## <u>Towards Optimal Utilization of</u> <u>Main Memory for Moving Object</u> <u>Indexing</u>

Bin Cui, Dan Lin and Kian-Lee Tan

School of Computing & Singapore-MIT Alliance, National University of Singapore {cuibin, lindan, tankl}@comp.nus.edu.sg

Presented by Donatas Saulys 2007-11-12

# Outline

### Motivation

### The IMPACT framework

- Twin-index
- Object classification
- Object migration
- Memory partitioning
- Experimental results
- $\odot$  Conclusions
- Related work
- Evaluation

# Motivation

- Tracking moving objects requires a lot of updates
  - Main Memory is much faster than disk
  - Buffering is not enough

#### Three observations

- 1. object classification
  - active and inactive objects
  - active objects more updates
- 2. most of the objects are inactive
- 3. High speed (active) objects degenerate the TPR-Tree index performance

# The IMPACT framework

- IMPACT Integrated Memory Partitioning and Activity conscious Twin-Index
- Twin index
  - A memory resident grid structure for *active* objects
  - A disk based structure for inactive objects (TPR\*-Tree)
- Object classification
- Object migration
- Memory partitioning

## **IMPACT: Structure**



#### A memory resident grid structure

• Stores active objects



#### • A memory resident grid structure (example)

- grid 400x400 (1 grid cell = 100x100),
- 4 active objects
- Future query time horizon H = 2



#### • A memory resident grid structure (example)

- Object 3 is inserted into the hash table
- Object 3 is inserted into the grid

• Future positions of object 3 are inserted into the grid (H=2)

Hash table				
ID	X	У	t	$\vec{v}$
3	205	305	0	(-40,-40)



- A memory resident grid structure (example)
  - Object 4 is inserted into the structure



- A memory resident grid structure (example)
  - Object 5 is inserted into the structure

ID	X	У	t	$\vec{v}$
3	205	305	0	(-40,-40)
4	260	310	0	(50, 0)
5	330	50	0	(-40, 0)



- A memory resident grid structure (example)
  - Object 6 is inserted into the structure

ID	X	У	t	$\vec{v}$
3	205	305	0	(-40,-40)
4	260	310	0	(50, 0)
5	330	50	0	(-40, 0)
6	350	90	0	(0,60)



#### A memory resident grid structure (example)

- The grid is stored as an array
- Objects in the same cell are stored in a bucket (e.g. linked list)



#### A disk-based structure (TPR\*-Tree)

• Stores inactive objects

OLRU buffer - In general, the OLRU scheme allocates the available buffer according to reference frequency of nodes.



# **IMPACT: Object classification**

#### Velocity threshold V

- Fast objects (active) huge expansions of MBRs
- Slow objects (inactive) no significant influence on TPR\*-tree's performance
- Determining V
  - Velocity histogram
  - Determine V according to the histogram and available memory
  - Update the histogram on every update
  - Adjust V periodically (e.g. rush hour)

# **IMPACT:** Object migration

#### An active object becomes inactive

- v(OID) < V
- e.g. v(3) < V



(	queue	
	ID	
	3	

# **IMPACT: Object migration**

#### An inactive object becomes active

- v(OID) > V, e.g. v(10) > V
- There is free memory



# **IMPACT: Object migration**

#### An inactive object becomes active

- v(OID) > V, e.g. v(10) > V
- There is NO free memory



 Frequent migration is avoided

# **IMPACT: Memory partitioning**

Memory allocation

- For the grid structure
- For the OLRU buffer of the tree

### • What allocation is optimal?

Ocst analysis on Uniformly Distributed Data
Ocst analysis
Ocst analysis on Uniformly Distributed Data
Ocst analysis
Ocst

- Buffer the 2 top levels of the TPR\*-Tree
- Allocate the rest to the grid

• Experimental settings

- A default total Main Memory of 8 MB
- Comparison with TPR\*-Tree
  - All main memory used for OLRU buffering
- 200 range queries (4% of the space)
- Output Output
  - 1000000 points (objects)

#### Effect of Memory Allocation



- More memory for the grid yields better performance
- If all memory for the buffer, then IMPACT~TPR\*-Tree
- Optimal 80K for the buffer (top 2 levels of the tree)

#### Effect of Memory Size



- If Total ~ 1M, then IMPACT ~ TPR\*-Tree
- If Total > 8M, then IMPACT can be 100% better than TPR\*-Tree
- Traditional buffering does not effectively utilize main memory

#### Effect of The Number of Updates



- Average update cost is increasing over the number of processed updates (time)
- IMPACT efficiency degenerates slower
  - Fast memory updates
  - Less overlap
  - Slower MBR enlargement

### Effect of Varying Velocity Distribution

Theta↑ => more inactive objects



- Both indices lead better performance with theta↑
- The active objects are the main bottleneck in both indices
- Handling them in main memory pays off.

# Conclusions

#### IMPACT framework

- Motivation Object classification
- Twin-index
- Efficient memory partitioning
  - In-memory grid
  - OLRU buffer for the disk based index
- Experiments show that IMPACT leads to better performance than the TPR\*-Tree

# Related work

### 

Indexing Moving Objects in Main Memory

- ONLY Main Memory is used (no disk)
- Predictive queries are also supported (handled differently)
- Hash table for fast access
- Grid structures, no Trees

### • DAT5 project

• Using a Tree structure instead of a Grid

## Evalution

### $\odot$ Good points

- Well written, easy to read
- Memory partitioning strategy based on analysis
- Nice experimental result graphs and explanations

## Evalution

### Could be improved

- Not enough details
  - on grid maintenance when time evolves
  - on predictive queries in the grid
  - how the query performance is affected by the low number of updates (TPR-Tree)
- Too few algorithms
  - Range query?
  - Velocity threshold V adjustment?

3,41 4 3 6 6 5 5,6

Grid, t = 0?

### The END