

Task 1. Will the conversion to BCNF be dependency preserving in any case? Proof your statement and give a reasoning for choosing BCNF design.

It is not always possible to achieve both BCNF and dependency preservation

dept_advisor(s_ID, i_ID, department_name)

$i_ID \rightarrow dept_name$

$s_ID, dept_name \rightarrow i_ID$

dept_advisor is not in BCNF, because i_ID is not a superkey

Any decomposition of dept_advisor will not include all the attributes in

$s_ID, dept_name \rightarrow i_ID$

Example:

(s_ID, i_ID)

(i_ID, dept_name)

Thus, the composition is NOT be dependency preserving.

The functional dependency $s_ID, dept_name \rightarrow i_ID$ can only be checked by computing the join of the decomposed relations

Advantages of BCNF over 3NF

We can use null values to represent some of the possible meaningful relationships among data items.

There is no problem of repetition of information

Task 2. Given table in 1NF, convert to 3NF if PK is UnitID:

<u>UnitID</u>	<u>StudentID</u>	Date	Tutor_ID	Topic	Room	Grade	Book	TutEmail
U1	St1	23.02.03	Tut1	GMT	629	4.7	Deumlich	tut1@fhbb.ch
U2	St1	18.11.02	Tut3	Gln	631	5.1	Zehnder	tut3@fhbb.ch
U1	St4	23.02.03	Tut1	GMT	629	4.3	Deumlich	tut1@fhbb.ch
U5	St2	05.05.03	Tut3	Phf	632	4.9	Dumlmiers	tut3@fhbb.ch
U4	St2	04.07.03	Tut5	AVQ	621	5	SwissTipo	tut5@fhbb.ch

<u>Tutor_ID</u>	TutEmail	<u>Topic</u>	Book		
Tut1	tut1@fhbb.ch	GMT	Deumlich		
Tut3	tut3@fhbb.ch	Gin	Zehnder		
Tut5	tut5@fhbb.ch	Phf	Dummlers	<u>UnitID</u>	<u>StudentID</u>
		AVG	SwissTopo		Grade

<u>UnitID</u>	Date	TutorID	Room	Topic	U1	St1	4.7
U1	23.02.03	Tut1	629	GMT	U2	St1	5.1
U2	18.11.02	Tut3	631	Gin	U1	St4	4.3
U4	04.07.03	Tut5	621	AVG	U5	St2	4.9
U5	05.05.03	Tut3	632	PhF	U4	St2	5

Task 3. Given table in 1NF, convert to 2NF if PK is {ProjectName, ProjectManager}, use decomposition:

<u>ProjectName</u>	<u>Projectmanager</u>	Position	Budget	Teamsize
Project1	Manager1	CTO	1kk\$	15
Project2	Manager2	CTO2	1.5kk\$	12

<u>ProjectName</u>	<u>Projectmanager</u>
Project1	Manager1
Project2	Manager2

<u>ProjectName</u>	Budget	Teamsize	<u>Projectmanager</u>
Project1	1kk\$	15	Manager1
Project2	1.5kk\$	12	Manager2

<u>Projectmanager</u>	Position
Manager1	CTO
Manager2	CTO2

Task 4. Given table, convert to 3NF if PK is Group, use decomposition:

<u>Group</u>	Faculty	Speciality
G1	F1	S1
G2	F2	S2

<u>Group</u>	Speciality
G1	S1
G2	S2

<u>Speciality</u>	Faculty
S1	F1
S2	F2

Task 5. Given table, convert to BCNF if PK is {ProjectID, Department}, use decomposition:

Curator depends on projectID and related departments, teamSize directly relates to project and related departments, ProjectGroupsNumber depends on TeamSize.

projectID → Curator

projectID → TeamSize

teamSize → ProjectGroupsNumber

<u>ProjectID</u>	<u>Department</u>	Curator	TeamSize	ProjectGroupsNumber
p1	d1	e1	100	5
p2	d2	e2	120	6

<u>ProjectID</u>	<u>Department</u>
p1	d1
p2	d2

<u>ProjectID</u>	TeamSize	Curator
p1	100	e1
p2	120	e2

<u>TeamSize</u>	ProjectGroupsNumber
100	5
120	6

Task 6. List the three design goals for relational databases, and explain why each is desirable. Give an example of both desirable and undesirable types of decompositions.

- 1) Dependency preserving decomposition.
This permits the validity of an update to be tested without the need to compute a join of relations in the decomposition.
- 2) Lossless join decomposition
By this way we can maintain an accurate relations in our database.
- 3) Minimization of information repetition
The smallest possible amount of space is used for storing the information.

Desirable type: **Lossless Decomposition**

By lossless decomposition it becomes feasible to reconstruct the relation R from decomposed tables R1 and R2 by using Joins.

Undesirable type: **Lossy Decomposition**

We cannot reconstruct the original relation