

## Avi Skidelsky, DAV-6100, M6 Assignment

In terms of dimensions that have counterparts between the two schemas, in my opinion the ones that could be consolidated to save space and reduce the chances of redundancy are Product and Supplier with Product Dimension, and Date with Time Dimension. The two dimensions that can't be consolidated are Geography Dimension and Customer Dimension since they don't have any counterparts in the second schema. You could be tempted to merge Supplier and Customer Dimension since the data fields are similar, but they represent different sides of the transaction, the one supplying the product and the one buying the product.

The new singular fact table would be comprised of the order\_key, customer code, date\_key, order\_key, product\_key, district code, and supplier\_key. As stated, Time Dimension would be replaced by Date, linked to the fact table using date\_key, since it is more detailed than the Time Dimension table and has all the same attributes. I would keep Customer Dimension and Geography Dimension as they are since they don't have any parallel in the second schema. The Product Dimension is where things would get complicated. In my opinion, Product Dimension, Product, and Supplier should be joined together seeing as they all offer complimentary information to each other. The dimension that I envision for this a singular table that builds off of the Product Dimension table. Adding to this, would be product\_id, product\_description and product\_category from the Product table as they seem to be useful attributes to include, and supplier\_status from the Supplier table as it would match up with vendor in the Product Dimension and provides more insight for each vendor in that table. Thankfully, it seems as if all aggregations between the two tables are similar.

