

Data accounting and error counting

Michał J. Gajda¹

¹*Migamake Pte Ltd*

Abstract

Can we infer sources of errors from outputs of the complex data analytics software? Bidirectional programming promises that we can reverse flow of software, and translate corrections of output into corrections of either input or data analysis.

This allows us to achieve holy grail of automated approaches to debugging, risk reporting and large scale distributed error tracking.

Since processing of risk reports and data analysis pipelines can be frequently expressed using a sequence relational algebra operations, we propose a replacement of this traditional approach with a data summarization algebra that helps to determine an impact of errors. It works by defining data analysis of a necessarily complete summarization of a dataset, possibly in multiple ways along multiple dimensions. We also present a description to better communicate how the complete summarizations of the input data may facilitates easier debugging and more efficient development of analysis pipelines. This approach can also be described as an generalization of axiomatic theories of accounting into data analytics, thus dubbed data accounting.

We also propose formal properties that allow for transparent assertions about impact of individual records on the aggregated data and ease debugging by allowing to find minimal changes that change behaviour of data analysis on per-record basis.

1. Introduction

Error tracing and error-impact estimation has been a holy grail of practical use of automated approaches to risk reporting(Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2013), large-scale distributed error tracking(Julian 2017), automated debugging.

Since processing of risk reports and data analysis pipelines can be frequently expressed using a sequence relational algebra operations, we propose a replacement of this traditional approach with a data summarization algebra that helps to determine an impact of errors. It works by defining data analysis of a necessarily complete summarization of a dataset, possibly in multiple ways along multiple dimensions.

We also present a description to better communicate how the complete summarizations of the input data may facilitates easier debugging and more efficient development of analysis pipelines.

This approach can also be described as an generalization of axiomatic theories of accounting into data analytics, thus dubbed data accounting.

We also propose formal properties that allow for transparent assertions about impact of individual records on the aggregated data and ease debugging by allowing to find minimal changes that change behaviour of data analysis on per-record basis.

Arxiv



© 2022 Copyright for this paper by its authors.



CEUR Workshop Proceedings (CEUR-WS.org)

The answer is indeed based on fully bidirectional computation and generalization of it to data-preserving transformations.

2. Literature review

Basel Committee Best Practices (BCBS) 239 (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2013) is a set of recommendations for the financial institutions on how to organize their risk reporting pipelines. These recommendations also give a careful considerations to general principles of data aggregation and reporting, and thus became reference for other work on best practice in aggregated reporting.

We also are inspired by practical rules coming from recent opinions on data pipeline construction methodology (Gajda 2020a, 2020b).

2.1. Bidirectional computing

Reversible computing (Bennett 1973) aims to reverse computation from outputs to inputs. Bidirectional computing (Bancilhon and Spyrtos 1985) attempts to generalize programs to allow picking a subset of either outputs and inputs, and computing the remaining.

Automated debugging aims to automatically indicate possible places in the program that may be buggy. Automated program derivation aims to propose valid programs given both inputs and outputs.

Differentiable computing (Levitt 1983; Abadi and Plotkin 2019) aims to find a minimum of one function, by computing both its value and differential on the pivot point.

2.2. Database view update problem

Database view is a computation from input relations to output relation. Database community have long tried to resolve *view update problem* (Chen and Liao 2011) which tries to reverse computation of the view, so that the update on results is transformed into update on source relations.

While this approach was limited in scope to relations, it has great impact on data analytics, since big datasets are often modeled directly as relations, or translatable to relations (for example graphs translated into incidence relation).

Analysis of the problem has led to identification of *view complement* which contains relation missing from the view, but essential for computing the update.

In the sense the database community identified *views* as non-injective. In order to achieve updatable views, it attempted to restore the injectiveness of the *views* by computing *view complement*.

2.3. Event sourcing

Event sourcing replaces database as a source of truth with a history of events that happened. This *event log* corresponds to general ledger in accounting, in the sense that it can only be appended to, and the state becomes just a *view* or *balance* on the ledger.

2.4. Automated debugging

Automated debugging approaches aim to find a location of a bug in the program from the fault in the output. This may be realized with approach akin to bidirectional program, but applied to program source, instead of inputs.

2.5. Philosophy and axiomatization of accounting

Accounting is a science that attempts to predict future performance (Ijiri 2018, 1975) of companies by insight into cash flows and metrics. The mathematical axiomatization of accounting (Ijiri 2018) is based on a concept of *time-invariant measure* that partitions money in a way that changes along time dimension, but preserves a total sum.

This is consistent with a traditional observation of accountants that it is better to have a *monotonic* measure of cash flow instead of recording only the sum of money currently available, and instead of adding and removing money, move the money between different *accounts*.

This approach, called double entry accounting (Ellerman 2007), is best presented by presenting a total balance as pair of *debit* and *credit* sides. Subtraction of *debit* from *credit* yields a total balance. Both sides are non-negative, and strictly monotonic over time. That means that we have a strictly monotonic measure that is easy to verify across time.

Next step is generalization of double-entry accounting to multiple *purpose accounts*: for example, we can make separately make account for cash balance, spending on

In order to deal with difficulty of putting all elements of the business on monetary scale, modern accountants base statements not just on ledger of past transactions, but *infobase* defined as entire database used to define financial statements (Warsono, Ridha, and Darmawan 2009).

Note that valuation-centred approach (like *fair value accounting* – FVA) makes it hard to communicate non-monetary information, and is subject to currency stability. It also faces difficulty in face of barter transactions where one company gives services directly in exchange for another service, with no money changing hands (Balzer and Mattessich 1991).

As opposed to FVA, traditional accounting is based on “going-on concern” which values assets on non-liquidation basis, and thus is oriented towards future performance of the company.

Information content school emphasises that disclosure of business information attempts to reduce uncertainty regarding the entity. It sees accounting information as a pro-active management support tool, that is not centred on **fair value**.

2.5.1. Accounting measure

In the work on axioms of accounting measure Ijiri (Ijiri 2018) notes that all pertinent objects are quantifiable by amount, volume, weight or another measure, and divided in a countable collections of classes. For each class there must be a physical measure, but they do not be the same for different classes. The principle of substitubility tells that two sets of objects that have the same quantity, can be mutually substituted for the purpose of exchanges. Non-substitutable objects must be accounted in a class of itself. Measures must be correct mathematical measures that are non-negative, zero if class is empty, and countably additive (monotonic). Some objects may possess multiple different classes that often correspond to different dimensions of reporting. Time is a real variable over which some objects change their classes. But total measure of objects

over time must be *invariant*. Measures may be allocated, imputed and compared, based on current and future value of an asset. Default is to use cost of replacement by a given point of time.

For example, we can estimate a cost of purchase for a workstation at 1000\$ in 2020. The value of a workstation will decrease due to wear and obsolescence to 800\$ 2021. But since the total measure must remain 1000\$, we divide this value in 2021 into two classes: current value of a workstation at \$800, and written off value of \$200.

Balzer and Mattesich(Balzer and Mattesich 1991), and Ellerman(Ellerman 2007) made different attempts at axiomatizing value-based accounting that partitions resources into disjoint groups, but they go along similar principles.

For example Ellerman(Ellerman 2007) gives a solution to monotonic tracking of information contained in both cash inflows and outflows by splitting them into pair of monotonically increasing values of *debit* and *credit* used in traditional double-entry accounting systems.

Some accounting philosophers add that the goal of accounting is more than just to sum up the numbers, it is to predict future state of business, and reduce uncertainty about this state(Warsono, Ridha, and Darmawan 2009). This means that accounting becomes a science of data analysis and summarization where accounting measure plays just a small part within a big edifice of information summarization.

2.6. Requirements for error impact reporting

Here we summarize basic requirements for error impact reporting in bulk:

The analytics pipeline does not **crash** for failing record, but instead runs as a whole for a given algebra expression, and provides *correct relation(s)* (that contain correct and relevant results) **and** *error-trace relations* that complement correct results with information needed for error reporting. That means that functions *must be total*.

No information is simply lost or discarded. Whenever a relevant information should not affect the output, we sort it to a **different category** of information that is provided, but irrelevant so it can be put into an error trace relation. We may convert between types of information, but non-null information must be converted to entities of non-null information. We treat information as monotonic (it can only increase), and additive.

With every *correct relation* that contains data that is valid and relevant at the current stage of the pipeline we also keep an *error trace* with records that were discarded and thus they could not impact the processing. This allows us to estimate the possible impact of erroneous records, if they were provided on the input. This means that we preserve erroneous inputs in the form of error outputs.

2.7. Railroad-oriented programming

At the end of the analytics pipeline we should always be able to provide an automatic *error dashboard* that summarizes how much data was correctly processed, and summarized in the output, and how much data was discarded, and for what reasons. This again means that the *dashboard* that gives a final summary of the output must be *sensitive* to all inputs and all forms of errors.

We should automatically tag the error trace with all information necessary to discover at which stage of the pipeline the data was discarded. This means that we should divide the analytics pipeline into summarization stages, and transformation stages, and transformation stages should preserve sufficient information about bits of input to evaluate their impact all the way until final summarization.

We conclude that the best approach to fulfill these requirements is to attempt to keep all **errored records** along with the correct records, and summarize them in parallel.

Railroad-oriented programming methodology (Wlaschin 2012) suggests merging of all **error records** together in a separate output stream that is also summarized, just like the data on the so called **happy path** (main path that yields validated records for summarization). This leads to two parallel streams of processing, one forwarding valid data, the other forwarding errors and anomalies.

Table 1: Translation of shared concepts within literature of different domains.

	Bidirectional computing	Databases	Event sourcing	Data structures	Railroad-oriented programming
Accounting					
double-entry accounting	reversible transformation	mark for deletion, data partition	N/A	partition	switching between <i>happy path</i> and <i>error path</i>
general ledger		monotonic query	event log	append-only or log-structured	N/A
N/A	bidirectional computation	view update problem	N/A	N/A	N/A
sensitive to inputs	bijection transformation	injectivity	N/A	not invariant, injectivity	N/A

3. Proposed work

This work attempts to unify approaches of bidirectional programming, railroad-oriented programming, and accounting to get the best features of all three. That is we aim to provide both injectiveness of debugging data pipelines (understood as finding difference to the program that fixes it), and in order to do so, we maintain strict injectiveness of view/filter computations, and monotonic data aggregations. In this process, we discover that unifying theory for bidirectional computation **and** debugging can be found on the basis of mathematical theory of accounting.

To our knowledge bidirectional computing was so far not applied to monotonic data aggregations. We also find that this is first work exploring connection between axiomatic accounting(Ijiri 2018) and both bidirectional computing and monotonic summarizations(Ross and Sagiv 1997).

3.1. Motivating example

We propose the following running example is that of the container ship contents.

Container ship example table “items”:

Description	Purchase price	Commodity	Quantity	Unit	Insurance
Sailors	<i>priceless</i>		17	person	2,000,000\$
Nutella	10\$		20,000,000	jar	
Grain		wheat grain	200	tonne	
Milk		milk	5,000	litre	
Cat			1	animal	
Nut oil	<i>unknown</i>	nut oil	1,000	litre	
Ship	2,000,000,000\$		1		1,000,000,000\$

Commodity prices reference table “Current prices”:

Market	Commodity	Price	Currency	Per unit	Quote date	Future date
forward	wheat grain	6.0981	USD	bushel	2021-12-01	2022-02-01
spot	wheat grain	6.0575	USD	bushel	2021-09-01	
spot	wheat grain	<i>closed</i>	USD	bushel	2021-12-01	
spot	milk	33.98	EUR	100kg	2021-12-01	

Table of reports:

Name	Description	Accounted	Unaccounted
Insured value	Total amount paid by insurer to all parties	Insured value	Cat, nut oil
Replacement cost	Cost of replacement for owner in case of loss	Purchase price or hiring cost	Cat, nut oil
Weight	Total mass transported	Weight of commodities	Sailors, cat
Weight	Total mass transported	Weight of commodities	Sailors, cat

The point is to show how different value may be computed depending whether we consider a total payment by insurer for the ship loss, cost of replacing the ship by a ship owner, or a cost of purchasing commodities on the market upon unreasonable delay. Since we will be interested only in *complete summarizations* of the dataset, we will only build queries that summarize relevant data *and summarize omitted or ignored data*. This is considered the best practice (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2013).

3.2. Outline

The similarity between best practices in impact reporting (Basel Committee on Banking Supervision 2013) and mathematical theory of accounting measure (Ijiri 2018) is not accidental. We may formalize *complete summarizations* of an input data set that generalize both notion of error impact report, and accounting measure defined above.

But instead of *measure* which is rather narrow numeric value, we generalize to use a notion of information that is an additive monoid over a given set. Notion of *ownership* is translated into *partitions* of the set. Invariance of total measure over time is replaced by invariance of total information monoid during processing.

Data space represents a complete summarization of a dataset. The language that can only formulate complete summarizations would work different from traditional relational algebra, and thus to define it we need a mathematical theory.

3.3. Definitions

Partition of a set we call a family of disjoint sets that cover the space.

Reals \mathbb{R} and positive reals $\mathbb{R}_+ = \{x \mid x \geq 0 \wedge x \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

We use symbol \leq for any partial ordering, \cup for tagged disjoint union, with in_r for tagging right and in_l for tagging left.

We use \cup as classical set union, and $\dot{\cup}$ for a union of sets labelled by right label $in_r()$ and left label $in_l()$.

3.3.1. Data space

As mentioned before, we will focus on *complete summarizations* of a given input. By complete we mean that they do not lose information.

We formalize the above notions as *data space*:

Data space is a tuple with the following $(\mathbb{D}, \leq_{\mathbb{D}}, \|_ \|_{\mathbb{D}}, (\mathbb{M}, e, \diamond))$:

- data carrier set \mathbb{D} ;
- information set \mathbb{M} ;
- partial ordering representing *information growth* $\leq_{\mathbb{D}}$ ¹;
- measure of data by elements of set \mathbb{M} : $\|_ \| : \mathbf{2}^{\mathbb{D}} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$.
- information fusion monoid $\diamond_{\mathbb{D}} : \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$, that is additive in m ;
- neutral element e of fusion monoid contains is the neutral element of \mathbb{M} that is equal to $\|\emptyset\|_{\mathbb{D}}$
- we expect *information fusion* to be invariant over any partition of the carrier set \mathbb{D} ;
- *monotonicity* of partial ordering with respect to *information fusion*:

(1)

$$a \leq b \wedge c \leq d \implies a \diamond c \leq b \diamond d$$

We note that our partial ordering can often be *derived* from well behaved information monoid by equational laws: $a \diamond b \leq a$ and $a \diamond b \leq b$.

It describes an additive monoid with partial ordering that is consistent with this monoid. That is because we are interested only in *complete summarizations* of a data on the given carrier set \mathbb{D} .

Examples of data spaces

- *accounting measure* (Ijiri 2018)
- any *mereological space* with a *finitely additive metric*, which is a family of sets equipped with operations of Boole's algebra, and additive metric over these sets (Arntzenius 2004; Barbieri and Gerla 2021);
- *typelikes* used for recording union types (Gajda 2022) with a partial ordering derived from the information fusion monoid as $a \diamond b \leq a$ and $a \diamond b \leq b$, and metric $\|_ \|$ as type inference operation.
- *Banach space (metric space)* with set union as information fusion.

Each set is also equipped with an *identity* data space:

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} \|_ \|_{id} &:= id \\ \mathbb{D}_{id} &:= \mathbb{M}_{id} \\ \leq &:= \subset \\ \diamond_{id} &:= \cup \end{aligned}$$

¹Of course, $\leq_{\mathbb{D}}$ is a monoidal preorder (Fong and Spivak 2021)

Another interesting example is *Paccioli algebra* that describes double-entry accounting:

(3)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_p &:= \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}_+ \\ (d_1, c_1) \diamond (d_2, c_2) &:= (d_1 + d_2, c_1 + c_2) \\ \text{partial ordering } (d_1, c_1) \leq_p (d_2, c_2), &\text{ iff } d_1 \leq d_2 \text{ and } c_1 \leq c_2 \end{aligned}$$

This is example, of how we create an additive data space over account balances, by converting each balance into a pair of strictly positive credit and debit.

Examples of data spaces (summarizations) Whenever summarization of data is performed, we should attempt to perform similar summarization on the fields in the error path, or other measure of impact counting when these fields are absent.

For each table, we indicate possible summarizations by assigning fitting monoid to a column, and indicating other columns that may be used for grouping the results.

For example the table `order_details` from typical schema:

Table 5: Example summarization.

column	type	unique	result	aggregation
<code>order_id</code>	integer	unique	set of identifiers	union
<code>product_id</code>	integer	-	set of identifiers	union
<code>unit_price</code>	number	-	number	min, max, avg
<code>quantity</code>	number	-	number	sum (<i>for each unit type</i>)
<code>unit_price * quantity</code>	number	derived	number	sum

Now that we read this example, we also see that reporting monoids exhibit certain trends:

- OIDs, unique identifiers, dimensions are usually summarized by sets
- number facts are usually summarized by sum, min, max, average

It is common to use the same summarization on the same datatype (unit). Summarizing together different datatypes (units) is usually a mistake, in which case we use a containing category, for example with count different types of faulty records instead of summing their values.

Automatic summarization can perform a summarization on all permitted aggregations in order to detect common patterns.

We can infer, that we may assign a heuristic that for every summarization of correct data would also summarize incorrect records on those monoids that can be still used in case of incomplete data.

That should make a reasonable default summarizations for the data outside the main path (or “happy path”) of the analysis.

3.3.2. Information preserving operations

Information preserving operations can be formulated in a general way as bidirectional and thus reversible, or as preserving the information measure.

Conjecture: Reversible operations are always preserving any specific information measure as defined above.

Partition of data space Instead of selecting or projecting data from the input, the lossless operation is to **partition** the data set into subsets of desired properties.

For example

For a predicate p , we can mark it as:

$$(\mathbb{D}_{\text{accepted}}, \mathbb{D}_{\text{rejected}}) = \text{partition}(p, \mathbb{D})$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{accepted}} = \{x | x \in \mathbb{D} \wedge p(x)\}$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{\text{rejected}} = \{x | x \in \mathbb{D} \wedge \neg p(x)\}$$

Information preserving union Union of two sets is information preserving, if members of each set are clearly labelled in a way that allows to infer from which input set they come from. This may be either because they come from *disjoint sets*, or because they are *explicitly tagged*:

$$\mathbb{D}_u = \mathbb{D}_1 \dot{\cup} \mathbb{D}_2 = \{\text{in}_l(d_1) | d_1 \in \mathbb{D}_1\} \cup \{\text{in}_r(d_1) | d_1 \in \mathbb{D}_1\}$$

In some cases we already have tags that serve the same purpose, that is, there is an origin function f :

(4)

$$\exists f. \forall x. f(x) = \begin{cases} \text{in}_l() & x \in \mathbb{D}_1 \\ \text{in}_r() & x \in \mathbb{D}_2 \end{cases}$$

Information preserving function In case we are interested only in information measures $\mathbb{M}_1, \dots, \mathbb{M}_n$ and $\mathbb{M}'_1, \dots, \mathbb{M}'_n$ we can narrow ourselves to the functions that preserve information for these functions, that is:

Given function $f : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}'$ we can compute a corresponding mapping of $g : \mathbb{M}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{M}'_i$ such that $g(m(x)) = m'(f(x))$.

Examples of information preserving functions In simplest example, it may occur that $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}'$ and $\mathbb{M}_i = \mathbb{M}'_i$.

Another example would be re-partitioning the dataset with respect to a predicate, or computing additional quantities for each record.

Note: that aggregation generally only preserve information that corresponds to their dimension (for example summing up quantities only preserves this dimension, but not the number of records). Later we will discuss how to construct aggregations preserving multiple dimensions by using tensor products of aggregations on individual dimensions.

3.3.3. Derivations of complex data spaces from simpler ones

Now we address a derivation of complex data spaces from simpler ones.

3.3.4. Tensor products

We already saw that *data metric space* can be derived from a well-behaved *information fusion monoid*.

Now we attempt to assemble *data spaces* from subspaces that conform to different *data metrics*:

Disjoint tensor product *Disjoint tensor product* of two *data spaces* $\mathbb{D}_1 \otimes \mathbb{D}_2$ is a data space such that:

- data carrier set is $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_1 \times \mathbb{D}_2$;
- partial ordering $a \leq c \wedge b \leq d \implies (a, b) \leq (c, d)$;
- information fusion $(a, b) \diamond (c, d) = (a \diamond_1 c, b \diamond_2 d)$
- neutral element $e = (e_1, e_2)$

Disjoint tensor product Given two data spaces over the same set, we may want to use composite *data metric* that represents information conveyed by data metrics in the both spaces:

Parallel product of two *data spaces* $\mathbb{D}_1 \oplus \mathbb{D}_2$ is a data space such that:

- carrier set is $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_1 \oplus \mathbb{D}_2$;
- partial ordering $a \leq c \wedge b \leq d \implies (a, b) \leq (c, d)$;
- information fusion $(a, b) \diamond (c, d) = (a \diamond_1 c, b \diamond_2 d)$
- neutral element $e = (e_1, e_2)$

Information reconstruction and information projection Given two dataspace \mathbb{D}_1 and \mathbb{D}_2 such that the data carrier is the same, but different information carriers \mathbb{M}_1 and \mathbb{M}_2 , we can make a $\mathbb{D} = \mathbb{D}_1 \oplus \mathbb{D}_2$ by making a tensor product of information carriers $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{M}_1 \otimes \mathbb{M}_2$ and using induced partial order and information fusion monoid:

- $a \leq b$ when both $\|a\|_{\mathbb{D}_1} \leq_{\mathbb{D}_1} \|b\|$ and $\|a\|_{\mathbb{D}_2} \leq_{\mathbb{D}_2} \|b\|_{\mathbb{D}_2}$
- $m \diamond_{\mathbb{D}_1 \oplus \mathbb{D}_2} n = (m \diamond_{\mathbb{D}_1} n, m \diamond_{\mathbb{D}_2} n)$

For disjoint information carriers, we may call the component dataspace \mathbb{D}_1 and \mathbb{D}_2 *projections*:

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}_1}(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{D}_1$$

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{M}_2}(\mathbb{D}) = \mathbb{D}_2$$

Products of functions Since we are interested in transformations of *data spaces*, we denote function products that correspond to the above products on data spaces:

$$(f \otimes g)(x) \begin{cases} \text{in}_r(x) & \rightarrow f(x) \\ \text{in}_l(y) & \rightarrow g(y) \end{cases}$$

$$(f \oplus g)(x) = (f(x), g(x))$$

Partial functions Each partial function $f : \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{M}_1$ can be extended to a total function $\mathbb{T}(f) : \mathbb{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$ by using the partition of the data space \mathbb{D} into two different fragments \mathbb{D}_1 and \mathbb{D}_2 :

$$\mathbb{T}(f)(a) \begin{cases} \text{in}_r(f(a)), & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{D}_1 \\ \text{in}_l(a), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

That means that $f : \mathbb{D} \mapsto \mathbb{M}_1 \dot{\cup} \overline{\mathbb{D}_1}$

Lookups and joins Joins may represent lookups of information that may change the impact of processed records. But it may also be true that even when computing inner join on correct data, some of the error stream data will have absent key fields necessary for the join. Because of this, for every join of correct data we perform a similar **outer join** on error path data. Because of this, we need to **always** perform outer join on error path data, with both records that are on the correct path and error records

We limit information preserving operations to outer join with a tagging of results to left, right, and inner output. Inner output consists of tuples matching by the join condition c , left part consists of tuples from \mathbb{D}_1 that were not matched by any of \mathbb{D}_2 , and right part consists of tuples from \mathbb{D}_2 that were not matched by any of \mathbb{D}_1 .

$$\mathbb{D}_1 \bowtie_c \mathbb{D}_2 = (\mathbb{D}_{left}, \mathbb{D}_{inner}, \mathbb{D}_{right})$$

For a predicate p , we can mark it as:

$$\mathbb{D}_{inner} = \{(x, y) | x \in \mathbb{D}_1 \wedge y \in \mathbb{D}_2 \wedge p(x, y)\}$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{left} = \{x | x \in \mathbb{D}_1 \wedge \nexists y \in \mathbb{D}_2 p(x, y)\}$$

$$\mathbb{D}_{right} = \{x | x \in \mathbb{D}_2 \wedge \nexists y \in \mathbb{D}_1 p(x, y)\}$$

Note that join condition c is a filter on a cartesian product of \mathbb{D}_1 , and \mathbb{D}_2 that only depends on the join columns (usually keys).

Value lookup example We take an example of looking up current price of the commodity in the table including `product`, and `quantity` of the position. The reference table is keyed by `product` and has `description`, and `current_price`. Normal lookup is inner join when we have guaranteed match of `product_id`, which we convert to outer join, where left side corresponds to `product_id` entries that are missing from the reference table, and right side corresponds to `product_id` entries in reference table that are unused.

Either left and right side are summarized into error feedback for the left table, and unused feedback for the right table to assure that records are never lost.

This allows us to easily find outdated references, or misspellings like `oli` instead of `oil` and report them correctly as a summary row with a count of 14 rows, and 5 units with unknown product name of `Nut oli` that was a result of mistyping.

Value lookup example We take an example of looking up current price of the commodity in the table including `product`, and `quantity` of the position. The reference table is keyed by `product` and has `description`, and `current_price`. Normal lookup is inner join when we have guaranteed match of `product_id`, which we convert to outer join, where left side corresponds to `product_id` entries that are missing from the reference table, and right side corresponds to `product_id` entries in reference table that are unused.

Either left and right side are summarized into error feedback for the left table, and unused feedback for the right table to assure that records are never lost.

This allows us to easily find outdated references, or misspellings like `oli` instead of `oil` and report them correctly as a summary row with a count of 14 rows, and 5 units with unknown product name of `oli`.

Columnar projection and row format Since we enforce principle of never discarding the data that can be relevant to debugging effort, we cannot simply discard fields with *projection* operator. Because of this, our records contain two types of fields:

- fields **relevant** to the final output
- fields **irrelevant** to final output and only kept for the debugging purposes

For each record, we have a single value for each **relevant** field, but possibly a set of values for each **irrelevant** field to take account of discarding duplicate **relevant** records. That means that we have a subrelation for each record that keeps only irrelevant fields.

This allows us to implement a *lossless projection* operation that moves relevant fields into irrelevant field set.

Note that the projection operation is executed the same way on both *correct relation* and *error tracking* relation that pairs with it.

3.4. Per-row data enrichment operations

In SQL syntax, it is common to add a computed field to a query from a single table:

```
select "Purchase price"*"Amount" as "Total price"
  from items;
```

We call these operations *data enrichment* and can execute them on all rows. However, in order to maximize debugging potential, we propose a methodology of automatically shifting computing additional fields as early in the pipeline of operations as possible. That allows us to provide more information. After the record leaves the *correct stream* and goes into *error stream*, we no longer enrich it with new field values relevant to the main computation in order to prevent *cascading faults*.

We can only enrich these records with more *error-specific* information, like adding a description of error found, and estimating the impact of this information.

That is why beside `fmap` operation on *correct data stream*, we also allow `emap` operation on the error stream that enriches error information. We can optionally schedule this information to be computed in advance when the stage of pipeline is reached, and before any records are added to the error stream:

```
pipeline = do
  forM filename -> do
    emap (@"Filename" :-> filename) $ do
      ...
```

Putting algebra together The final step is to use these operation in a *relevant* way: that means that all data spaces need to be either included in the final aggregation, or used by data spaces that contribute to it. Just like in linear logic we are not allowed to use certain variables more than once, in the data space algebra we are not allowed to *forget* a variable.

3.5. Translating relational algebra

Relational algebra is a standard algebra used as basis for describing database operations, and analytics pipelines.

These primitives are usually implemented on sets of rows (records of the same shape) called **relations**. However, they can equally well be implemented on multisets or lists of records²

It uses the basic primitives of:

- projection which discards a set of columns, and keeps only the columns relevant for the further processing
- selection which selects a subset of records
- rename which renames some fields to others
- cartesian product (cross product) of two relations, with outputs being a list of all possible pairs of rows from both inputs

²In which case, usually there are an additional operation for sorting, and extracting subset of unique, distinct records.

- set operations of union, difference, and intersection

Note that all joins, intersection, and difference operators that are technically implemented as outer joins with a post-processing step.

For convenience we also provide lambda or map operation that computes a new field (or fields) from the others (logically redundant, but provided as convenience).

Table 6: Translation of operations from relational algebra and SQL to data space algebra.

Relational algebra	SQL	Data space algebra
Projection	SELECT field FROM ...	extraction
selection	WHERE ... or HAVING ...	partition
rename	WHERE ... or HAVING ...	mapping function
cross product	SELECT ... FROM table1, table2	disjoint tensor product
outer join	OUTER JOIN	partition induced by NULL on each table, then parallel tensor product
natural join	INNER JOIN	parallel tensor product on partition induced by non-NULL for each table
union	UNION	disjoint tensor product (tagged union), then partition removing duplicates, and mapping removing tags
multiset union	UNION ALL	tagged union, then information-preserving function that removes tags
difference	MINUS	partition on the first table that puts shared elements in the error set
intersection	INTERSECT	partition on each table that puts shared element in the output set

Using these operations, we can also implement joins. Additionally there are joins, and aggregation operations provided.

Joins are operations that take two relations and produce rows that are contains bigger rows, that are merged from both inputs.

Additionally we also add the aggregate operations:

- groupings which produce a relation with records that are subrelations with fields from the same subgroup
- aggregation operations which take any monoid operation over a given field, and produce rows that are monoid sum over all records in a relation

The set of operations above are widely acknowledged as sufficient to provide most of ETL and data aggregation needs. Whenever a new database or data analytics operation is proposed, it is customary to compare it to basic relational algebra operations. Thus we will propose a set of operations that allow us to get the same results as relational algebra expressions.

4. Discussion

4.1. Error aggregates vs error estimates

Use of error-tracing relational algebra allows us to easily make general assertions on how the individual records impact processing (since each total summarization must be sensitive to all records). When we expect a given record to be 100% correct, we just assert its fields are included in a correct recordset at the end of correct path.

If we expect a given record to be discarded, we may just assert that it is present in the error set.

That also means that we may use a failing assertion to quickly point to all possible code sites or data inputs that may need to be changed in order to fix the issue.

4.2. Replacing relational algebra in analytics

We proposed a replacement of relational algebra with set of operations that allow for the same computation, but structured in a way that assure all data is summarized and included. We justify it by analogy to accounting theory, and thus coin the name “data accounting” for the process of complete summarization of a data set in order to assure conformance to statistical and analytical best practice. We described the process of translation of classical relational algebra into this new “data space algebra”. This algebra allows for reversible transformation of data, and preservation of mathematical principles of accounting while aggregating the data. Implementation of “data space algebra” operations on top of traditional SQL is shortly described.

5. Conclusion

We also suggest a common summarization mechanism for all well-defined columns within the error table in order to facilitate finding of patterns in the errors.

We provide data space algebra as an alternative to conventional relational algebra for the purpose of more robust reporting, and suggest using accounting principles for more disciplined data analysis. We shortly described how to convert traditional relational algebra expressions so that there one of the outputs gives the same information as relational query. Naturally for full accounting of input data we also require additional information to be summarized in order to assure that all data is accounted for.

Bibliography

Abadi, Martin, and Gordon D. Plotkin. 2019. “A Simple Differentiable Programming Language.” *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 4 (POPL). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3371106>.

- Arntzenius, Frank. 2004. "Gunk, Topology and Measure." In *Oxford Studies in Metaphysics: Volume 4*, edited by Dean Zimmerman. Oxford University Press.
- Balzer, Wolfgang, and Richard Mattessich. 1991. "An Axiomatic Basis of Accounting: A Structuralist Reconstruction." *Theory and Decision* 30 (3): 213–43.
- Bancilhon, François, and Nicolas Spyratos. 1985. "Algebraic Versus Probabilistic Independence in Data Bases." In *Proceedings of the Fourth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, March 25-27, 1985, Portland, Oregon, USA*, 149–53. ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/325405.325424>.
- Barbieri, Giuseppina, and Giangiacomo Gerla. 2021. "Defining Measures in a Mereological Space (an Exploratory Paper)." *Logic and Logical Philosophy* 31 (1): 57–74. <https://doi.org/10.12775/LLP.2021.005>.
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. 2013. "BCBS 239: Principles for Effective Risk Aggregation and Risk Reporting." <https://www.bis.org/publ/bcbs239.htm>.
- Bennett, C. H. 1973. "Logical Reversibility of Computation." *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 17 (6): 525–32. <https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.176.0525>.
- Chen, Haitao, and Husheng Liao. 2011. "A Survey to View Update Problem." *International Journal of Computer Theory and Engineering* 3: 23–31.
- Ellerman, David. 2007. "Double-Entry Accounting: The Mathematical Formulation and Generalization." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, December. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1340619>.
- Fong, Brendan, and David I. Spivak. 2021. "Symmetric Monoidal Preorders." Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Gajda, Michal Jan. 2020a. "Agile Data Pipelines: ETL for 2020." Data Science Europe. 2020. <https://youtu.be/aHAc8ght9Gw>.
- . 2020b. "Agile Generation of Cloud API Bindings with Haskell." Haskell.Love. 2020. <https://skillsmatter.com/skillscasts/14905-agile-functional-data-pipeline-in-haskell-a-case-study-of-multicloud-api-binding>.
- . 2022. "Towards a more perfect union type."
- Ijiri, Yuji. 1975. *Theory of Accounting Measurement*. 10. American Accounting Association.
- . 2018. "Axioms and Structures of Conventional Accounting Measurement." *Accounting, Economics, and Law: A Convivium* 8 (1): 20170057. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1515/ael-2017-0057>.
- Julian, Mike. 2017. "Practical Monitoring."
- Levitt, Michael. 1983. "Molecular Dynamics of Native Protein: I. Computer Simulation of Trajectories." *Journal of Molecular Biology* 168 (3): 595–617. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2836\(83\)80304-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-2836(83)80304-0).
- Ross, Kenneth A, and Yehoshua Sagiv. 1997. "Monotonic Aggregation in Deductive Databases." *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 54 (1): 79–97. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1006/jcss.1997.1453>.
- Warsono, Sony, Muhammad Ridha, and Arif Darmawan. 2009. "Mathematics in Accounting as a Big Unanswered Question." *SSRN Electronic Journal*, July. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1439084>.
- Wlaschin, Scott. 2012. "F# for Fun and Profit." 2012. <https://swlaschin.gitbooks.io/fsharpforfunandprofit/content/posts/recipe-part2.html>.