Leveraging Big Data Computing through EDX for Advanced Energy R&D & Analytics



Vic Baker, Kelly Rose, Jennifer Bauer, Dave Rager

National Energy Technology Laboratory, U.S. Department of Energy

8/18/16



Spanning the subsurface to atmosphere, engineered & natural systems



Common Energy Data Challenges



- *Finding & accessing* authoritative, appropriate data
- Multiple scales and sources
- Often *indirect sources*
- Discontinuous data
- Missing data
- Numerous forms of *uncertainty*
- Multi-component data
- Cost of data preservation
- Challenge of *big data*

3:10

- Historical, non digital datasets
- Structured & unstructured
- Representing *numerous systems*
- Spanning *numerous sources*



National Energy Technology





NETL's Energy Data Exchange (EDX) provides an *innovative* solution for data-driven efforts offering:

- A secure, online coordination and collaboration platform supporting energy research, knowledge transfer and data discovery needs
- Enduring and reliable access to historic and current R&D data, data driven products, and tools
- Offers both *public* and *secure, private* functionalities

EDX serves as a liaison between data resources and future needs



Basic "google" search on key search terms returns millions of results, many are not data related

> EDX Search is focused on energy data resources



Big data tools for small & big data challenges...



- Big Data capabilities can address common R&D challenges associated with data:
 - Gathering/search
 - Integration
 - Management
 - Analysis/Use
- Combined with appropriate hardware, has the potential to offer EDX users functionality to support management and R&D analytical needs





Spark vs MapReduce vs Single Threaded Application





What is "big data"?





What is big data computing?

NETL

- Combination of hardware & software technologies that make it possible to realize value from "Big Datasets"
- HPC vs BDC
 - Traditional HPC systems are focused on performing calculations at fast speeds
 - BDC is focused on computing to sift through huge amounts of big datasets
 - HPC systems usually cost \$1000's of k
 - BDC can operate on range of hardware, including inexpensive (\$10's of k) clusters optimized for distributed, inmemory, iterative processing for analytics, query, and data mining
- Both HPC and BDC can harness cloud server farms or add additional physical nodes

DistributedSources UserDriven Metadata Process Unstructured Geosciences DataDriven Complex Content Volume Formats DataMining ata Sources DataDiversity MultiScale Ingest **ComputingCapabilities** Disseminate

cloudera Sp

Why use big data computing?



• Discovery, Data Mining, and Cataloging

- Sift through massive collections of unstructured data from multiple sources
 - Web crawling,
 - document parsing,
 - geospatial file/service processing (# features, envelope, projection, metadata)
- Correlate relevant data using natural language processing and machine learning
 - Think "Amazon.com" recommendations for data instead of products

• Spatial, Temporal, Image Data Processing

- Harness cluster computing to distribute complex computations
 - Quadtrees, nested grids
 - Nearest Neighbors
 - CT Scans







- Apache Hadoop is a software framework for storing Big Data and running applications on clusters of commodity hardware.
- Hadoop contains libraries enabling users to perform data analysis (SQL-like queries) or develop custom applications (Scala, Java, Python-based distributed jobs).
- Hadoop enables you to store, manage, and work with your Big Data.





Hadoop was not built for speed...



Hadoop was specially built to tackle Big Data problems

What Hadoop isn't...



- We don't install applications on Hadoop
 - (i.e., we don't install ArcGIS Server on Hadoop, but we can use Hadoop to store and work on GIS data)
- Hadoop likes large files, not lots of small files
 - network and disk access overhead will slowdown runtime performance
- Hadoop isn't necessarily fast just because it's a cluster.. but...
 - tools such as Spark, HBase, and Solr offer significant performance boost vs 'standard' Hadoop libraries



MapReduce: Single Pass Processing



- Custom Hadoop applications (written in Java or Python)
- Single-pass execution not iterative!
 - Load data, process single iteration, export result
- Typically consists of one 'Map' phase and one 'Reduce' phase
- Applications are highly specialized
 - Architecture designed for one-pass computations,
 - Cases requiring multi-pass algorithms require stringing multiple one-pass applications together.
 - I/O not stored in memory between jobs
- Suitable for batch operations such as image conversion
- Provides distributed computing option for developers but imposes constraints for algorithm design

How Does MapReduce Work: Thought Example



Problem:

Solution:

Four friends are playing cards. The cards spill on the floor.

Pickup and organize (by suit) the spilled deck of cards

Have each friend grab some of the cards and organize their cards by suit.

This is analogous to 'Mapping' in Hadoop

Combine each friend's stacks of cards (organized by suit) and combine like suits together.

This is analogous to **'Reduce'** in Hadoop





Hive Example: Well API Aggregation

🐮 well-aggeg

15 INS

Execut



- SQL-like queries on Hadoop
- Problem: •
 - Well data in occ data have bad API data
- Solution:
 - Perform spatial binning to • identify nearest neighbors from valid data set using Hive
 - 908 Million distance comparisons
 - 9360 OCC wells vs 97000 AllWells
- ~20 minutes using three (3) node experime consisting of desktop PCs (eight (8) core i7 with sixteen (16) GB RAM each running VM

well-aggegation Based on original data from Adi						
1 add jar 2 /usr/local/bin/gis-tools-for-hadoop-master/lib/esri-ge 3 /usr/local/bin/gis-tools-for-hadoop-master/lib/spatial 4 create temporary function ST Point as 'com.esri.hadoo 5 create temporary function ST_Distance as 'com.esri.hadoo 7 drop table wells_agg; 9 CREATE TABLE wells_agg(occ_api STRING, allwells_api ST	l-sdk-hadoop.jar; p.hive.ST_Point'; doop.hive.ST_Distance'		la DOUBLE, allwells_surface	_lo DOUBLE, allwells_surface	e_la DOUBLE, distance DOUBLE	=);
11 FROM	~				🖺 File Browser 🛛 📾 Job Browser 🛛 🕯	¢\$vic ∽ @)≈ ⊕ <mark></mark>
L3 L4 L4 With the Editor Query Editor My Queries Saved Queries	History					
L5 INSE L6 Log Columns Results Chart						
	api_number default.allwells.ic_		tor_n 🝦 default.aliwells.current_op	· –	🔷 default.aliwells.well_num 🍦 default.aliv	
0 35033006690000 PI 35033006690000 1 35033006940000 PI 35033006940000		BOWERS & WISE CHAMBERLAIN	BOWERS & WISE CHAMBERLAIN	PENDERGRAFT BERENDZEN	1 WILDCAT 1 WILDCAT	ок
2 35037007960000		GRANDEREAN	GRAWBEREAN	DERENDZEN	WILDCAT	OK =
3 35027004690000 4 35035214590000 5 35035214600000 Columns Sample Properties	data				WILDCAT CRAIG CTY C CRAIG CTY C	
6 35035214610000	_lo 1977_jan 🔶 1977_feb 🔶 1	.977_mar 🍦 1977_apr 🔶 1977_m	ay 单 1977_june 🍦 1977_july 🔶 1977_aug	♦ 1977_sept ♦ 1977_oct ♦ 1977_nov ♦ 1	CRAIG CTY C	свм ок
7 35035214620000 0 4.0 35.1020011902 -96.3720016	6479 0 0 0	0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 CRAIG CTY C	
8 35035214630000 9 35043350960000 1 13.0 34.688999176 -96.3700027	7466 0 0 0	0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 CRAIG CTY C	СВМ ОК
2 21.0 34.6949996948 -98.0889969	🔶 🍦 occ_api 🛛 🍦 allwells	_api		ls_surface_lo 💠 allwells_surface_l		ок
3 24.0 35.0670013428 -97.343002 11 35031021370000 4 26.0 36.9000015259 -98.218002	0 1310000.0 350292034 1 1310000.0 350296013		34.688999176 -96.366			JTHWEST OK
5 27.0 36.700007629 -95.692001;	1 1310000.0 350296013 2 1310000.0 350296012		34.688999176 -96.365 34.688999176 -96.369		0.00578170196274	
6 30.0 36.9560012817 -101.93000	3 70090.0 350192055		34.2420005798 -97.532		0.00949866130148	
7 33.0 36.8930015564 -100.25	4 60048.0 350190939	-97.5059967041	34.4109992981 -97.502	204895 34.4151420593	0.00561607396027	
8 35.0 35.8790016174 -95.920997	5 60015.0 350190302	-97.5149993896	34.4889984131 -97.508	34.4893836975	0.00663351285544	
9 43.0 34.5130004883 -97.1149978	6 60015.0 350190289		34.4889984131 -97.506		0.00875994375403	
10 44 0 33 R0700R900R .97 40500R	7 60015.0 350190251 8 60015.0 350190247		34.4889984131 -97.5118 34.4889984131 -97.508		0.00689226175297 0.00772812475783	
	9 50115.0 350153576		34.9659996033 -98.243		0.00464073091534	
norimontal cluster	10 50115.0 350153526		34.9659996033 -98.245		0.00274379376768	
perimental cluster	11 50115.0 350153526	-98.2480010986	34.9659996033 -98.245	3436157 34.9645957947	0.00274379376768	
soro i7 processors	12 50115.0 350153526	-98.2480010986	34.9659996033 -98.245	34.9645957947	0.00274379376768	
core i7 processors	13 50002.0 350153673		34.9319992065 -98.132		0.00958145645951	
$\frac{1}{2}$	14 50002.0 350153694 15 50002.0 350153694		34.9319992065 -98.124 34.9319992065 -98.129		0.00353378738659 0.00736930006711	
ning VMs)	15 50002.0 350153698 16 39437.0 350492374		34.9319992065 -98.129.		0.00810574698402	
	17 39290.0 350493928		34.7750015259 -97.248		0.00341229521374	
	18 39290.0 350493928	-97.2509994507	34.7750015259 -97.248	34.7725715637	0.00341229521374	
	19 39233.0 350490051	-97.2480010986	34.7840003967 -97.257	920654 34.7852592468	0.00957408764884	

Example of big data computing for geospatial analysis: Variable Grid Method: Capturing Uncertainty in the Analysis





What: Variable Grid Method (VGM) is an approach designed to address issues of data uncertainty by communicating the data (colors) and uncertainties (grid cell sizes) simultaneously in a single layer.

> VGM is a <u>flexible</u> method that allows for the communication of different data <u>and</u> uncertainty types, while still preserving the overall spatial trends and patterns.



Using NETL's Variable Grid Method

Communication tool to better display analytical results with their uncertainty quantification or qualification. Capable of working with various data types, formats, and uncertainty representations

VGM approach highlighted in a special issue of Transactions in GIS (July 2015)



Novel, flexible approach leveraging GIS capabilities to simultaneously visualize & quantify spatial data trends (colors) and underlying uncertainty (grid size)

ArcGIS, Python based **tool in beta testing** to help facilitate use of the VGM approach

Results to date – big data geoprocessing



Merging GIS and Big Data computing for advanced 3D/4D geospatial analysis

- Offload intensive geometric operations from desktop to a Hadoop cluster
- Is highly scalable
- Self healing
- The approach is ideal for executing geometric operations in parallel involving many features.

VGM use case for geoprocessing, presented at 12/2015 AGU and 6/2016 ARMA Symposium

"hasM": fals	8e.	
	erence": {"wkid":4326},	
"features":	· ·	
{	L	
"attributes"	': {	
	PINU": 3708520259.0,	
"OR Base	e_m_": 0.0,	803
	at": 41.484683,	
"Salinit	y_": 0.0,	
"WSN": 1	•	
"Surf Lo	on": -80.103193,	
"Brine_D	Dens": 0.0,	
	s_T": 0.0,	
"Porosit	y_": 0.0,	
"NET_THI	CKN": 0.0,	
"Oriskan	ny_T": 1190.549	
},		
"geometry":	{	
"y": 508	34098.520442805,	
"x": -89	17047.03754837,	
"spatial	LReference": {	
"wki	ld": 4326,	
"lat	estWkid": 4326	
}		
}		
},		
{		
"attributes"	': {	
"UWIAP	PINu": 3703920665.0,	
"OR_Base	e_m_": 1077.9,	
"Surf_La	at": 41.730652,	
Evan	ple JSON from	

Hadoop-Based VGM Detailed Workflow



":4326},	VGM-Step-0	VGM-Step-1	VGM-Step-2
59.0,	Description: Convert 'enclosed-Json' ESRI feature class into 'feature-per-row' unenclosed- Json.	Description: Generate multi-resolution bounding quads for input point data set (i.e., ORWells-wgs84)	Description: Generate non-overlapping topology of vgm-step-1 quads and calculate well point data per new geometries.
	Input: 'Enclosed-Json' formatted data (i.e., ORWells-wgs84.json) uploaded from ArcMap using ESRI/Hadoop toolbox tools 'Features to	Input: vgm-step-0 output 'Unenclosed-Json' of row-per-feature representation of orwells-wgs84 data	Input: Multi-resolution quads generated in vgm- step-1 AND the point data generated from vgm- step-0
,	Json' & 'Copy to HDFS'. Output: Processed 'Unenclosed-Json' with 'feature per row' layout suitable for Mapper. Mapper (Setup): Create EsriFeatureClass from input file and write each feature as a row represented as unenclosed-Json.	Output: Quads of varying extents with attribution (i.e., point count, max/min/avg salinity, porosity, brine density) Mapper (Setup): Load point features from vgm- step-0 and use to generate quadtree node extents.	Output: Non-overlapping polygons as 'unenclosed-Json' features with attribution (point count, min/max/avg porosity, etc.) Mapper (Setup): Load vgm-step-1 output files 'representing attributed quads of varying resolutions to generate non-overlapping topology. Mapper: Feed the Mapper with rows from the
65.9, rom	Reducer: Aggregate Mapper output into one or more files	Mapper: Feed mapper each row of 'unenclosed-Json' from vgm-step-0 point data and query the quadtree for all quads that contain Reducer: Aggregate Mapper output into one or more files and store in vgm/working/output-0/.	vgm-step-0 'unenclosed-Json' point feature data, query topology for 'point in polygon' to generate polygon's attributes, and perform geometry subtraction using ESRI Hadoop libs Reducer: Tally the attributes for each polygon and write attributed polygon as unenclosed- Json.
	$ \begin{array}{c} \mbox{triples} (- M) = M \\ \mbox{triples} (- M) \\ \mbox{triples} (- M) = M \\ \mbox{triples} (- M) \\ t$		

Overlapping attributed quads

(shown via ArcMap)

'Feature per row' formatted data for MapReduce

Attributed polygons for ArcMap

Hadoop-VGM Input





Hadoop-VGM Output





Hadoop-VGM: ArcMap to Hadoop





Hadoop-VGM: Step 0: Data Prep



Input 'ORWells-wgs84.json' generated from ArcMap

Hadoop-VGM: Step 1: Generate Quads

NETL

Input: VGM-Step-0 formatted point data

{"attributes":{"UWI	APINu":0.0,"OR_Base_m_":1221.03,"Surf_Lat"
{"attributes":{"UWI	APINu":0.0,"OR Base m ":1273.15,"Surf Lat"
{"attributes":{"UWI	APINu":0.0,"OR Base m ":2224.13,"Surf Lat"
{"attributes":{"UWI	_APINu":0.0,"0R_Base_m_":2233.88,"Surf_Lat"

VGM-Step-1

Output: Attributed overlapping quads

{"attributes":{"count":10,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":23,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":13,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":14,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":15,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":16,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":16,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":16,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":16,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":16,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":10,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":24,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":18,"sumPorosity":3.5,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":18,"sumPorosity":3.5,"avgPorosity":0.19444444



(Output from this intermediate step shown in ArcMap)

Hadoop-VGM: Step 2: Generate Topology



Input: VGM-Step-0 formatted point data

{"attributes":{"UWI___APINu":0.0,"OR_Base_m_":1221.03,"Surf_Lat" {"attributes":{"UWI__APINu":0.0,"OR_Base_m_":1273.15,"Surf_Lat" {"attributes":{"UWI__APINu":0.0,"OR_Base_m_":2224.13,"Surf_Lat" {"attributes":{"UWI__APINu":0.0,"OR_Base_m_":2233.88,"Surf_Lat"

+

VGM-Step-1 overlapping quads

{"attributes":{"count":10,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":23,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":20,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":13,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":14,"sumPorosity":0.0,"avgPorosity":0.0,"minPo



Output:

Updated Attribution non-overlapping polygons

{"attributes":{"count":10,"sumPorosity":33.2,"avgPorosity":3.320000
{"attributes":{"count":5,"sumPorosity":8.3,"avgPorosity":1.66000000
{"attributes":{"count":13,"sumPorosity":3.7,"avgPorosity":0.2846153
{"attributes":{"count":2,"sumPorosity":9.0,"avgPorosity":4.5,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":12,"sumPorosity":18.0,"avgPorosity":1.5,"min
{"attributes":{"count":1,"sumPorosity":8.3,"avgPorosity":8.3,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":1,"sumPorosity":8.3,"avgPorosity":3.035,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":20,"sumPorosity":60.7,"avgPorosity":3.035,"minPo
{"attributes":{"count":11,"sumPorosity":5,7,"avgPorosity":0.28481818



(VGM-Step-2 output in ArcMap w/ symbology based on point count)

Hadoop-VGM Performance Test



- Once a working system was achieved, the next step was to scale up the amount of input data to identify opportunities for performance enhancements within the implementation.
- Benchmarking VGM-Hadoop steps with 1 million sample points:
 - Input data size: 114 MB
 - VGM-Step-0: 54 seconds
 - VGM-Step-1: 2 minutes 28 seconds
 - VGM-Step-2: 3 hours 28 minutes
 - Output data size: 32.8 MB
- Successfully loaded output from vgm-step-2 into ArcMap (Input data failed to load)
- Running Hadoop-VGM using a 1 million point data set identified bottlenecks in the implemented approach -- namely in VGM-Step-2's topology generation implementation.

Apache Spark: The future



- In-memory data analysis
 - Enables datasets and intermediate steps to be kept in memory between iterations
 - (MapReduce datasets are loaded from disk, processed via single pass, and written to disk)
- Faster than MapReduce by an order of magnitude of more
- Develop iterative algorithms
 - Repeatedly perform operations (functions) until a condition is met (unlike MapReduce)
 - Better suited for graph / tree processing (iterative bi-directional traversal)
- Available for Java, Python, and Scala
- Spark is blurring the lines between HPC and BDC

Performance Comparison: WordCount

Nome	/ user / vic / wordcount / input / linux-words / 302 / linux.words.302mb
aaliis aals Aalst Aalto	Home / user / vic / wordcount / wordcount-spark / output / part-00001 (echinochrome, 8192)
AAM aam	(non-German,8192) (condonative,8192)
AMSI	(preimitative, 8192)
Aandahl	(correl, 8192)
A-and-R	(panspermatism, 8192)
Aani	(Fierabras, 8192)
AA0	(racking, 8192)
AAP	(consentience, 8192)
APSS	(larger, 8192)
Aaqbiye	(synecology, 8192)
Aar	(inapprehensible,8192)
Aara	(LOOM, 8192)
Aarau	(conquinamine, 8192)
ARC	(passamezzo,8192)
aardvark	(Bilski,8192)
aardvarks	(versemen, 8192)
aardwolf	(distressful,8192)
aardwolves	(polyaxone, 8192)
Aaren	(Susette, 8192)
Aargau	(shelfpiece,8192)
aargh	(unkingdom, 8192)
	(Vernen, 8192)
	(warehoused, 8192)
	(pioscope, 8192)
	(bacteriohemolysin,8192)

aa

Aá

Word Count

- Count word occurrences contained within input file
- Comparing performance for:
 - MapReduce
 - Spark
 - Stand-alone Java application
- Input file based on copies of linux.words
- Input file sizes:
 - 302 MB, 1.2 GB, 18.9 GB, 37.8 GB



Results to date – big data processing time test



 Compared execution times for varying size data sets using Hadoop cluster-based MapReduce and Spark vs a stand alone, single threaded Java application (running on the Hadoop cluster's main node).

 Spark's in-memory design outperform the single-threaded Java application for larger datasets

SPARK VS MAPREDUCE VS SINGLE THREADED APP



- Team succeeded in running the NN algorithm in the geoprocessing, big data cluster.
- Time of execution went from 10 hours on desktop PC to 10 minutes

Autoindexing: Deep Analysis Recommendation Engine





- Perform deep contextual analysis on 25k+ documents on EDX
- Machine learning, natural language processing
- Generates correlation matches of contextually similar files
- Being expanded to include spatial and webcrawl assets
- Implemented using Spark (Scala)
- Sign up @ <u>http://edx.netl.doe.gov</u>

Hue Dashboard for Webcrawl Application





Key Take Aways



What we've learned about BDC for geoprocessing applications:

- Capable of parallel operations; ability to scale; ideal for 'in situ' processing in the 'cloud'
- Working on integration of EDX (datasets) with geoprocessing tools & models, big data computing, and high performance computing capabilities
- Seeking to overcome to 1 million point problem (ESRI shares this problem)
- Rapidly evolving landscape new BDC libraries and tools being released

Geoprocessing applications:

- Tested and executed improvements in geoprocessing calculation times using custom big data algorithms for i) nearest neighbor cluster analysis and ii) for uncertainty quantification/visualization approaches
- Developing custom big data search tool to improve connection of EDX users to public, authoritative datasets for energy R&D

Ongoing & Next Steps



T3

NETL







Vic Baker (<u>vic.baker@matricresearch.com</u>, <u>vic.baker@netl.doe.gov</u>) *Mid-Atlantic Technology, Research & Innovation Center (MATRIC), National Energy Technology Laboratory, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA*

Kelly Rose (kelly.rose@netl.doe.gov)

U.S. Dept. of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory, Albany, Oregon, USA

Jennifer Bauer (<u>jennifer.bauer@netl.doe.gov</u>) AECOM, National Energy Technology Laboratory, Albany, Oregon, USA

Dave Rager (<u>david.rager@netl.doe.gov</u>)

Optimal Solutions Technologies Inc., National Energy Technology Laboratory, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA

