit array for space efficiency. Since the current S3 Select does not support bitwise operators, PushdownDB implements a Bloom filter using a string of 0’s and 1’s, which is space- and computation-inefficient. We suggest adding bit-wise operators to S3 Select.

Suggestion 4: Partial group-by. In Section III-C, we used the inefficient CASE clause to implement S3-side group-by, because group-by is currently not supported in S3 Select. Adding full support of group-by may lead to unbounded memory consumption in the storage node. We suggest adding partial group-by (with limited groups) to S3 to resolve this performance issue.

Suggestion 5: Computation-aware pricing. Across our evaluations on the optimized PushdownDB, data scan costs dominate a majority of queries. The current S3 Select charges scanning with a fixed amount regardless of the computation being performed. We believe a fairer pricing model is needed, in which the data scan cost should depend on the workload.