

Crossing Analytics Systems: Case for Integrated Provenance in Data Lakes

Isuru Suriarachchi and Beth Plale School of Informatics and Computing Indiana University

IEEE E-science 2016 : Hot Topics

The **Data Lake** has arisen within last couple of years as conceptualization of data management framework with flexibility to support multiple data processing tools needed for truly Big Data analytics.

Data Warehouse

- Supports multidimensional analytical processing
 - Online Analytical Processing (OLAP) or Multidimensional OLAP
- Numeric facts (measures) categorized by dimensions creating vector space (OLAP cube).
- Interface is matrix interface like Pivot tables
- Schema is star schema, snowflake schema
- Storage is largely relational database

Data Warehouse Architecture



• ETL: Extraction, Transformation, Load

Credit: https://www.linkedin.com/topic/data-warehouse-architecture

Challenging the Warehouse: Big Data

- From numerous sources
 - social media, sensor data, IoT devices, server logs, clickstream etc.
- Not all numeric (quantitative) thus differently structured
 - Structured, semi-structured, unstructured
- Continuously generated or archived

Suitability of Data Warehouse for Today's Big Data

- ETL imposes burden
 - Schema on write
 - Inflexibility/inefficiency at ingest time
 - Information loss upon schema translation
- Weak fit for popular Big Data analytical tools (e.g., Spark, Hadoop) and data serving platforms (e.g., HDFS, S3)

Data Lake

- A scalable storage infrastructure with no schema enforcement at ingest
- Data ingested in raw form: no loss
- Schema-on-read
- Integrated Transformations

– With e.g., Hadoop, Spark



Data Lake Challenges

- Increased flexibility leads to harder manageability
 - Differently typed data can be easily dumped into the Data Lake
 - Data products can be in different stages of their lifecycle: raw, half processed, processed etc.
 - Can easily turn into "data swamps"
- Requires traceability!!..
 - Provenance can help

Data Provenance

- Information about activities, entities and people who involved in producing a data product
- Standards
 - OPM
 - PROV
- If a Data Lake ensures that every data product's provenance is in place starting from data product's origin, critical traceability can be had

What provenance perspective could bring to a Data Lake?

- Track origins of data, chained transformations
- Contribute to reuse determinations of trust and quality
- React!! Minimally constrain what enters a Lake?

Challenges in Provenance Capturing

- Chains of Transformations
 - Different analytics systems: Hadoop, Spark etc.
- Need is end to end integrated provenance across transformations
- System specific provenance collection methods are less useful
 - Integration/stitching problems
 - E.g.: RAMP, HadoopProv for Hadoop



Solution to minimal lake governance

- All components in lake *stream* provenance to central provenance subsystem
 - Stores provenance for long term queries
 - Monitors provenance stream in real time
- Event in stream represented by edge in provenance graph
- Global lake wide policy: Uniform Persistent ID (PID) (Handle, UUIDs, DOIs) attached to all data objects in Data Lake
 - required to guarantee integrated provenance

Model

Chain of transformations sharing Ids



- PID assigned to all data objects
 - granularity
- Transformations T₁, T₂, and T₃
 - Distributed
 - May use different frameworks



Provenance traces integrate across systems of Data Lake





Reference Architecture



- Real-time provenance stream processing
- Stored provenance for long term usage

Prototype Use Case



- Different frameworks used
 - Flume: Captures tweets and write into HDFS
 - Hadoop Job: Computes hashtag counts
 - Spark Job: Computes category counts

Central provenance store

- Uses Komadu
 - A distributed provenance collection tool
 - Visualization,
 Custom Queries



I. Suriarachchi, Q. Zhou and B. Plale (2015). Komadu: A Capture and Visualization System for Scientific Data Provenance. *Journal of Open Research Software* 3(1):e4

Client Library



- Log4j like API for provenance capture
- Dedicated thread pool in provenance layer
- Batching to minimize network overhead

Use case evaluation

- Flume, Hadoop and Spark jobs instrumented using Komadu client libraries
- Jobs stream provenance events into central provenance store (Komadu)
- Persistent IDs (UUID) assigned for each data object at entry to data lake; PID persists thereafter with data object

Use case evaluation: experimental environment

- 5 small VM instances, 2 2.5GhZ cores, 4 GB RAM, 50 GB local storage
- 4 VM instances used for HDFS cluster
- 3.23 GB Twitter data collected over 5 days running Flume on master node
- Hadoop and Spark set up on top of HDFS cluster
- Separate instance for RabbitMQ and Komadu

Use case evaluation: Metrics

- Batch size:
 - impact of batch size on provenance capture efficiency. Measured by total execution time for Hadoop using provenance event batching mechanism in Komadu library
- Overhead of provenance capture:
 - Measured against total tool-specific execution time
 - measure overhead of customized value field (in key value pair)
 - Measure overhead of provenance capture for Hadoop and Spark

Batch Size Test



- Hadoop job execution times with varying batch sizes
- Optimal batch size: ~5000 KB

Overhead: Hadoop



- custom val: emits PID with key value pair as (#nba, <2, *id*>) instead of (#nba, 2)
- data prov HDFS: writes provenance into HDFS, used by HadoopProv and RAMP

Overhead: Spark



 Higher provenance capture overhead compared to Hadoop

Future Work

- Performance overhead is prohibitively high
 - decouple PID assignment from execution?
 Examine granularity
- Live provenance stream processing for real time monitoring/reaction
- Explore minimal provenance at on-line rates and more comprehensive provenance at offline rates

Work funded in part by National Science Foundation OCI-0940824



IEEE E-science 2016 : Hot Topics