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Users hate BI. And have for a long time
The old problem was access, the new problem is analysis.
What do you mean by “analytics”?

You keep using that word. I do not think it means what you think it means.
User-focused criteria: context and point of use

Information use is diverse and varies based on context:
- Get a quick answer
- Solve a one-off problem
- Analyze causes
- Do experiments
- Make repetitive decisions
- Use data in routine processes
- Make complex decisions
- Choose a course of action
- Convince others to take action

One size doesn’t fit all.
There are two parts to “analytics”

The mathy stuff

The query & reporting stuff

\[ \int \frac{k}{(k+i\mu)(k-i\mu)} e^{ikr} dk = \frac{\mu}{2i} \pi e^{-\mu r} \]

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{(k+i\mu)(k-i\mu)} e^{ikr} dk = \frac{\mu}{2i} \pi e^{-\mu r} \]

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{ikr}}{k-i\mu} dk + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{(k+i\mu)(k-i\mu)} e^{ikr} dk = \frac{\mu}{2i} \pi e^{-\mu r} \]

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k'}{k'^2 + \mu^2} e^{-ik'r} dk' + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^2 + \mu^2} e^{ikr} dk = \pi i e^{-\mu r} \]

\[ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^2 + \mu^2} e^{-ikr} dk + \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{k}{k^2 + \mu^2} e^{ikr} dk = \pi i e^{-\mu r} \]

\[ k = k' \]
Analysis: the verb that’s ignored

Analysis is something people do across this spectrum

Good paper on the topic of analysis: Enterprise Data Analysis and Visualization: An Interview Study
http://vis.stanford.edu/files/2012-EnterpriseAnalysisInterviews-VAST.pdf
Old market says: There’s nothing wrong with what you have, just keep buying new products from us
The big data market has an answer...
The data lake: just dump the data in!
Combine with self-service tools: we’ll figure it out later!
GOOD NEWS EVERYONE
WE'RE BACK WHERE WE STARTED!
The primary view of BI, self service is publishing data.
An architectural history of BI tools

First there were files and reporting programs. Application files feed through a data processing pipeline generate an output file. The file is used by a report formatter for print/screen.

Every report is a program written by a developer.
An architectural history of BI tools

We had the concept of cubes before we had RDBMSs. First commercial product (Express) in 1970.

Provided interactive response time but had problems: rigidly defined schema, inflexible definition, data size limits, slow cube build times, resulting in cube explosions.
An architectural history of BI tools

Then we had databases and tools with embedded SQL, and query-by-example templating soon after.

These had better scalability and flexibility over OLAP models. They decoupled storage from access from the rendering of the interface.
An architectural history of BI tools

With more regular schema models, in particular dimensional models that didn’t contain cyclic join paths, it was possible to automate SQL generation via semantic mapping layers. Query via business terms made BI usable by non-technical people.
Response time is a key driver for analysis

Many approaches today are a step backward. Unless you resolve this task performance gap, real analysis work is a challenge and will remain the domain of Excel and tools that extract subsets of data into memory.

Flow is possible only in the “less than 3 second” range
BI server architecture shifts

The SQL-generating server model of BI scales extremely well but has poor user response time.

Solution 1: pre-cache query results or prebuild datasets on the BI server (i.e. the old OLAP model) Well-known problems with this.

Solution 2: Shove all the data into a BI server repository. Avoids subset problems. Adds potential scaling problems.
IT reality today is multiple data stores, not one place

Independent, purpose-built databases and processing systems for different types of data and query / computing workloads is the new norm for information delivery. No single place for data or access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marge Inovera</td>
<td>Statistician</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Bath</td>
<td>Sewer inspector</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan Awfulitch</td>
<td>Dermatologist</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadia Geddit</td>
<td>DBA</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source Environments: Databases, Documents, Flat Files, Objects, Streams, ERP, SaaS Applications

BI, dashboards, analytics, apps

Query processing

Data processing

Stream processing
There is always a third way

The previous choices were driven by client-server thinking. We have a distributed (cloud) environment.

Possibilities:

Don’t force all the compute into the DB or server.

Don’t force all the compute to the client.

Data on demand, bring it to the analysis from where it is, and/or execute the analysis local to where the data is.
Connectors to data sources the tool can communicate with.

Semantic layer tools: what we’re used to

- Client requests and responses in native format
- BI server:
  - Semantic layer
  - Query generation
- Connectors
  - SQL and NoSQL connectors

Note: most BI servers still can’t talk to more than one DB at the same time
Map-based tools: what we’re back to

Query from client / server
Queries sources directly
Any integration done locally
No semantic layer translating

XML, JSON, text, binary return formats

SQL and NoSQL connectors

Connector based data sources the tool can communicate with.

Internal or external API-accessible sources.

Note: most products have minimal to no local join ability
With analysis, the BI approach has to be inverted.

The process used today for data warehousing:
1. Model
2. Collect
3. Analyze

The new process is:
1. Collect
2. Analyze
3. Model

This is a shift from planned design to adaptive design for data management, and a multi-skill team.
Analysis and BI: Discoverability and Repeatability

Focus on repeatability
Application cycle time

Focus on discoverability
Analyst cycle time

80% of data use
80% of analysis

Promote
Consume
Collect
Analyze
Explore
Model
Discover

Application cycle time
Analyst cycle time
Just enough modeling: an analogy for analytic data

Multiple contexts of use, differing quality levels

You need to keep the original because just like baking, you can’t unmake dough once it’s mixed.
A core problem with one global schema is change
Big data answer? Schema on read

Relational Database: Schema-on-Write

- Multi-structured Source Data
- ETL
- Relational DBMS
- SQL

Big Data Processing: Schema-on-Read

- Multi-structured Source Data
- Load as-is
- Hadoop
- Schema mapped to original files
- SQL
Schema on read is an answer, sometimes

Schema-on-read is really only good for the developer who doesn’t know what to do with the data. There is a price to pay with schema on read, but you usually don’t see it at the beginning.

SoR problem: metadata is what you wished your data looked like.
Reality is not requirements = code
Reality is the data, not the metadata
How did we get to this point with BI & big data?

There’s a difference between having no past and actively rejecting it.
ODBC to SQL in Big Data, SQL on Big Data

**Pros**
- Can get detailed data
- Performance leverages the architecture
- You get all of SQL

**Cons**
- Lower user concurrency
- Cannot access unstructured data (requires schema)
- Cost - Manage security in multiple tools, separate administration for metadata
Move Data to Separate BI Server

**Pros**
- Least Costly
- Use existing BI tools
- Full functionality without compromise

**Cons**
- Shallow insights – summary data
- Scale single server
- IT required Data movement
- Separate security models
- Batch data updates
(R)OLAP on Big Data

**Pros**
- Use existing BI tools
- Higher user concurrency
- Predictable response time

**Cons**
- Lacks ad-hoc freedom
- Not real-time: batch data updates
- Very rigid schema
- Multiple tools and data duplication
- Separate security models, administration

OLAP Middleware
Native BI

Pros

✓ More user concurrency
✓ Linear scalability
✓ Agility for analysts (drill to detail)
✓ Supports direct complex data sources

Cons

✘ Newer technology and approach
✘ Requires some Big Data skills to set up and maintain
✘ Workload management needed to response time

BI runs on Big Data
One of the key things Hadoop does is to separate the storage, execution and API layers of a database. This allows for processing flexibility, but it does not permit one to build a reliable, high performance database across the layers. You trade these for write flexibility.

- Abstraction layers
- General-purpose data engines
- Storage management
- Hadoop distributed filesystem (HDFS)
A more specific look at layers and engines

You can program to any layer you choose. Some projects build on top of multiple others.
Four models for SQL on Hadoop

1. Parse and compile SQL into MapReduce jobs
2. Put a SQL interpreter on a generic execution engine
3. Run a native SQL engine in the cluster
4. Run a SQL interpreter on a non-generic engine (this will limit SQL functionality based on the underlying engine).

Hadoop distributed filesystem (HDFS)

Storage (filetypes in HDFS, Hbase, etc)

Hadoop distributed filesystem (HDFS)
What’s under the hood matters in querying.

Source: Randy Bias
The core problem of old BI was scalability. This is solved. New uses require new platforms for different workloads.

Note: this was 8 years ago. Largest MPP RDBMS I know is 99PB

Source: Noumenal, Inc.
The shifting BI paradigm

The tool market is shifting, driven by new architectures that are enabled by new technologies.

Front-end tools are evolving away from BI-as-publishing, which changes their design, increases the burden on back end databases and creates new interaction challenges.

You need to evaluate tools based on more usage scenarios and interactive capabilities, less on report-building / dashboard features.

One standard tool is not the norm, it’s the exception.
When replacing the old with the new (or ignoring the new over the old) you always make tradeoffs, and usually you won’t see them for a long time.

Technologies are not perfect replacements for one another. Often not better, only different.
The right tool is the one that people will actually use, not the one you want them to use.

“But we already have an enterprise standard”
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