Exercises

21.1 **Answer:** The CGI interface starts a new process to service each request, which has a significant operating system overhead. On the other hand, servelets are run as threads of an existing process, avoiding this overhead. Further, the process running threads could be the Web server process itself, avoiding inter-process communication which can be expensive. Thus, for small to moderate sized tasks, the overhead of Java is less than the overheads saved by avoiding process creating and communication.

For tasks involving a lot of CPU activity, this may not be the case, and using CGI with a C or C++ program may give better performance.

21.2 **Answer:** Most computers have limits on the number of simultaneous connections they can accept. With connectionless protocols, connections are broken as soon as the request is satisfied, and therefore other clients can open connections. Thus more clients can be served at the same time. A request can be routed to any one of a number of different servers to balance load, and if a server crashes another can take over without the client noticing any problem.

The drawback of connectionless protocols is that a connection has to be reestablished every time a request is sent. Also, session information has to be sent each time in form of cookies or hidden fields. This makes them slower than the protocols which maintain connections in case state information is required.

21.3 **Answer:** Caching can be used to improve performance by exploiting the commonalities between transactions.

   a. If the application code for servicing each request needs to open a connection to the database, which is time consuming, then a pool of open connections may be created before hand, and each request uses one from those.
b. The results of a query generated by a request can be cached. If same request comes again, or generates the same query, then the cached result can be used instead of connecting to database again.
c. The final webpage generated in response to a request can be cached. If the same request comes again, then the cached page can be outputed.

21.6 Answer:

a. Let there be 100 transactions in the system. The given mix of transaction types would have 25 transactions each of type A and B, and 50 transactions of type C. Thus the time taken to execute transactions only of type A is 0.5 seconds and that for transactions only of type B or only of type C is 0.25 seconds. Given that the transactions do not interfere, the total time taken to execute the 100 transactions is 0.5 + 0.25 + 0.25 = 1 second. i.e, the average overall transaction throughput is 100 transactions per second.

b. One of the most important causes of transaction interference is lock contention. In the previous example, assume that transactions of type A and B are update transactions, and that those of type C are queries. Due to the speed mismatch between the processor and the disk, it is possible that a transaction of type A is holding a lock on a “hot” item of data and waiting for a disk write to complete, while another transaction (possibly of type B or C) is waiting for the lock to be released by A. In this scenario some CPU cycles are wasted. Hence, the observed throughput would be lower than the calculated throughput.

Conversely, if transactions of type A and type B are disk bound, and those of type C are CPU bound, and there is no lock contention, observed throughput may even be better than calculated.

Lock contention can also lead to deadlocks, in which case some transaction(s) will have to be aborted. Transaction aborts and restarts (which may also be used by an optimistic concurrency control scheme) contribute to the observed throughput being lower than the calculated throughput.

Factors such as the limits on the sizes of data-structures and the variance in the time taken by book-keeping functions of the transaction manager may also cause a difference in the values of the observed and calculated throughput.

21.10 Answer: In the absence of an anticipatory standard it may be difficult to reconcile between the differences among products developed by various organizations. Thus it may be hard to formulate a reactionary standard without sacrificing any of the product development effort. This problem has been faced while standardizing pointer syntax and access mechanisms for the ODMG standard.

On the other hand, a reactionary standard is usually formed after extensive product usage, and hence has an advantage over an anticipatory standard - that of built-in pragmatic experience. In practice, it has been found that some anticipatory standards tend to be over-ambitious. SQL:1999 is an example of a standard that is complex and has a very large number of features. Some of
these features may not be implemented for a long time on any system, and some, no doubt, will be found to be inappropriate.

21.11 **Answer:** The key problem with digital certificates (when used offline, without contacting the certificate issuer) is that there is no way to withdraw them.

For instance (this actually happened, but names of the parties have been changed) person $C$ claims to be an employee of company $X$ and get a new public key certified by the certifying authority $A$. Suppose the authority $A$ incorrectly believed that $C$ was acting on behalf of company $X$, it gives $C$ a certificate $cert$. Now, $C$ can communicate with person $Y$, who checks the certificate $cert$ presented by $C$, and believes the public key contained in $cert$ really belongs to $X$. Now $C$ would communicate with $Y$ using the public key, and $Y$ trusts the communication is from company $X$.

Person $Y$ may now reveal confidential information to $C$, or accept purchase order from $C$, or execute programs certified by $C$, based on the public key, thinking he is actually communicating with company $X$. In each case there is potential for harm to $Y$.

Even if $A$ detects the impersonation, as long as $Y$ does not check with $A$ (the protocol does not require this check), there is no way for $Y$ to find out that the certificate is forged.

If $X$ was a certification authority itself, further levels of fake certificates can be created. But certificates that are not part of this chain would not be affected.