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Abstract: We designed a data warehouse for the French bank LCL meeting users’ needs regarding marketing operations decision. However, the nature of the work of users implies that their requirements are often changing. In this paper, we propose an original and global approach to achieve a user-driven model evolution that provides answers to personalized analysis needs. We developed a prototype called WEDriK (data Warehouse Evolution Driven by Knowledge) within the Oracle 10g DBMS and applied our approach on banking data of LCL.

1 INTRODUCTION

In the context of a collaboration with the French bank LCL-Le Crédit Lyonnais (LCL), the objective was to develop the decision support system for marketing operations. To achieve this objective, data of interests coming from heterogeneous sources have been extracted, filtered, merged, and stored in an integrating database, called data warehouse. Due to the role of the data warehouse in the daily business work of an enterprise like LCL, the requirements for the design and the implementation are dynamic and subjective. Therefore, data warehouse model design is a continuous process which has to reflect the changing environment, i.e. the data warehouse model must evolve over the time in reaction to the enterprise’s changes.

Indeed, data sources are often autonomous and generally have an existence and purpose beyond that of supporting the data warehouse itself. An important consequence of the autonomy of data sources is the fact that those sources may change without being controlled from the data warehouse administrator. Therefore, the data warehouse must be adapted to any change which occurs in the underlying data sources, e.g. changes of the schemas. Beside these changes on the source level, the users often change their requirements. Indeed, the nature of their work implies that their requirements are personal and usually evolve, thus they do not reach a final state. Moreover these requirements can depend on their own knowledge.

Our key idea consists then in considering a specific users’ knowledge, which can provide new aggregated data. We represent this users’ knowledge under the form of aggregation rules. In a previous work (Favre et al., 2006), we proposed a data warehouse formal model based on these aggregation rules to allow a schema evolution. In this paper, we extend our previous work and propose an original and complete data warehouse model evolution approach driven by emergent users’ analysis needs to deal not only with the schema evolution but also with the required evolution for the data.

To perform this model evolution, we define algorithms to update dimension hierarchies by creating new granularity levels and to load the required data exploiting users’ knowledge. Hence, our approach provides a real time evolution of the analysis possibilities of the data warehouse to cope with personalized analysis needs. To validate our approach, we developed a prototype named WEDriK (data Warehouse Evolution Driven by Knowledge), within the Oracle 10g Database Management System (DBMS), and applied our approach on data of the French bank LCL.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. First, we detail our global evolution approach in Section 2. We present implementation elements in Section 3, detailing the necessary algorithms. In Section 4, we show, through a running example ex-
tracted from the LCL bank case study, how to use our approach for analysis purposes. Then, we discuss the state of the art regarding model evolution in data warehouses in Section 5. We finally conclude and provide future research directions in Section 6.

2 A USER-DRIVEN APPROACH

In this section, we present our user-driven global approach for updating dimension hierarchies to integrate new analysis possibilities into an existing data warehouse (Figure 1). The first phase of our approach is the acquisition of the users’ knowledge under the form of rules. Then, in the integration phase, these rules are transformed into a mapping table within the DBMS. Then the evolution phase allows to create a new granularity level. Finally, the analysis phase could be carried out on the updated data warehouse model. It is an incremental evolution process, since each time new analysis needs may appear and find an answer. We detail in this section the first three phases.

![Figure 1: Data warehouse user-driven evolution process.](image)

2.1 Acquisition phase

In our approach, we consider a specific users’ knowledge, which determines the new aggregated data to integrate into the underlying data warehouse. More precisely, this knowledge defines how to aggregate data from a given level to another one to be created. It is represented in the form of “if-then” rules.

To achieve the knowledge acquisition phase, our key idea is to define an aggregation meta-rule to represent the structure of the aggregation link. The meta-rule allows the user to define: the granularity level which will be created, the attributes characterizing this new level, the granularity level on which is based the level to be created and finally the attributes of the existing level used to build the aggregation link.

Let \( EL \) be the existing level, \( \{ EA_i, i=1..m \} \) be the set of \( m \) existing attributes of \( EL \) on which conditions are expressed, \( GL \) be the generated level and \( \{ GA_j, j=1..n \} \) be the set of \( n \) generated attributes of \( GL \). The meta-rule is as follows:

\[
\text{if ConditionOn}(EL,\{ EA_i \}) \text{ then GenerateValue}(GL,\{ GA_j \})
\]

Thus, the if-clause contains conditions on the attributes of the existing level. The then-clause contains the definition of the values of the generated attributes, which characterize the new level to be created. The user instantiates the above meta-rule to define the instances of the new aggregated level and the aggregation link with the instances of the existing level.

In the literature, different types of aggregation links can compose the dimension hierarchies to model real situations (Pedersen et al., 2001). In this paper we deal with classical links: an instance in a lower level corresponds to exactly one instance in the higher level, and each instance in the lower level is represented in the higher level. Thus, aggregation rules define a partition of the instances in the lower level, and each class of this partition is associated to one instance of the created level. To check that the aggregation rules satisfy this definition, we deal with the relational representation of aggregation rules which is a mapping table. The transformation is achieved during the integration phase.

2.2 Integration phase

The integration phase consists in transforming “if-then” rules into mapping tables and storing them into the DBMS, by means of relational structures.

For a given set of rules which defines a new granularity level, we associate one mapping table. To achieve this mapping process, we exploit firstly the aggregation meta-rule for building the structure of the mapping table, and secondly we use the aggregation rules to insert the required values in the created mapping table. Since we are in a relational context, each granularity level corresponds to one relational table.

Let \( ET \) (resp. \( GT \)) be the existing (resp. generated) table, corresponding to \( EL \) (resp. \( GL \)) in a logical context. Let \( \{ EA_i, i=1..m \} \) be the set of \( m \) attributes of \( ET \) on which conditions are expressed and \( \{ GA_j, j=1..n \} \) be the set of \( n \) generated attributes of \( GT \). The mapping table \( MT_{GT} \) built with the meta-rule corresponds to the following relation:

\[
MT_{GT}(EA_1, ..., EA_m, GA_1, ..., GA_n)
\]

The aggregation rules allow to insert in this mapping table the conditions on the attributes \( EA_i \), and the values of the generated attributes \( GA_j \).

In parallel, we define a mapping meta-table to gather information on the different mapping tables. This meta-table includes the following attributes: \( MappingTableID \) and \( MappingTableName \) correspond respectively to the identifier and the name of the mapping table; \( AttributeName \) and \( TableName \) denote the attribute implied in the evolution process and its ta-
2.3 Evolution phase

The data warehouse model evolution consists in updating dimension hierarchies of the current data warehouse model by creating new granularity levels. The created level can be added at the end of a hierarchy or inserted between two existing ones, we thus speak of adding and inserting a level, respectively. In the two cases, the rules have to determine the aggregation link between the lower and the created levels. In the second case, it is also necessary to determine the aggregation link between the inserted level and the existing higher level in an automatic way. The user can insert a level between two existing ones only if it is possible to semantically aggregate data from the inserted level to the existing higher level. For each type of dimension hierarchy updates, we propose, in the following section, an algorithm which creates a new relational table and its necessary link(s) with existing tables.

3 IMPLEMENTATION

To achieve the data warehouse model updating, we developed a prototype named WEDrIk (data Warehouse Evolution Driven by Knowledge) within the Oracle 10g DBMS. It exploits different algorithms whose sequence is represented in the Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Algorithms sequence.](image)

The starting point of the algorithms sequence is a set of rules expressed by a user to create a granularity level. These rules are transformed under the form of a mapping table (Algorithm 1). Then we check the validity of the rules by testing the content of the mapping table (Algorithm 2). If the rules are not valid, the user has to modify them. This process is repeated until the rules become valid. If they are valid, the model evolution is carried out (Algorithm 3).

### Transformation algorithm

For one meta-rule $MR$ and its associated set of aggregation rules $R$, we build one mapping table $MT_{GT}$. The structure of the mapping table is designed with the help of the meta-rule, and the content of the mapping table is defined with the set of aggregation rules. Moreover, the necessary information are inserted in the meta-table $MAPPINGMETA\_TABLE$ (Algorithm 1).

**Algorithm 1 Pseudo-code for transforming aggregation rules into a mapping table**

```plaintext
Require: (1) the meta-rule $MR$, if ConditionOn($EL_{i}$,$(EA_{i})$) then GenerateValue($GL$, $(GA_{i})$) where $EL$ is the existing level, $(EA_{i}$, $i = 1..m)$ is the set of $m$ attributes of $EL$, $GL$ is the level to be created, and $(GA_{j}$, $j = 1..n)$ is the set of $n$ generated attributes of $GL$. (2) the set of aggregation rules $R$; (3) the mapping meta-table $MAPPINGMETA\_TABLE$
Ensure: the mapping table $MT_{GT}$

1: CREATE TABLE $MT_{GT}$($(EA_{i})$,$(GA_{j})$)
   { Values insertion in $MT_{GT}$
2: for all rule of $R$ do
3:   INSERT INTO $MT_{GT}$ VALUES(ConditionOn($EL_{i}$,$(EA_{i})$),GenerateValue($GL$, $(GA_{j})$))
4: end for
5: for all $EA_{i}$ of $(EA_{i})$ do
6:   INSERT INTO MAPPINGMETA\_TABLE VALUES($MT_{GT}$, $EL$, $EA_{i}$, 'conditioned')
7: end for
8: for all $GA_{j}$ of $(GA_{j})$ do
9:   INSERT INTO MAPPINGMETA\_TABLE VALUES($MT_{GT}$, $GL$, $GA_{j}$, 'generated')
10: end for
11: return $MT_{GT}$
```

### Constraints checking algorithm

For each tuple of $MT_{GT}$, we write the corresponding query to build a view which contains a set of instances of the table $ET$. First, we check that the intersection of all views considered by pairs is empty. Second, we check that the union of the instances of the whole of views corresponds to the whole of instances of the table $ET$ (Algorithm 2).

### Model evolution algorithm

The model evolution consists in the creation of the table $GT$ and the definition of the required links, according to the evolution type (Algorithm 3). For an addition or an insertion, it thus consists in creating the table $GT$ and inserting values by exploiting the mapping table $MT_{GT}$, and
Algorithm 2 Pseudo-code for checking constraints

```
Require: existing table ET, mapping table MT
Ensure: Intersection_constraint_checked and Union_constraint_checked
        two booleans
        {Views creating}
    1: for all tuple t of MT do
        2: CREATE VIEW v_t AS SELECT * FROM ET where
            Conjunction(t, {ET}),
        3: end for
        {Checking the intersection of views considered by pair is empty}
        4: for s = 1 to n, do
            5: if UNION_SELECT * FROM v_s INTERSECT SELECT * FROM v_s+1
                6: if t ∩ s ≠ ∅ then
                    7: Intersection_constraint_checked=false
                8: end if
            9: end for
        10: if U = SELECT * FROM v_s then
            11: Union_constraint_checked=false
        12: end if
        13: if U ≠ SELECT * FROM ET then
            14: return Intersection_constraint_checked
        15: Union_constraint_checked=false
        16: return Union_constraint_checked
```

then in linking the new table GT with the existing one ET. For the insertion, we just use the mapping table MT, which only contains the link between the lower table ET and the generated table GT. Then we have to automatically establish the aggregation link between GT and ET2, by inferring it according to the one that exists between ET and ET2.

Algorithm 3 Pseudo-code for hierarchy dimension updating

```
Require: type the type of evolution (inserting or adding a level), existing lower table ET, existing higher table ET2, mapping table MT, n = 1..m the set of n attributes of MT which contain the conditions on attributes, {GA_i, j=1..n} the set of n generated attributes of MT, GT which contain the values of the generated attributes, the key attribute GA_k of GT, the attribute B linking ET with ET2
Ensure: generated table GT
    {Creating the new table GT and making the aggregation link between ET and GT}
1: CREATE TABLE GT (GA_k, {GA_i});
2: ALTER TABLE ET ADD (GA_k);
3: for all (tuple t of MT) do
4: INSERT INTO GT (GA_k, {GA_i})
5: UPDATE ET SET GA_k, WHERE {EA_i}
6: end for
    {If it is a level insertion: linking GT with ET2}
7: if type = "inserting" then
8: ALTER TABLE GT ADD (B);
9: UPDATE GT SET B=SELECT DISTINCT B FROM ET WHERE ET.GA_k=GT.GA_k;
10: end if
11: return GT
```

4 A RUNNING EXAMPLE

To illustrate our approach, we use a case study defined by the French bank LCL. LCL is a large company, where the data warehouse users have different points of view. Thus, they need specific analyses, which depend on their own knowledge and their own objectives. We applied our approach on data about the annual Net Banking Income (NBI). The NBI is the profit obtained from the management of customers account. It is a measure observed according to several dimensions: CUSTOMER, AGENCY and YEAR (Figure 3).

![Data warehouse model for the NBI analysis](image1)

Figure 3: Data warehouse model for the NBI analysis.

To illustrate the usage of WEDriK, let us focus on a simplified running example. Let us take the case of the person in charge of student products. He knows that there is three types of agencies: "student" for agencies which gather only student accounts, "foreigner" for agencies whose customers do not leave in France, and "classical" for agencies without any particularity. He needs to obtain NBI analysis according to the agency type. The existing data warehouse could not provide such an analysis. What we seek to do is showing step by step how to achieve this analysis with our approach.

Let us consider the samples of the tables AGENCY and TF-NBI (Figure 4).

![Samples of tables](image2)

Figure 4: Samples of tables.

1-Acquisition phase. The acquisition phase allows the user to define the following aggregation meta-rule in order to specify the structure of the aggregation link for the agency type:

- If ConditionOn(AGENCY, AgencyID)
- then GenerateValue(AGENCY, AgencyID, AgencyTypeLabel)

He instances the meta-rule to define the different agency types:

(R1) If AgencyID ∈ {01993, 01905, 02256} then AgencyTypeLabel = "student"
(R2) if AgencyID=’01929’ then AgencyTypeLabel=‘foreigner’
(R3) if AgencyID in [’01903’, ’01905’, ’02256’, ’01929’] then AgencyTypeLabel=’classical’

2-Integration phase. The integration phase exploits the meta-rule and the different aggregation rules to generate the mapping table MT_AGENCY_TYPE (Figure 5). The information concerning the mapping table is inserted in MAPPING_META_TABLE (Figure 6).

3-Evolution phase. Then the evolution phase allows to create the AGENCY_TYPE table and to update the AGENCY table (Figure 7). More precisely, the MAPPING_META_TABLE allows to create the structure of the AGENCY_TYPE table and a primary key is automatically added. The MT_AGENCY_TYPE mapping table allows to insert the required values. Furthermore, the AGENCY table is updated to be linked with the AGENCY_TYPE table, with the addition of the AgencyTypeID attribute.

4-Analysis phase. Finally, the analysis phase allows to exploit the model with new analysis axes. Usually, in an OLAP environment, queries require the computation of aggregates over various dimension levels. Indeed, given a data warehouse model, the analysis process allows to summarize data by using (1) aggregation operators such as SUM and (2) GROUP BY clauses. In our case, the user wants to know the sum of NBI according to the agency types he has defined. The corresponding query and the results are provided in Figure 8.

5 RELATED WORK

When designing a data warehouse model, involving users is crucial (Kimball, 1996). What about the data warehouse model evolution? According to the literature, model evolution in data warehouses can take the form of model updating or temporal modeling.

Concerning model updating, only one model is supported and the trace of the evolutions is not preserved. In this case, the data historization can be corrupted and analysis could be erroneous. We distinguish three types of approach. The first approach consists in providing evolution operators that allow an evolution of the model (Hurtado et al., 1999; Blaschka et al., 1999). The second approach consists in updating the model, focusing on enriching dimension hierarchies. For instance, some authors propose to enrich dimension hierarchies with new granularity levels by exploiting semantic relations provided by WordNet\(^1\) (Mazón and Trujillo, 2006). The third approach is based on the hypothesis that a data warehouse is a set of materialized views. Then, when a change occurs in a data source, it is necessary to maintain views by propagating this change (Bellahsene, 2002).

Contrary to model updating, temporal modeling makes it possible to keep track of the evolutions, by using temporal validity labels. These labels are associated with either dimension instances (Bljujute et al., 1998), or aggregation links (Mendelzon and Vaisman, 2000), or versions (Eder and Koncilia, 2001; Body et al., 2002). Versioning is the subject today of many work. Versions are also used to provide an answer to “what-if analysis” by creating versions to simulate a situation (Bébel et al., 2004). Different work are then interested in analyzing data throughout versions, in order to achieve the first objective of data warehousing: analyzing data in the course of time (Morzy and Wrembel, 2004; Golfarelli et al., 2006). In these works, an extension to a traditional SQL language is required to take into account the particularities of the approaches for analysis or data loading.

Both of these approaches do not directly involve users in the data warehouse evolution process, and

\(^1\)http://wordnet.princeton.edu/
thus constitute solutions rather than for users’ analysis needs evolution. Thus these solutions make the data warehouse model evolve, without taking into account new analysis needs driven by users’ knowledge, and thus without providing an answer to personalized analysis needs. However, the personalization of the use of a data warehouse becomes crucial. Works in this domain are particularly focused on the selection of data to be visualized, based on users’ preferences (Bellantreche et al., 2005). In opposition of this approach, we add supplement data to extend and personalize the analysis possibilities of the data warehouse. Moreover our approach updates the data warehouse model without inducing erroneous analyses; and it does not require extensions for analysis.

6 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We aimed in this paper at providing an original user-driven approach for the data warehouse model evolution. Our key idea is to involve users in the dimension hierarchies updating to provide an answer to their personalized analysis needs based on their own knowledge. To achieve this process, we propose a method to acquire users’ knowledge and the required algorithms. We developed a prototype named WEDriK within the Oracle 10g DBMS and we applied our approach on the LCL case study.

To the best of our knowledge, the idea of user-defined evolution of dimensions (based on analysis needs) is novel; there are still many aspects to be explored. First of all, we intend to study the performance of our approach in terms of storage space, response time and algorithms complexity. Moreover, we have to study how individual users’ needs evolve in time, and thus we have to consider different strategies of rules and mapping tables updating. Finally, we are also interested in investigating the joint evolution of the data sources and the analysis needs.
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