



Performance Archaeology

Tomas Vondra, Microsoft

vondratomas@microsoft.com / tomas@vondra.me

<https://vondra.me>

POSETTE 2025



Agenda

- Intro
 - Why do this at all?
- OLTP
 - TPC-B (pgbench), starjoin
- OLAP
 - TPC-H (data loads + queries)
- Future
 - What might happen?

Motivation

- How did the performance evolve over time?
 - actually quite tricky question for long time periods
- typical development benchmarks not useful
 - compare two commits, maybe focused on a small piece of the code
- sometimes people compare two releases (old + new)
 - difficult to combine the effects (hardware changes, ...)
- application performance is not good either
 - application changes, hardware gets upgraded, data size grows, ...

Not entirely fair ...

- development happens in the context of current hardware
 - 20 years ago we had much less RAM / fewer cores, spinning rust, ...
- hardware determines focus of tuning / optimization
 - If your workload is I/O-bound, who cares about CPU?
 - If you have 4 cores, why would you care about 100+ cores?
- a lot of stuff improved outside of Postgres too
 - we're not on kernel 2.6 anymore ...
- users see a compounded effect of all those improvements
 - hardware + OS + Postgres

Hardware used

xeon (OLTP, ~2016)

- 2x Xeon E52699v4 (44 cores / 88 threads)
- 64GB RAM
- WD Ultrastar DC SN640 960GB
(NVMe SSD, PCIe 3.1)
- Debian 12.7 (kernel 6.10)
- ext4
- gcc 12.2.0

i5 (OLAP, ~2012)

- i5-2500k (4 cores / 4 threads)
- 16GB RAM
- 6x Intel DC S3700 100GB
(SATA SSD, RAID0)
- Debian 12.7 (kernel 6.10)
- ext4
- gcc 12.2.0

Let's do some benchmarks!

(there'll be a lot of numbers & charts)

OLTP


TPC-B

- dataset sizes:
 - small - fits into shared buffers (locking)
 - medium - fits into RAM (CPU-bound)
 - large - larger than RAM (I/O-bound)
- modes: read-only & read-write
- client counts: 1, 16 32, 64, 128, 256
- short runs (minutes)
- unified configuration (shared_buffers=2GB, max_wal_size=128GB, ...)
- pgbench always from PG18

pgbench / read-only / 1.5GB




pgbench -S -M simple / scale 100 (small)



pgbench / read-only / 1.5GB




pgbench -S -M simple / scale 100 (small)



pgbench / read-only / 150GB




pgbench -S -M simple / scale 10000 (large)



pgbench / read-write / 1.5GB



pgbench -N -M simple / scale 100 (small)



starjoin

- TPC-B is rather simplistic (no joins, ...)
 - representative of the most trivial OLTP applications only
- let's try "OLTP starjoin"
 - "point" join query in a normalized schema
 - "main" table with multiple (by PK) joined to "dimensions"
- very common query pattern
 - example: payment + info for different payment types
- let's assume cached data, 10 dimensions


OLTP starjoin

```
SELECT * FROM t
    JOIN dim1 ON (t.id1 = dim1.id)
    JOIN dim2 ON (t.id2 = dim2.id)
    JOIN dim3 ON (t.id3 = dim3.id)
    JOIN dim4 ON (t.id4 = dim4.id)
    ...
    JOIN dim10 ON (t.id10 = dim10.id)
WHERE t.id = 3498398;
```

OLTP starjoin / 10M rows / simple




starjoin / -M simple



OLTP starjoin / 10M rows / prepared



starjoin / -M prepared



OLTP summary & future

- massive scalability improvements
 - often 20-50x for many clients
 - small regressions with few clients (not clear from charts)
 - fast-path locking 9.2, many improvements in 9.5 + 9.6 (locking, ...)
- weird inversions are gone (since ~9.4)
 - "prepared" slower than "simple", throughput with more clients tanking
- seems we're out of "low hanging fruit" :-(
 - lot of effort for small incremental improvements (~5%)
- throughput test ignores "consistency" (got much better)

OLAP

TPC-H (simplified)


- 10GB (not the largest, but sufficient for this)
- 22 queries, stressing different operators
- data loads (copy, create index, ...)


TPC-H Analyzed: Hidden Messages and Lessons Learned from an Influential Benchmark

Peter Boncz, Thomas Neumann, and Orri Erling

<https://homepages.cwi.nl/~boncz/snb-challenge/chokepoints-tpctc.pdf>

TPC-H / 10 GB / data load





OLAP "apparent regressions"

- more complex queries => harder to plan
- GUC default changes
 - not a "real" regression, but annoying (unexpected) plan changes
- `effective_cache_size` higher
 - assumption data is "cached" / random I/O cheaper (what if not the case?)
- `effective_io_concurrency`
 - change of formula in PG 14 => shorter prefetch distance :-(
- FK join estimates
 - better estimates but got a worse plan in a couple places
- there are probably more
 - Incremental Sort makes it easier to hit underestimates

OLAP summary & future

- massive improvements over the years
 - 8.4 prefetching (bitmap scans)
 - 9.2 index-only scans
 - 9.6 (and later) parallelism
- mostly unchanged since PG 11
- possible incremental improvements (small gains)
 - parallel COPY, optimization using PGO/BOLT, ...
- significant improvements requires fundamental changes
 - columnar storage/executor, offloading to specialized analytical engines, ...

Summary

- pretty substantial improvements in the past
- but what to expect in the future?
- performance is not everything
 - ease of operation and features matter a lot too, of course ...
 - ... but that's not what this talk is about ;-)

OLTP

- What's the PG17 regression in "large" pgbench?
- Optimizing the starjoin "join order" issue would be huge.
- Can we learn something from BOLT to optimize binary?
 - `-report-bad-layout`
- plenty of "NUMA stuff" to improve

<https://www.postgresql.eu/events/pgconfeu2024/schedule/session/5839-numa-vs-postgresql/>

<https://anarazel.de/talks/2024-10-23-pgconf-eu-numa-vs-postgresql/numa-vs-postgresql.pdf>

OLAP

- JIT / BOLT didn't help much (surprising)
 - How come? OLAP is very CPU-intensive.
 - might be due to `-skip-funcs=ExecInterpExpr.*`
- more radical rethink may be needed
 - columnar storage/executor may be needed (to compete with the best)
- complex plans can get "wrong" easier
 - updating defaults more carefully?
 - better tuning advice / automated tuning? hints?

Resources

- slides
 - <https://vondra.me/pdf/performance-archaeology-pgconfeu-2024.pdf>
- (horrible) scripts + results
 - <https://github.com/tvondra/postgres-archaeology>
- want to reproduce / do something similar?
 - tomas@vondra.me
 - office hours