

Mesodata:
Engineering Domains for Attribute
Evolution and Data Integration

by

Denise Bernadette Angela de Vries, *B.Comp.& Inf.Sc., B.Sc.(Hons)*
School of Informatics and Engineering,
Faculty of Science and Engineering

21 October 2005

A thesis presented to the
Flinders University of South Australia
in total fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Contents

Abstract	ix
Certification	xi
Acknowledgements	xii
1 Introduction	1
2 Literature Review	5
2.1 Database Organisation and Evolution	5
2.2 Causes of Change	6
2.3 Change Management	7
2.4 Information Capacity	9
2.5 Techniques for Database Evolution	12
2.6 Schema Integration	12
2.6.1 Common Data Model	13
2.6.2 Schema Intension Graphs	14
2.6.3 Hypergraph Data Model	15
2.6.4 Evolutionary ER Diagrams	17
2.6.5 Schematic Conflicts	17
2.7 Schema Matching	19
2.8 Semantic Heterogeneity	20
2.9 Object-Relational Databases	21
2.10 Data Conversion	23
2.10.1 Attribute Evolution	23
2.11 Data and View Integration	25

2.12	Mediation Techniques	26
2.13	Ontologies	31
2.14	Concept Graphs	33
2.15	Knowledge Interchange	34
2.16	Summary	35
3	Mesodata in DBMS	38
3.1	Modelling	38
3.2	Mesodata	41
3.3	Mesodata Domains	42
3.3.1	Definition of the Mesodata Domain	43
3.3.2	Extended Querying	44
3.4	Structured Domains	45
3.4.1	Filters	46
3.4.2	Topological Spaces	46
3.5	Mesodata Operators	49
3.6	Comparison of Mesodata with User-Defined Types	49
3.7	Conceptual Model Incorporating Mesodata	51
3.8	Summary	53
4	Reference Data Language	55
4.1	Aims	55
4.2	Mesodata Definition Language	56
4.2.1	Create Domain Syntax	56
4.2.2	Drop Domain Syntax	57
4.2.3	Alter Domain Syntax	57
4.2.4	Refresh Domain Syntax	58
4.2.5	Describe Domain Syntax	58
4.2.6	Show Domains Syntax	58
4.3	Mesodata Extended SQL	59
4.3.1	Create Table Syntax	59
4.3.2	Alter Table Syntax	59
4.3.3	Drop Table Syntax	60

<i>CONTENTS</i>	iii
4.3.4 Describe Mesodata Type Syntax	60
4.3.5 Show Mesodata Types Syntax	61
4.4 Extensions to Manipulation Language	61
4.4.1 Select Syntax	61
4.5 Summary	63
5 Application of Mesodata	64
5.1 Domain Evolution	64
5.2 Change Management	65
5.3 Attribute Domain Evolution	66
5.4 Categories of Domain Evolution	68
5.4.1 Attribute Representation Change	69
5.4.2 Domain Constraints Change	69
5.4.3 Domain Perception (meaning) Change	70
5.4.4 Minimise Change	70
5.5 Data Integration	71
5.6 Enhanced Queries	73
5.6.1 Example of a Circular Domain	74
5.7 An Object-Relational Example	75
5.7.1 Hierarchical Domain	77
5.8 Summary	77
6 Empirical Study of a Database System	79
6.1 Motivation for the Study	79
6.2 System Overview and Evolution	80
6.2.1 System Metrics	81
6.2.2 Stable Characteristics	85
6.2.3 Deleted Values	85
6.2.4 Modified Domains	86
6.3 Data Conversion and Maintenance	88
6.4 Summary	91

7	Prototype Model	93
7.1	Prototype Evaluation	93
7.1.1	Evaluation Criteria	94
7.1.2	Prototype Platform	94
7.1.3	Prototype Components	95
7.1.4	Query Parser	96
7.2	Example Database	97
7.2.1	Evaluation of Model	98
7.2.2	Enhanced Querying	99
7.2.3	Domain Perception Change	101
7.2.4	Domain Constraints Change	103
7.2.5	Data Integration	104
7.2.6	Attribute Representation Change	104
7.3	Summary of Evaluation	105
8	Conclusions and Further Research	106
8.1	Database Evolution	106
8.2	Techniques for Database Evolution	107
8.3	Data Integration	107
8.4	Mesodata Layer	108
8.5	Future Research	108
8.5.1	DB Platform Support for Mesodata	108
8.5.2	XML	109
8.5.3	Ontologies of Data Structures	109
8.5.4	Mesodata types based on UDTs	109
8.5.5	Modelling Tools	109
8.5.6	Other Database Technologies	109
	Appendices	110
A	Publications Resulting From This Thesis	110
B	Sample Session	114

C Sample Session SQL Files	139
C.1 adjColours.sql	139
C.2 categories.sql	140
C.3 shadescolours.sql	140
C.4 furnitureB.sql	141
C.5 customers.sql	142
C.6 suppliers.sql	143
C.7 sales.sql	144
C.8 salesitem.sql	144
C.9 hexColours.sql	145
C.10 furnitureC.sql	146
C.11 salesB.sql	146
C.12 salesitemB.sql	147
C.13 codelist.sql	147
D Prototype Functionality	149
E Prototype Domain Querying	152
F Data type Comparisons	160
G Mapping MySQL to Java types	165
Bibliography	167

List of Figures

2.1	Techniques for Database Information Systems	12
2.2	SIG - Schema Intension Graph	15
2.3	HDM - Two Source Schemas and One Global Schema	16
2.4	Database Evolution and Related Research Areas	35
3.1	A Matrix for Classifying DBMS	40
3.2	Mesodata Layer Between Metadata and Data	41
3.3	Hierarchy of Some Suggested Mesodata Types for Different Do- main Structures	42
3.4	A Filter in Metric Space	47
3.5	ERD An Attribute Referencing a Mesodata Domain	52
3.6	ERD Multiple Attributes Referencing Mesodata Domains	52
3.7	ERD An Attribute Referencing Joined Mesodata Domains	52
3.8	ERD An Attribute Referencing Multiple Mesodata Domains	53
3.9	ERD UML Notation	53
5.1	Ranges of Year Domains	67
5.2	Heterogenous but Similar Schemata	71
5.3	Example Colour Chart as Weighted Graph	72
5.4	Attribute ‘Colour’ Referencing Mesodata Type Weighted Graph	73
5.5	Days of the Week with English and French Terms	75
5.6	Configurations for Telephone Numbers	76
6.1	Schematic of the Database System	81
6.2	Growth of Relations	82
6.3	Growth of Attributes	83
6.4	New Relations	83

6.5	Attribute Movement	84
6.6	Unmodified Attributes	86
6.7	Deleted Attributes	87
6.8	Modified Attributes	87
6.9	Modified Relations	88
7.1	Deployment Diagram	96
7.2	Activity Diagram for Mesodata Wrapper	97
7.3	Entity-Relationship Model of Test Database	98

List of Tables

2.1	Schematic Conflicts	18
2.2	Evolutionary Operations in ORDBs	22
2.3	Schematic Changes that Affect Data	36
3.1	Partial List of Mesodata Types with Extended SQL Operators	48
3.2	Comparison of User Defined Types (UDT) and Mesodata Types	50
6.1	Analysis Results	92
D.1	Prototype Functionality	149
E.1	Prototype Querying	153
F.1	Comparison of Data Types	161
G.1	Mapping SQL and Java data types (MySQL 2003)	165

Abstract

The introduction of databases for data storage and handling revolutionised the way we dealt with records and enabled simple and fast information processing, aggregation and summarisation. Database and information technology systems have evolved from simple file processing systems to powerful database systems. Data management technology has progressed from hierarchical and network systems to relational databases, data modelling tools and indexing and organisational techniques. The development of Relational Database Management Systems and automated systems put the layout and *form* into the unchanging metadata and gave us *record once* systems.

Unfortunately, the ‘real world’ upon which databases are modelled constantly changes. These changes may affect the schema for a variety of reasons including;

- Unanticipated requirements,
- A change in the universe of discourse,
- A change to the interpretation of facts about the universe of discourse,
- Changes in the form of updates to effect upgrades to the functionality or scope of a system,
- Changes in the form of updates to effect efficiency improvements,
- Changes caused by system operation,
- Error correction.

Different formalisms have been developed to deal with schema changes with the aim being to preserve information capacity and preserve semantic correctness. Schematic changes may be the result of evolving one system or may arise due to the need for merging two or more systems. Schematic conflicts occur which must be resolved and the schemata unified to produce a new version. To reach this goal there are graph based *schema integration* architectures, as well as, semi-automatic systems applying *schema matching* and *schema translation* techniques. These systems also utilise ontologies, thesauri, and so forth to integrate data from heterogeneous sources in order to process queries and views.

Data integration or conversion remains a partially resolved issue. Some metadata changes are managed by changes to application code and system down time for conversion procedures. However an attribute change may result in data loss, changed accuracy, and altered semantics. Whilst the use of ontologies, concept graphs and other knowledge interchange techniques are alleviating the problems of data integration, these structures are not yet an integral part of the database architecture.

This thesis argues a three-level architecture for relational databases with an interface positioned between data and metadata for complex domains. This intermediary level is the *mesodata* layer. This mesodata layer, separate from the metadata and data, provides complex structures, such as graphs, queues, and circular lists, in which to store domain values and their inter-relationships as well as supplying the ‘intelligence’ required to operate and manipulate them. The domain structures enable different orderings that form the bases of filters for enhanced querying and information retrieval. DBMS supplied mesodata types would allow for the re-usable inclusion of domain information such as in ontologies, taxonomies and concept graphs that to date have been only application specific.

Certification

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

As requested under Clause 14 of Appendix E of the *Flinders University Research Higher Degree Policies and Procedures Manual* I hereby agree to waive the conditions referred to in Clause 13(b) and (c), and thus

- Flinders University may lend this thesis to other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research;
- Flinders University may reproduce this thesis by photocopying or by other means, in total or in part, at the request of other institutions or individuals for the purpose of scholarly research.

Signed

Dated

Denise Bernadette Angela de Vries

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor John Roddick for his advice, support and enthusiasm throughout my candidature.

There are many people in the School of Informatics and Engineering at Flinders University who have helped me in large ways and small, I believe I owe each person thanks. In particular, the members of the Knowledge Discovery and Intelligent Systems Group for constructive criticism, rigorous discussions and friendship, – (in room number order) Darin Chan, Dongqiang Yang, Trent Lewis, Martin Luerssen, Richard Leibbrandt, Darius Pfitzner, David Powers, Aaron Ceglar, Carl Mooney, Sally Rice, Anna Shillabeer, Edi Winarko, Ron Porter, Paul Calder, Amos Omondi, Tiffany Winn, and Lorraine Harker – and Murk Bottema and Jalina Widjaja for their assistance and comments.

I appreciate too the Flinders Postgraduate Students' Association for providing support, advice, resources and the research training courses and workshops that were so helpful at the beginning of my candidature. Thank you Leonie Randall and Audrey Nicholson.

I am very grateful for the all the assistance I received from Versatile Solutions Pty. Ltd, especially to Mr Arthur Verster for his time and effort.

However, none of this work could have been achieved without the unstinting support of Bart de Vries who must be the most generous, patient and caring person in the world.

Denise Bernadette Angela de Vries
October 2005
Adelaide.