

Data Quality Assessment: Challenges and Opportunities [Vision]

Sedir Mohammed

Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam
Germany
Sedir.Mohammed@hpi.de

Felix Naumann

Hasso Plattner Institute, University of Potsdam
Germany
Felix.Naumann@hpi.de

Hazar Harmouch

University of Amsterdam
Netherlands
h.harmouch@uva.nl

Divesh Srivastava

AT&T Chief Data Office
USA
divesh@research.att.com

ABSTRACT

Data-oriented applications, their users, and even the law require data of high quality. Research has broken down the rather vague notion of data quality into various dimensions, such as accuracy, consistency, and reputation, to name but a few. To achieve the goal of high data quality, many tools and techniques exist to clean and otherwise improve data. Yet, systematic research on actually assessing data quality in all of its dimensions is largely absent, and with it the ability to gauge the success of any data cleaning effort.

It is our vision to establish a systematic and comprehensive framework for the (numeric) assessment of data quality for a given dataset and its intended use. Such a framework must cover the various facets that influence data quality, as well as the many types of data quality dimensions. In particular, we identify five facets that serve as a foundation of data quality assessment. For each facet, we outline the challenges and opportunities that arise when trying to actually assign quality scores to data and create a data quality profile for it, along with a wide range of technologies needed for this purpose.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Sedir Mohammed, Hazar Harmouch, Felix Naumann, and Divesh Srivastava. Data Quality Assessment: Challenges and Opportunities [Vision]. PVLDB, 17(1): XXX-XXX, 2024.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

1 THE MANY DIMENSIONS OF DATA QUALITY

Data quality (DQ) has been an important research topic for the past decades [10, 39, 41, 57], reflecting its critical role in all fields where data is used to gain insights and make decisions. A manifold of DQ dimensions exist that regards data and its properties from various perspectives and contribute to understanding and characterizing the complex nature of data [10, 39, 57]. Table 1 shows the 29 representative DQ dimensions we consider. Their definitions from [36] and further discussions are given in Appendix A.

Importance. Especially in the fast-moving landscape of *artificial intelligence* (AI), where data plays a pivotal role, the significance

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.

Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 17, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX




Figure 1: Facets of data quality assessment and the exemplary characteristics for various data quality dimensions.

of DQ is dramatically increasing, so much so that literature calls this trend a paradigm shift from a model-centric view to a data-centric one [59]. Data-centric AI emphasizes the data and its impact on the underlying model [43, 44, 58]. Literature showed that DQ, with its various dimensions, significantly influences prediction accuracy [13, 23, 32, 44]. Consequently, DQ assessment that had been conducted independently of the actual model development in the past has become closely coupled to the “context” in which the data is situated. Domain-specific particulars provide a context that imposes specific requirements on the DQ assessment, such as the *Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act*, in the medical context when assessing data quality concerns, such as accuracy, consistency, representativity, and privacy [1].

Such requirements have also become part of general regulation, as in the *General Data Protection Regulation* (GDPR) [3], the current draft of the *AI Act* [22], or the *Data Act* [21] of the European Union. Similar initiatives to regulate DQ and AI are also being made by the United States [27] and China [50], which underlines the current international interest in the topic of DQ and correspondingly DQ assessment. Nonetheless, this also raises the potential risk posed by these laws, possibly mandating contradictory requirements for data quality. Organizations might find themselves in a predicament where meeting the DQ requirements of one regulation could inadvertently lead to non-compliance with another. In particular, if requirements are defined with regard to DQ dimensions, but the actual DQ assessment of the respective dimensions is not clearly defined, it further complicates compliance efforts.

Examining DQ is by no means just an academic problem [8]. Industry is also concerned about the impact of DQ on business matters [2, p. 15-19]. As a result, companies have shifted from internal “data gazing” [34, p. 154-155] to hiring auditing firms for quality assurance. Literature shows that poor DQ has an enormous economic impact on an organization, either through a loss of revenues or through additional costs incurred internally [38], [48, p. 3-5]. Although auditing firms offer essential services that enhance the quality of financial data and promise compliance with data-related regulations, the assurance of comprehensive DQ across all types of data and use cases remains missing. This includes issues related to data governance, continuous DQ monitoring, and fostering a DQ culture within organizations.

In addition to recognizing the relevance of DQ and understanding it in terms of the various dimensions, the overall goal is to improve DQ by cleaning the data. Yet, DQ cannot be improved if it cannot be measured [53]. For this reason, we need concrete *assessment* methods to evaluate DQ in individual dimensions. We refer to the definition by Batini et al., which understands assessment as the measurement of DQ and the comparison with reference values for diagnosing DQ [8].

Complexity. Conducting comprehensive DQ assessment and the development of assessment methods are complex tasks because more is needed than simply regarding some data elements. From a data perspective, metadata must first be available in order to incorporate external knowledge; assessment methods must be scalable so that large volumes of data can also be assessed; the origin of the data, including the creation process and transformation, must be traceable; storage systems can provide different levels of accessibility and must be analyzed for their functionalities; the data use case must be understood; the relevance of individual attributes for the fulfillment of the task must be identified; user studies must be designed so that different stakeholders can participate, and sufficient numbers of users are required. In short, with the multitude of important DQ dimensions, their assessment goes far beyond some simple counts and checks but must involve technologies from a broad set of fields.

This paper proposes five *facets* of DQ assessment as potential sources for data quality information. Each *facet* presents its own unique set of challenges and opportunities that necessitate resolution. To overcome the challenges and capitalize on the opportunities, we derive a wide range of technologies that require cross-community expertise. We envision the thorough implementation of these technologies by different research communities. The ultimate goal is the integration of these technologies into a robust framework. We advocate for developing a *DQ assessment framework* that enables correct and efficient evaluation across all DQ dimensions, resulting in deeper data profiling [4] and insights into the data.

In this work, we primarily refer to structured data, especially when identifying challenges and opportunities per *facet*. However, the challenges and opportunities extend to semi-structured or unstructured data.

Structure. The following Section 2 explores the assessment facets in more detail, highlighting their challenges and research opportunities. We summarize and cluster the dimensions in Section 3 before highlighting further, orthogonal challenges of DQ assessment in

Section 4. We close this vision paper with several use cases for DQ assessment (Section 5), a discussion of related work (Section 6) and a conclusion (Section 7).

2 DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHALLENGES

Data quality (DQ) assessment, in its enormous variety of dimensions [10, 39, 41], poses many unique definitional, computational, and organizational challenges. Interestingly, DQ cannot be assessed by only regarding the data at hand. Rather, its context is also needed. This section identifies five *facets* that can serve as the foundation for DQ assessment; each facet poses its own challenges and opportunities for future research.

2.1 Facets of Data Quality Assessment

To assess DQ, a broad set of assessment *facets* must be considered (see Figure 1): the *data, metadata and external data* itself, the *source* of the data, the *system* to access it, the *task* to be performed with the data, and finally the *humans* who interact with the data. Each of these facets may play a role to determine the DQ for the task at hand. We discuss each of the facets individually, identifying typical challenges when consulting it regarding DQ. We also present opportunities to overcome the proposed challenges, along with a wide range of technologies needed for this purpose.

2.2 DQ Assessment: The Data Facet

Raw data values are intended to represent real-world concepts and entities. We consider the data semantics and the form of their digital representation. We also include any available metadata, such as schema information and other documentation, and any external knowledge in the form of external data relevant to DQ assessment, such as a knowledge base to validate data.

Some DQ dimensions can be assessed by regarding data alone, such as checking for consistent representation or to the uniqueness of records, i.e., whether they are duplicate-free. Many others require some external ground truth. For instance, to assess accuracy, having access to the correct values can help to determine how closely the data matches the reality it represents. Similarly, assessing representativity requires external information about the overall population to ensure the data sample accurately reflects this broader group.

Challenges & Opportunities

- Scalability: Data come in large quantities, so assessment methods should scale well.
- Granularity: As data occur in different granularities (values, records, columns, tables), the assessment must identify the necessary level of detail and devise quality-metric aggregation methods to cross levels of granularity.
- Encryption: Data may sometimes be available in encrypted form, so the data content cannot be accessed directly.
- Metadata availability / quality: Metadata, such as schema and data types, should be present and of a certain level of quality.
- Reference data: When external knowledge is needed, it might be challenging to discover it in the first place, to align/match it to the data at hand, and to assess its own quality.

An effective DQ assessment framework must be inherently scalable. This scalability entails that individual assessment methodologies should not only support efficient execution but also leverage advanced data structures, partitioning, data distribution, and sampling to enhance performance.

To manage metadata, data catalogs [20] can provide adequate support, but might need to be extended to manage the quality of the metadata: is it up to date, complete, etc.? These catalogs can be automatically populated using schema discovery [11] and data profiling techniques [4]. By automatically identifying and addressing DQ issues, a DQ assessment framework ensures the integrity and reliability of the metadata, thereby supporting accurate DQ assessment [42].

To satisfy the need for reference data, the framework should integrate with known data platforms, such as Kaggle¹ or the UC Irvine Machine Learning Repository² or general knowledge bases, such as Wikidata³, DBpedia [31], or Yago [55]. This integration would allow the application of diverse data integration methods, facilitating accurate data matching and enhancing the framework’s versatility [9, 17], [26, p. 81-92]. Additionally, leveraging *semantic web technologies* would empower the framework to gather and interpret data from the web, enabling external data to be used for the DQ assessment [12]. Given the variety of data models (tables, graphs, trees), the framework should also be able to handle all kind of reference data. This is particularly challenging with data that includes *natural language* texts, demanding methods capable of semantic and syntactic processing to effectively incorporate these texts into the DQ assessment, potentially with the help of large language models. For certain dimensions, the complete external data is not required: for instance, for representativity or relevancy, summary statistics of the data or distributions of the entities are sufficient to perform DQ assessment. In this sense, the framework should be able to discover the respective domain-specific data sources for helpful information for the assessment. The framework should also use privacy-preserving record linkage techniques for matching to maintain individuals’ privacy [56].

In many scenarios, DQ assessment should be able to assess even encrypted data. If the relevant data owner grants consent, a partial decryption can be performed so that the framework assesses approved DQ dimensions. Alternatively, different encryption schemes, such as *homomorphic encryption*, can be used to apply functions while the data is encrypted [5].

2.3 DQ Assessment: The Source Facet

The source of data represents a logical perspective (as opposed to the physical perspective of the “system” as discussed below), focusing on data provenance, which includes information on the data’s origin, data provider and other organizations involved in creating and transforming the data [25]. This perspective encompasses evaluating the methodologies used for data generation and data collection, and assessing the integrity and organizational compliance of the source.

Thus, this facet evaluates the (perceived) quality of a data source, and by extension the DQ it provides. For instance, the assessment of traceability focuses on verifying the documentation of the data’s origin, the transformations the source has performed, and the entities involved in its history. Another example is assessing reputation, which involves evaluating the credibility and reliability of the data source. This assessment includes investigating the data source’s historical reliability and standing and critically reviewing the data collection methods to confirm that they follow known and established practices.

Challenges & Opportunities

- Time granularity: The time interval for assessing the data or a source’s credibility and reliability can significantly impact the assessment results. A longer interval might provide a more comprehensive view of the source’s track record, while a shorter interval could reflect more recent changes in their data quality practices.
- Provenance: The lineage of the data must be traceable, including the origin and previous transformations. This includes ensuring the accuracy of provenance information and the ability to verify it.
- Processes: Information about the data collection and transformation process and the credibility of the annotating agents can affect DQ assessment.

DQ assessment should capture different time intervals to reflect the dynamic nature of data relevance. For instance, to prioritize current assessment information, the framework can use decay functions that give higher weight to more recent information about a source.

The accurate management of information about the data source and any conducted data transformations is essential so that subsequent queries regarding the provenance of the data are answered reliably and efficiently. To maintain the integrity of provenance information, periodic auditing and self-checks are necessary. Any provenance information found to be of low quality should be corrected to maintain the system’s integrity.

Furthermore, the DQ assessment should catalog information concerning the data collection and preparation processes systematically. This necessitates establishing strict documentation requirements alongside mechanisms to ensure adherence to these standards, guaranteeing that all phases of data collection are transparent and verifiable. An example of such documentation about specific data sets are *Data Cards*, which were developed to support responsible AI [46].

2.4 DQ Assessment: The System Facet

The system facet pertains to a physical perspective on the data, including the infrastructure and technologies used for storing, handling, and accessing the data. Additionally, it covers the system’s technical compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, ensuring that data management practices adhere to necessary technical standards. For instance, evaluating recoverability and portability of a dataset demands insights into the infrastructure used for data storage and management. For recoverability, this involves assessing the system’s capacity to restore a previous state of the data in compliance with regulations governing long-term data storage.

¹<https://www.kaggle.com>

²<https://archive.ics.uci.edu>

³<https://www.wikipedia.org>

Regarding portability, it pertains to the systems capability and the adherence to interoperability standards of transferring data seamlessly to an external environment.

Challenges & Opportunities

- **Transparency:** An understanding of the system’s features, capabilities, and implementation is needed to assess many DQ dimensions. This includes knowledge of the system’s architecture, data processing capabilities, interoperability with other systems, security features, and user interface aspects.
- **Auditability:** Besides the mere documentation of system features, verifying such features, such as compliance with regulations to delete user data or fulfilling security standards, can be important.

The DQ assessment framework should be able to extract and document information on the given system’s architecture, functionalities and settings in an automated and comprehensible way for users of different user groups. To facilitate the organization and management of this system information, data catalogs can be utilized and enhanced [20].

Through regular checks, the framework should assess the system’s compliance with prevailing regulations, such as for security standards. Automated checks can streamline this process by enabling the framework to access regulatory information from specialized legal knowledge bases [49] and evaluate compliance based on the system’s documented characteristics. Conversely, when domain experts undertake these assessments, the framework should facilitate their tasks with intuitive visualizations and clear explanations [19].

2.5 DQ Assessment: The Task Facet

The task facet pertains to the specific use case and context in which the data shall be employed. The nature of the task influences which parts of the data will be regarded and how well they represent the real-world situation. For instance, a concrete task is needed to assess the two dimensions added-value and appropriate amount of data. The change in the underlying task could highly influence the assessment [53] (e.g., the data could be appropriate for a traditional analytics task, such as association rule mining, whereas using the data for a *machine learning* (ML) algorithm could be insufficient). Additionally, for specific tasks involving human interaction, the assessment is not measurable (i.e., objectively quantifiable); instead, the assessment is subjective: user surveys are needed to assess whether the data made a difference respectively was appropriate (see human facet).

Challenges & Opportunities

- **Relevance:** Given a task, the attributes (e.g., columns) relevant to the fulfillment of the task must be identified.
- **Impact:** Identify what will be the consequences of executing this task.

The DQ assessment framework should be able to use statistical methods, such as Shapley values [52], to include only the attributes relevant to fulfilling the task in the assessment. Probabilistic or approximate data embody an uncertainty of the information contained

in the data, and thus, they express a form of DQ by being transparent about the trustworthiness of the data. Therefore, methods are needed to model this *uncertainty* and automatically determine the impact on relevant DQ dimensions and the underlying task. Alternatively, the framework should allow domain experts to make a simple manual selection of attributes.

By accessing knowledge bases, the framework should be able to estimate the riskiness of the task. Again, the framework should also make it possible for domain experts to intervene manually so that the riskiness of the task is assessed manually.

2.6 DQ Assessment: The Human Facet

The human facet encompasses the diverse groups interacting with the data, performing the task, and interpreting the results. This perspective aligns DQ with the specific needs, expectations, and contexts in which different users operate. For instance, the dimensions of ease of manipulation and understandability are inherently subjective, making their assessment particularly nuanced. As such, these aspects are best evaluated through user surveys that observe how different users interact with and manipulate the data. These surveys should focus on the users’ experiences and challenges in handling the data, providing insights into its practical usability and comprehension.

Challenges & Opportunities

- **Survey design:** Meaningful surveys need to be designed to capture a range of expertise levels and the context in which the data is operationalized.
- **Intent:** The data potentially affects diverse user groups, such as developers, engineers or customers, all of whose perspectives can play a role in DQ assessment.
- **Representativity:** The group of participants must be representative regarding all potential user groups to capture the respective needs of the different user groups.

DQ assessment should involve experts in the creation and execution of user studies. The DQ assessment framework should offer dual capabilities: first, to automatically generate and evaluate a questionnaire based on good user survey design principles [30], and second, to provide a platform that enables experts to design user surveys manually. In both automated and manual survey creation, one must account for the diverse range of stakeholders and ensure their representation within the overall user study, guiding the execution of the study to reflect this diversity accurately.

Furthermore, it is essential that questionnaires, study outcomes, and the data underlying the DQ assessment are presented in a manner that is both clear and accessible. A clear user interface design ensures comprehensibility and inclusivity, making the information understandable to users from various backgrounds and effectively accommodating different user groups [19].

3 CLUSTERING DATA QUALITY DIMENSIONS

In light of the five discussed facets for DQ assessment, classifying each DQ dimension w.r.t. these facets allows grouping DQ dimensions that share similar challenges and opportunities, as they are related to a similar set of facets. We introduce a three-level system (“++”, “+”, “-”) to classify the participation of the respective facet

Dimension	Data	Source	System	Task	Human
Recoverability	-	-	++	-	-
Portability	+	-	++	-	-
Efficiency	-	-	++	-	-
Believability	+	++	-	-	++
Privacy	-	++	-	-	++
Reputation	-	++	-	-	++
Uniqueness	++	-	-	-	-
Representativity	++	-	-	-	-
Accuracy	++	-	-	-	-
Diversity	++	-	-	-	-
Balance	++	-	-	-	-
Consistency	++	+	-	-	-
Precision	++	-	-	-	-
Concise Representation	++	-	-	-	-
Completeness	++	-	-	-	-
Added value	-	-	-	++	++
Appropriate amount of data	-	-	-	++	++
Relevancy	-	-	-	++	++
Transparency	+	++	++	-	++
Traceability	+	++	++	-	++
Cost	-	++	++	++	++
Accessibility	-	++	++	-	++
Reliability	++	++	-	-	++
Understandability	++	-	-	-	++
Documentation	++	++	-	-	++
Timeliness	+	++	-	++	-
Ease of manipulation	+	-	++	-	++
Security	-	-	++	-	++

Table 1: k -Means clustering over the assessment facets per DQ dimension, $k = 8$.

in the DQ assessment. Here, “++” means strong facet involvement in the assessment, while “-” represents low involvement. Medium facet involvement is represented by “+”. In Table 1, we give an example of such a clustering of the 29 DQ dimensions gathered from literature [36]. Each dimension is defined and discussed in more detail in Appendix A.

For each DQ dimension, we reviewed the existing literature, research papers, and best practices pertaining to DQ assessment. We then looked for common facets or aspects that are frequently mentioned or considered important in assessing the respective DQ. Based on the classification, we employed a straightforward k -Means clustering technique to generate a potential grouping of the 29 DQ dimensions.

For example, the first group, which includes the assessment of recoverability, portability, and efficiency, shares challenges related

to the system facet, concretely the mentioned *transparency* and the *auditability* aspects. To assess these DQ dimensions, detailed system information is essential. For recoverability, data versioning capabilities are crucial; portability demands an understanding of interoperability standards; and assessing efficiency requires insights into the system’s data processing strategies. Moreover, compliance with relevant regulations is a critical factor across all three dimensions. This includes verifying the legality of data versioning or storage practices (recoverability), adherence to interoperability standards (portability), and the legal compliance of data processing strategies (efficiency), like GDPR demands [3]. The dimensions in the fifth group, including transparency, are harder to assess as they involve challenges listed in most of the facets.

4 PRAGMATIC CHALLENGES

Apart from the facet-specific challenges and opportunities in devising DQ assessment methods as presented in Section 2.1, we introduce in this section several orthogonal challenges to DQ assessment in general remain.

Ambiguity. The many attempts to compile and define DQ dimensions [10, 41, 45] are a testament to the difficulty of formally grasping such a broad notion. Even the definitions of the dimensions are inherently ambiguous and thus, are too their meaning, their measures, and their assessment methods [8].

Explainability. Due to their ambiguity, it is important that assessment results be explainable to consumers. In addition, the results should be traceable to their root cause, enabling measures to improve quality.

Efficiency. While efficiency is already mentioned as a specific challenge for the data facet, overall assessment effort and time should be low from a user perspective. Data consumers might be unable or not be willing to wait long for assessment results, and experts might not have much time to complete DQ questionnaires or otherwise help in DQ assessment.

Compliance. The impetus to ensure that data is of sufficient quality often stems from an overarching objective, such as fulfilling organizational data governance processes and goals, or complying to a legal framework, such as GDPR [3] or Europe’s recent AI Act, which explicitly demands measures to ensure DQ [22]. To document compliance, the process of DQ assessment should be transparent, auditable, and ultimately explainable.

Scoring. While this paper uses the term of assessment, ultimately DQ should be *scored* at some numeric scale. Only then can the assessment of multiple DQ dimensions on a dataset be combined to an overall quality score, or be effectively compared to measurements on other datasets. Finding a meaningful, ideally normalized, score for each dimension is the ultimate goal of DQ assessment.

To summarize, any DQ assessment effort cannot focus only on a set of DQ dimensions at hand, but must consider the broader context of the organization and its members.

5 USE CASES FOR DATA QUALITY PROFILES

Ultimately, merely assessing DQ in its various dimensions is not enough. Rather, the assessed values need to be interpreted for the use case at hand: Is the DQ sufficient for the use of the data, or

must the DQ be improved, for instance by cleaning the data or by finding other, additional data sources? We have identified several use cases for the ability to assess DQ in a DQ profile.

ML performance. Poor quality training data is known to often negatively affect the performance of ML models [13]. Knowing the quality of data in its various dimensions might help predict the performance of a model and thus potentially trigger further data preparation steps, such as cleaning the data or gathering more of it. Actually predicting ML performance based on DQ is an open research topic, whose solution has the potential to save much training effort and avoid disappointment in ML results [23, 28].

Legal and ethical compliance. While ML models are trained with the general goal of prediction performance in mind, other dimensions of training data also warrant consideration. Even when showing good testing performance, a ML model and its underlying training data might not fulfill the organization’s ethical standards, for instance reflecting an unwanted bias [60], or fulfill legal standards, such as privacy [3].

Assessing data cleaning performance. As Lord Kelvin (supposedly) said: “If you can’t measure it, you can’t improve it.” When cleaning data, progress is often difficult to measure. Also, individual cleaning steps might affect various DQ dimensions simultaneously. With systematic DQ assessment, it is possible to observe the performance and progress of such efforts, also allowing aborting of expensive cleaning projects once quality is sufficient or once no more progress is made. Thus, a “best effort” cleaning approach can be reduced to “just enough” cleaning [28].

Pricing of data. Data markets, which sell datasets or query results, are becoming commonplace. Castro Fernandez [15] recognizes the effect of poor DQ on pricing, but leaves open the question of actually measuring said quality. Miao et al. [35] also introduce a pricing model based in part on the completeness of the data, yet base completeness only on counting missing values, rather than a more holistic measure that considers missing records as well. A complete assessment of the quality of a dataset should not just consider the data itself (data facet) but also the whole context, therefore also our other introduced facets (source, system, task, human). Thus, for example, the relevance of a dimension for the task at hand can be systematically derived and should comprise sufficient metadata to determine its price.

6 RELATED WORK

To the best of our knowledge, there are no works that comprehensively extract the challenges and opportunities of DQ assessment across DQ dimensions. Nevertheless, we highlight a few representative works that closely examine the DQ assessment in a general sense.

In their framework for information quality assessment, Stvilia et al. [53] have identified various sources of DQ assessment. They distinguish between intrinsic, relational, and reputational information quality, which relates to several facets we have introduced in Section 2. However, the actual challenges and opportunities within the proposed taxonomy is not derived. Batini et al. [8] divide the assessment into different phases and detail various assessment metrics across DQ dimensions. The authors provide an outline of the phases, however, they do not provide any of the challenges encountered

neither during each phase nor during the assessment processes of the individual DQ. In their work, Pipino et al. [45] present a DQ assessment process that distinguishes between subjective and objective assessment. In particular, they present an approach that combines subjective and objective assessment results. However, the work does not specifically address the concrete challenges arising from objective and subjective assessment.

Although systematic and comprehensive studies on the subject are currently lacking, several existing studies tackle the challenges associated with specific DQ dimensions. These studies align with our methodology of examining individual *facets* as foundational elements for DQ assessment. Following are selected DQ dimensions and their connections to the *facets* we have identified.

Batini and Scannapieco [10, p. 22] describe, for example, that external data is required to assess accuracy to determine correctness (data facet). The same applies, for example, to completeness in the sense of the open world assumption, where a reference relation is required for the assessment (data facet). Another example is timeliness [10, p. 29]. Here, the authors describe that timeliness is always associated with a specific task (task facet). Information on metadata (data facet) and information on changes made (source facet) is also required. In another work, Batini [7, p. 33-34] discusses accessibility. The authors describe a user dependency on accessibility (human facet). Batini et al. [8] also describe that a user study is possible for assessment. In addition, accessibility is always measured in the context of a system that makes the data available [7, p. 33-34] [45] (system facet).

7 CONCLUSION

In this vision paper, we have outlined a series of assessment *facets* for evaluating *data quality* (DQ). These facets provide the foundational inputs necessary for a comprehensive assessment of DQ. From this basis, we have delineated specific challenges and opportunities associated with each facet, illuminating the complex nature of DQ assessment. Our vision encompasses the development of a DQ assessment framework capable of conducting an exhaustive DQ evaluation in its many dimensions, thereby generating a DQ profile based on the input dataset and the identified assessment facets. To realize this vision, we have identified essential technologies to realize each facet, indicating that their implementation necessitates collaboration among experts from various computer science disciplines. Beyond the technical area, the successful development of such a DQ assessment framework also demands expertise from disciplines outside of computer science, including law and social sciences. This interdisciplinary approach is vital for addressing the comprehensive challenges of DQ assessment, ensuring that the framework is robust, efficient, ethically grounded, and legally compliant.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was partially funded by the KITQAR project, supported by Denkfabrik Digitale Arbeitsgemeinschaft im Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales (BMAS).

REFERENCES

- [1] 1996. *Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (HIPAA)* | CDC. <https://www.cdc.gov/php/publications/topic/hipaa.html>

- [2] Shazia Sadiq (Ed.). 2013. *Handbook of data quality: research and practice* (Berlin Heidelberg). Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-36257-6>
- [3] 2016. *General Data Protection Regulation* (Last accessed: 2024-02-13). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:02016R0679-20160504>
- [4] Ziawasch Abedjan, Lukasz Golab, and Felix Naumann. 2015. Profiling relational data: a survey. *Vldb Journal* 24, 4 (2015), 557–581. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00778-015-0389-Y>
- [5] Abbas Acar, Hidayet Aksu, A. Selcuk Uluagac, and Mauro Conti. 2018. A Survey on Homomorphic Encryption Schemes: Theory and Implementation. *Comput. Surveys* 51, 4 (2018), 79:1–79:35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3214303>
- [6] Abolfazl Asudeh, Zhongjun Jin, and HV Jagadish. 2019. Assessing and remedying coverage for a given dataset. In *2019 IEEE 35th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 554–565.
- [7] Carlo Batini. 2016. *Data and information quality: dimensions, principles and techniques*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [8] Carlo Batini, Cinzia Cappiello, Chiara Francalanci, and Andrea Maurino. 2009. Methodologies for data quality assessment and improvement. *Comput. Surveys* 41, 3 (2009), 16:1–16:52. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1541880.1541883>
- [9] Carlo Batini, Maurizio Lenzerini, and Shamkant B. Navathe. 1986. A Comparative Analysis of Methodologies for Database Schema Integration. *Comput. Surveys* 18, 4 (1986), 323–364. <https://doi.org/10.1145/27633.27634>
- [10] Carlo Batini and Monica Scannapieco. 2006. *Data quality: concepts, methodologies and techniques*. Springer.
- [11] Jana Bauckmann, Ulf Leser, and Felix Naumann. 2006. Efficiently Computing Inclusion Dependencies for Schema Discovery. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Data Engineering Workshops (ICDE)*, Roger S. Barga and Xiaofang Zhou (Eds.). IEEE, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDEW.2006.54>
- [12] Bettina Berendt, Andreas Hotho, and Gerd Stumme. 2002. Towards Semantic Web Mining. In *Proceedings of the International Semantic Web Conference (ISWC) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Ian Horrocks and James A. Hendler (Eds.), Vol. 2342. Springer, 264–278. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-48005-6_21
- [13] Lukas Budach, Moritz Feuerpfel, Nina Ihde, Andrea Nathansen, Nele Noack, Hendrik Patzlaff, Hazar Harmouch, and Felix Naumann. 2022. The Effects of Data Quality on Machine Learning Performance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.14529* (2022).
- [14] Li Cai and Yangyong Zhu. 2015. The Challenges of Data Quality and Data Quality Assessment in the Big Data Era. *Data Sci. J.* 14 (2015), 2. <https://doi.org/10.5334/DSJ-2015-002>
- [15] Raul Castro Fernandez. 2023. Data-Sharing Markets: Model, Protocol, and Algorithms to Incentivize the Formation of Data-Sharing Consortia. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data (PACMOD)* 1, 2 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3589317>
- [16] Line H. Clemmensen and Rune D. Kjærsgaard. 2022. Data Representativity for Machine Learning and AI Systems. *CoRR abs/2203.04706* (2022). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2203.04706> arXiv:2203.04706
- [17] AnHai Doan, Alon Halevy, and Zachary Ives. 2012. *Principles of Data Integration*. Morgan Kaufmann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2011-0-06130-6>
- [18] Cynthia Dwork. [n.d.]. Differential Privacy. In *Automata, Languages and Programming*. Vol. 4052. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1007/11787006_1 Series Title: Lecture Notes in Computer Science.
- [19] Achim Ebert, Nahum D. Gershon, and Gerrit C. van der Veer. 2012. Human-Computer Interaction: Introduction and Overview. *KI - Künstliche Intelligenz* 26, 2 (2012), 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13218-012-0174-7>
- [20] Lisa Ehrlinger, Johannes Schrott, Martin Melichar, Nicolas Kirchmayr, and Wolfram Wöb. 2021. Data Catalogs: A Systematic Literature Review and Guidelines to Implementation. In *Database and Expert Systems Applications - DEXA 2021 Workshops - BIODDD, IWCF, MLKgraphs, AI-CARES, ProTime, AISys 2021, Virtual Event, September 27-30, 2021, Proceedings (Communications in Computer and Information Science)*, Vol. 1479. Springer, 148–158. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-87101-7_15
- [21] European Parliament. 2023. *Data Act* (final ed.). <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781782258674>
- [22] European Parliament. 2024. Artificial Intelligence Act (Proposal). <https://media.licdn.com/dms/document/media/D4E1FAQF1e5-c80Uqgw/feedshare-document-pdf-analyzed/0/1705928091363?e=1709164800&v=beta&t=-4aKfU14bWHcCzBjma4uQGkM6k10x1dsNhr524hwj8> Leaked version from 2024-1-21.
- [23] Daniele Foroni, Matteo Lissandrini, and Yannis Velgrakis. 2021. Estimating the extent of the effects of Data Quality through Observations. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1913–1918. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00176>
- [24] Haibo He and Edwardo A. Garcia. 2009. Learning from Imbalanced Data. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* 21, 9 (2009), 1263–1284. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2008.239>
- [25] Melanie Herschel, Ralf Diestelkämper, and Housseem Ben Lahmar. 2017. A survey on provenance: What for? What form? What from? *Vldb Journal* 26, 6 (2017), 881–906. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00778-017-0486-1>
- [26] Thomas N. Herzog, Fritz Scheuren, and William E. Winkler. 2007. *Data quality and record linkage techniques*. Springer. OCLC: ocn137313060.
- [27] The White House. 2023. *Executive Order on the Safe, Secure, and Trustworthy Development and Use of Artificial Intelligence*. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2023/10/30/executive-order-on-the-safe-secure-and-trustworthy-development-and-use-of-artificial-intelligence/>
- [28] Sanjay Krishnan, Jiannan Wang, Eugene Wu, Michael J. Franklin, and Ken Goldberg. 2016. ActiveClean: Interactive Data Cleaning For Statistical Modeling. *PVLDB* 9, 12 (2016), 948–959. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2994509.2994514>
- [29] Sophie Kuebler-Wachendorff, Robert Luzsa, Johann Kranz, Stefan Mager, Emmanuel Symoudis, Susanne Mayr, and Jens Grossklags. 2021. The Right to Data Portability: conception, status quo, and future directions. *Informatik Spektrum* 44, 4 (2021), 264–272. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00287-021-01372-w>
- [30] Jonathan Lazar, Jinjuan Heidi Feng, and Harry Hochheiser. 2017. *Research Methods in Human Computer Interaction* (second ed.). Elsevier.
- [31] Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, Dimitris Kontokostas, Pablo N. Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, Mohamed Mordsey, Patrick van Kleef, Sören Auer, and Christian Bizer. 2015. DBpedia - A large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from Wikipedia. *Semantic Web* 6, 2 (2015), 167–195. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-140134>
- [32] Peng Li, Xi Rao, Jennifer Blase, Yue Zhang, Xu Chu, and Ce Zhang. 2021. CleanML: A Study for Evaluating the Impact of Data Cleaning on ML Classification Tasks. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE51399.2021.00009>
- [33] Anne E. Magurran. 2021. Measuring biological diversity. *Current Biology* 31, 19 (2021), R1174–R1177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.07.049>
- [34] Arkady Maydanchik. 2007. *Data quality assessment*. Technics Publications.
- [35] Xiaoye Miao, Yunjun Gao, Lu Chen, Huanhuan Peng, Jianwei Yin, and Qing Li. 2022. Towards Query Pricing on Incomplete Data. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering (TKDE)* 34, 8 (2022), 4024–4036. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2020.3026031>
- [36] Sedir Mohammed, Lou Therese Brandner, Felicia Burtscher, Sebastian Hal-lensleben, Hazar Harmouch, Andreas Hauschke, Jessica Heesen, Stefanie Hildebrandt, Simon David Hirsbrunner, Julia Keselj, Philipp Mahlow, Marie Massow, Felix Naumann, Frauke Rostalski, Anna Wilken, and Annika Wölke. 2024. A Data Quality Glossary. (2024). <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.10474880> Publisher: Zenodo Version Number: 1.0.
- [37] Carmen Moraga, María Ángeles Moraga, Coral Calero, and Angélica Caro. 2009. SQuaRE-Aligned Data Quality Model for Web Portals. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Quality Software (QSIC)*. IEEE, 117–122. <https://doi.org/10.1109/QSIC.2009.23>
- [38] Tadhg Nagle, Tom Redman, and David Sammon. [n.d.]. Assessing data quality: A managerial call to action. *Business Horizons* 63, 3 ([n.d.]), 325–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2020.01.006>
- [39] Felix Naumann. 2002. *Quality-Driven Query Answering for Integrated Information Systems*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2261. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45921-9>
- [40] Felix Naumann and Melanie Herschel. 2010. *An introduction to duplicate detection*. Number 3 in Synthesis lectures on data management. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- [41] Felix Naumann and Claudia Rolker. 2000. Assessment Methods for Information Quality Criteria. In *Fifth Conference on Information Quality (IQ 2000)*. MIT, 148–162.
- [42] Sebastian Neumaier, Jürgen Umbrich, and Axel Polleres. 2016. Automated Quality Assessment of Metadata across Open Data Portals. *Journal on Data and Information Quality* 8, 1 (2016), 2:1–2:29. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2964909>
- [43] Felix Neutatz, Binger Chen, Ziawasch Abedjan, and Eugene Wu. 2021. From Cleaning before ML to Cleaning for ML. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin* 44, 1 (2021), 24–41. <http://sites.computer.org/debull/A21mar/p24.pdf>
- [44] Felix Neutatz, Binger Chen, Yazan Alkhatib, Jingwen Ye, and Ziawasch Abedjan. 2022. Data Cleaning and AutoML: Would an Optimizer Choose to Clean? *Datenbank-Spektrum* 22, 2 (2022), 121–130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13222-022-00413-2>
- [45] Leo L. Pipino, Yang W. Lee, and Richard Y. Wang. 2002. Data Quality Assessment. *Commun. ACM* 45, 4 (2002), 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.1145/505248.506010>
- [46] Mahima Pushkarna, Andrew Zaldivar, and Oddur Kjartansson. 2022. Data Cards: Purposeful and Transparent Dataset Documentation for Responsible AI. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FACT)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1776–1826. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533231>
- [47] Abdulhakim A. Qahtan, Ahmed Elmagarmid, Raul Castro Fernandez, Mourad Ouzzani, and Nan Tang. 2018. FAHES: A Robust Disguised Missing Values Detector. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining (SIGKDD)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2100–2109. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3219819.3220109>
- [48] Thomas C Redman. 2001. *Data quality: the field guide*. Digital press.
- [49] Livio Robaldo, Cesare Bartolini, Monica Palmirani, Arianna Rossi, Michele Martoni, and Gabriele Lenzini. 2020. Formalizing GDPR Provisions in Reified I/O Logic: The DAPRECO Knowledge Base. *J. Log. Lang. Inf.* 29, 4 (2020), 401–449.

- <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10849-019-09309-Z>
- [50] Huw Roberts, Josh Cowls, Jessica Morley, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Vincent Wang, and Luciano Floridi. 2021. The Chinese approach to artificial intelligence: an analysis of policy, ethics, and regulation. *36*, 1 (2021), 59–77. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-020-00992-2>
- [51] Vraj Shah, Thomas Parashos, and Arun Kumar. 2024. *How do Categorical Duplicates Affect ML? A New Benchmark and Empirical Analyses*. https://adalabucsd.github.io/papers/TR_2023_CategDedup.pdf
- [52] Lloyd S Shapley. 1953. A Value for n-Person Games. In *Contributions to the Theory of Games II*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 307–317.
- [53] Besiki Stvilia, Les Gasser, Michael B. Twidale, and Linda C. Smith. 2007. A framework for information quality assessment. *J. Assoc. Inf. Sci. Technol.* 58, 12 (2007), 1720–1733. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ASI.20652>
- [54] Latanya Sweeney. 2002. k-Anonymity: A Model for Protecting Privacy. *Int. J. Uncertain. Fuzziness Knowl. Based Syst.* 10, 5 (2002), 557–570. <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0218488502001648>
- [55] Thomas Pellissier Tanon, Gerhard Weikum, and Fabian M. Suchanek. 2020. YAGO 4: A Reason-able Knowledge Base. In *Proceedings of the Extended Semantic Web Conference (ESWC) (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Vol. 12123. Springer, 583–596. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-49461-2_34
- [56] Dinusha Vatsalan, Peter Christen, and Vassilios S. Verykios. 2013. A taxonomy of privacy-preserving record linkage techniques. *Information Systems (IS)* 38, 6 (2013), 946–969. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.IS.2012.11.005>
- [57] Richard Y. Wang and Diane M. Strong. 1996. Beyond Accuracy: What Data Quality Means to Data Consumers. *J. Manag. Inf. Syst.* 12, 4 (1996), 5–33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1996.11518099>
- [58] Steven Euijong Whang, Yuji Roh, Hwanjun Song, and Jae-Gil Lee. 2023. Data collection and quality challenges in deep learning: a data-centric AI perspective. *VLDB Journal* 32, 4 (2023), 791–813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S00778-022-00775-9>
- [59] Daochen Zha, Zaid Pervaiz Bhat, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, Zhimeng Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, and Xia Hu. 2023. Data-centric Artificial Intelligence: A Survey. *CoRR abs/2303.10158* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.10158> arXiv:2303.10158
- [60] Daochen Zha, Zaid Pervaiz Bhat, Kwei-Herng Lai, Fan Yang, Zhimeng Jiang, Shaochen Zhong, and Xia Hu. 2023. Data-centric Artificial Intelligence: A Survey. *CoRR abs/2303.10158* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.10158> arXiv:2303.10158

A DEFINITIONS AND ASSESSMENT CHALLENGES OF DATA QUALITY DIMENSIONS

In this appendix, we define the 29 data quality dimensions referenced in Table 1. The set of dimensions and their definitions are taken from the Data Quality Glossary [36], which was compiled through a thorough literature study. This appendix extends the definitions and in particular discusses the challenges of assessing DQ for the individual dimensions. These discussions form the basis of scoring the importance of each of the facets, as explained in Section 2.2 and summarized in Table 1.

A.1 Accessibility

Accessibility has technical, organizational, financial, and legal perspectives. Technical accessibility ensures sufficient resources (computer, network) at each point of processing to allow smooth and fast access. Organizational accessibility allows users without technical knowledge or disabilities to access the data easily [7, p. 34]. Legal accessibility results from the licensing of legally protected datasets, which allows for continued use of the data, while financial accessibility can be achieved through reasonable or waived user fees.

Challenges. From a technical perspective, various test scenarios must be created for the assessment to show how resilient the technologies are under full load or under the influence of disruptions, such as power outages or destruction. From an organizational point of view, it requires designing a user study that includes diverse user groups with different levels of technical understanding and disabilities. From a legal perspective, it requires a law expert who understands the various licensing terms and conditions and verifies their compliance with applicable laws, such as the GDPR. The challenges from a financial perspective include evaluating different usage models and their appropriateness for different user groups, such as individuals, students, and small and large organizations.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	++	++	-	++

A.2 Accuracy

Accuracy describes the correspondence between a phenomenon in the world and its description as data [7, p. 23].

Challenges. Accuracy can be assessed at an individual data point, column, or row level, or for an entire dataset, so the level of granularity needs to be defined. The assessment involves determining the degree of correspondence between the data value and its empirically ascertainable, correct value for both perspectives. An aggregation of the individual results per data point is needed to assess the accuracy of items of larger granularity, e.g., row or dataset. A key challenge in this process is obtaining knowledge of the correct value(s), which is essential regardless of whether the assessment is binary (equal or unequal) or based on nuanced comparison functions, such as measuring similarity on a scale from 0 to 1 [10, p. 20], [8]. Thus, external data sources can be needed for assessment.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.3 Added-value

The added-value of data refers to beneficially utilizing data in a use case [45]. Data is beneficially utilized if its use results in a profit (monetary, knowledge) for the data owners or it fulfills a specific task, such as achieving a desired level of prediction accuracy.

Challenges. Assessing benefits, especially intangible gains like knowledge, is inherently complex. Distinguishing the unique contribution of data from other influencing factors in achieving these outcomes poses a significant challenge. Considering a downstream task, like the ML context, the assessment of added-value can be more straightforward when aligned with measurable outcomes, such as achieving a predefined threshold of prediction accuracy.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	-	++	++

A.4 Appropriate amount of data

The amount of data describes the size of the data that is appropriate to fulfill a specific task [41, 45].

It can be too small or too large; for example, a certain amount of training data is needed to adequately train an ML model. Conversely, an excessive amount of data, such as unnecessarily high-resolution image files, can lead to data management issues.

Challenges. Assessing the required amount of data for specific tasks varies significantly based on context. The classification of what is “appropriate” must be defined in advance to reflect the requirements and constraints of the specific application. This can be assessed with measures like the dataset size (e.g., measured by bytes or rows) or by a user who takes over the part of the evaluation.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	-	++	++

A.5 Balance

The balance of data considers the distribution of the contained data points. Data is balanced if the data points within the represented range of values are equally distributed in relation to each other [24].

For example, in a balanced dataset that divides clients into age groups, clients of all ages should be equally represented. This does not mean that all age groups of the total population must be included (see diversity).

Challenges. A significant challenge in assessing a dataset’s balance lies in evaluating datasets with numerous attributes. Assessing the balance of datasets with multiple attributes might exhibit balance in one attribute but are imbalanced. Considering an underlying task, the relevance of the imbalance of individual attributes to fulfilling the task must be assessed.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	+	-

A.6 Believability

Believability describes the degree to which the available information is regarded as correct [41] [7, p. 424-426].

Challenges. Believability cannot be represented exclusively as a statistical quantity. Rather, a user study is required, in which users express their opinions about the data or its source. Also, relevant for the assessment are information about the provenance of the data [7, p. 424], and further documentation about the data.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	++	-	-	++

A.7 Completeness

Completeness refers to the degree to which data is present and whether the data is sufficient to fulfill a use case in which the data shall be employed.

Challenges. The assessment involves two perspectives. The first perspective quantifies the extent of missing values inside the data, which is a straightforward task when such values are explicitly identified or represented by conventional placeholders, like “NaN”. However, the placeholders for missing values are not always known, they are “hidden missing values” [47]. A common example is using specific but arbitrary values to fill missing entries, such as representing a missing date with 1900-01-01. Identifying these hidden missing values necessitates prior knowledge of how they are encoded in the data.

The assessment regarding the second perspective includes the quantification of absent tuples that would match the data model schema (open world assumption) [7, p. 29]. To quantify this, a reference is needed [10, p. 25], usually in the form of external data.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.8 Concise Representation

Concise representation considers in what form data is represented [41]. Concise data is presented suitably and recognizably, depending on the intended use [10, p. 45].

An example is storing timestamps with millisecond precision, such as 2024-03-01 12:00:00.123, in a dataset where only minute-level accuracy is needed for a given use case, which introduces unnecessary verbosity. Simplifying this to 2024-03-01 12:00 enhances conciseness, making the data more practical and easier to work with for its intended use.

Challenges. The assessment of concise representation is typically user-specific and context-dependent. For example, the data representation may be appropriate in one context but inappropriate in another. Previous experience and disabilities again play a role in the user-specific view.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	++	++

A.9 Consistency

Data is consistent if all conditions imposed on the state of the data are met. Consistency includes integrity constraints, such as data types, value ranges, dependencies, or relationships across data sources [7, p. 35].

Examples of a lack of consistency include different date formats in a single column, different cities for the same zip code, or purchase orders with invalid customer numbers.

Challenges. A primary challenge in the assessment of the consistency is determining and understanding the necessary integrity conditions specific to each dataset, which can be complex, especially for datasets with diverse characteristics.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	+	-	-	-

A.10 Consistent Representation

A dataset is consistent in its representation if no attribute (column) has two or more unique values that are semantically equivalent (e.g., New York vs. NYC or 2024-1-12 vs. 2024-12-1) [14, 45, 51]. This includes exact duplicates. Additionally, when duplicates occur in attributes designated as categorical column types, these are specifically referred to as *categorical attributes* [51].

Challenges. A key assessment challenge is identifying semantic equivalence in various representations, which demands syntactic and semantic analysis. This matching task becomes more complex with large and diverse datasets, requiring sophisticated automated methods for handling scale and complexity.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.11 Cost

The cost of data includes both the monetary costs incurred in generating or acquiring and permanently storing the data, and the personnel costs incurred in acquiring and preparing the data. Costs may be calculated for an entire dataset or per query to the data [41, 57].

Examples are data annotation costs by data stewards or crowdworkers, purchase of data from data brokers or data markets, storage in the cloud, and personnel costs, e.g., cleaning and reformatting.

Challenges. A critical aspect of cost assessment is considering the variety of cost factors. While personnel costs for data cleaning are significant, other elements, such as data acquisition, storage, processing, technology and tools investment, data security and compliance costs also play a crucial role. The scalability of these costs with increasing data volumes presents another challenge: managing, storing, and processing large datasets can lead to substantial cost escalations. The duration of data preparation activities can significantly impact overall costs, especially when considering personnel and opportunity costs. The context determines to what extent the data should be cleaned and how long it should be stored.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	++	++	++	++

A.12 Diversity

We adopt the *richness* definition of *diversity*, which is known from ecology. A dataset is diverse if each type of entity of the total set occurs at least once. The dataset aims to reflect the *diversity* of entity types from the total set, i.e., containing all relevant variants [33].

For instance, if an employee database (total set) consists of male and female employees and the department they work in has been recorded in addition to gender. The dataset is diverse if it contains at least one female employee and one male employee from each department. Note that we call a dataset balanced (see Section A.5 above) if the same number of male and female employees work in each department.

Challenges. The key challenge is defining and identifying all relevant entity types within the data, a task complicated by the need for domain-specific knowledge and the potential vastness or ambiguity of the entity range. Even if one regards only values that are present, checking for all combination is computationally expensive [6]. Additionally, comparing the data’s diversity against a potentially vast, poorly defined, or evolving “total set” is a significant analytical challenge.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.13 Documentation

Data is well documented if relevant, complete and correct structured metadata and a textual description are available [39, 41]. Typical metadata includes the volume of the data, its syntactic schema (data types) and its semantic schema (table and column names), statistics, information about its provenance and any transformation that has been performed so far. Textual descriptions, formalized in so-called data sheets, include the data’s purpose and previous use(s).

Challenges. In addition to simply checking the availability of documentation, the assessment should include an in-depth evaluation of the metadata on a syntactic and semantic level. It includes ensuring the completeness and accuracy of metadata, encompassing various elements from technical schemas to transformation history. The relevance and quality of textual descriptions, such as data sheets outlining the data’s purpose and usage history, are equally crucial yet subjective. Challenges are compounded by the lack of standardization in documentation formats, the evolving nature of datasets, and the necessity for specific technical expertise to accurately assess technical details. Additionally, understanding the provenance of the data, keeping documentation updated with ongoing changes, and addressing legal and ethical considerations add complexity to the task.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	++	-	-	++

A.14 Ease of manipulation

Data are easily manipulable if changes or additions are intuitively or without prior knowledge made (data in an Excel spreadsheet vs.

data on a website) [45, 57]. Ease of manipulation can be viewed from both a positive and a negative perspective: On the one hand, there is a risk that data will – intentionally or unintentionally – be falsified (negative case). On the other hand, manipulable data can be easily adapted for legitimate individual purposes (positive case).

Challenges. Assessing ease of manipulation entails a balance between ensuring the flexibility for legitimate modifications and safeguarding against unauthorized alterations. This evaluation process defines “ease” in data manipulation, which varies based on the technical format, the users’ skill levels, and the required tools. A central challenge lies in distinguishing positive uses, such as adapting data for valid individual purposes, and negative scenarios, like intentional falsification.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	-	++	-	++

A.15 Efficiency

The efficiency of data, indicated by response time, measures the effectiveness with which various processes or algorithms can be executed on the data [39]. Factors affecting response time and thus efficiency include network traffic, computational complexity, and data storage mechanisms. Efficient data is characterized by its ability to be processed with minimal delay.

Challenges. Assessment challenges include understanding the nuanced interaction between processes and algorithms on response time to predict the latency in advance.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	++	-	-

A.16 Portability

Portability is a by the GDPR required property of the data and describes the ability to transfer structured data reliably and securely from one system to another. Portable data is formatted according to common standards, like JSON, CSV or XML [29].

A simple transfer of personal data from a social network to an external data storage device would be an example of good *portability*.

Challenges. Assessing the portability requires ensuring that data formats are universally compatible and adhere to common standards, which is crucial for secure and reliable transfer between systems. The existence of different communication protocols between the systems adds to the complexity of the assessment. This assessment must rigorously address security and privacy concerns to maintain data integrity and comply with privacy regulations, particularly under GDPR.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	-	++	-	-

A.17 Precision

The precision contains out of three perspectives.

Firstly, precision reflects the consistency of data recorded repeatedly under unchanged conditions, distinct from data accuracy. For instance, if a hospital patient’s vital signs are measured consistently every 120 seconds, this is an example of high precision. However, such regular measurement intervals do not necessarily reflect the accuracy of the data, such as potential measurement errors.

Precision also pertains to the level of detail in information. For instance, a form might request a year of birth or an exact birthdate, where the latter represents higher precision.

A further dimension of precision is the accuracy in categorizing predefined value classes, such as differentiating between “brown” and “black” in specifying skin color.

Challenges. The assessment challenges include defining the required level of detail of measurements. Similarly, the differentiation of individual categories must be appropriately defined.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.18 Privacy

Data is private if the persons described in the data have control over and access to that data [45]. Private data protects the user’s right to informational self-determination. The legal protection of privacy can be ensured from an organizational and technical perspective:

Organizational privacy can be established through consent declarations by users, which can prohibit the entire use of the data or contain instructions for use, such as task-related access.

For the technical establishment of privacy, the data can, for example, be encrypted [39] or anonymized by privacy preserving techniques [10, p. 225], [18, 54].

Challenges. Ensuring that individuals described in the data maintain control and access over their data while balancing this with the legitimate use of the data is a key challenge in the assessment. Organizational privacy relies heavily on interpreting and implementing user consent declarations effectively, a task that requires precision to respect user choices without limiting data accessibility. Technically, implementing privacy measures like encryption or anonymization poses challenges in selecting suitable techniques and assessing their impact on for data accessibility, the accuracy, integrity constrains or the needed storage. Additionally, keeping up with evolving legal standards for data privacy and adapting to global variations in privacy laws adds complexity to compliance efforts.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	++	-	-	++

A.19 Recoverability

Data are recoverable if, despite system errors or data carrier loss, the data can still be operated on, respectively the previous data quality can be guaranteed [37].

Challenges. The assessment of recoverability involves evaluating the effectiveness and robustness of data backup and recovery processes, ensuring the existence of backups and their ability to restore data quickly and accurately. Testing for various failure scenarios is challenging due to the unpredictability and diversity of potential issues. Another critical aspect is ensuring the integrity and quality of data post-recovery, verifying that the restored data matches the original.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	++	-	-

A.20 Relevancy

Data is relevant if – from the user’s point of view or for an application – it contains necessary information and thus contributes to the concrete realization of an underlying task [39].

For example, in an online store, the name and price of an article are relevant for the comparability of products. On the other hand, the number of people involved in manufacturing the individual products can be of little relevance, depending on the use case.

Challenges. Determining what constitutes relevant data varies considerably based on user perspectives and application-specific needs. The dynamic nature of relevancy, evolving with changing user requirements, market trends, and legal standards, adds to the complexity of maintaining up-to-date relevance assessments. This assessment also involves balancing the need for complete information against the risk of including unnecessary data, which can complicate data management and violate privacy requirements.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	-	++	++

A.21 Reliability

Reliability describes the extent to which the data can be trusted that the information represented are correct [10, p. 38] [41].

Challenges. Key challenges are verifying the credibility of data sources, maintaining data integrity and consistency. Challenges include ensuring data completeness, managing biases, and staying current with the data’s temporal relevance. Additionally, a domain expert can also be part of the assessment, who assesses the data from a semantic and syntactic perspective, which is associated with a subjective factor.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	++	-	-	++

A.22 Representativity

A dataset is statistically representative if each entity of the total set to be represented has the same chance of being represented. Thus, the relative distributions of the characteristic properties of the total set are reflected in the data [16].

For example, a dataset (total set) consists of 70 male and 30 female students. Of the male students, 40 study art and 30 history, while 15 of the female students study art and the remaining 15 history. Based

on the previously stated total, a dataset would be representative if it consisted of 9 female art and history students, 24 male art students and 18 male history students.

This dataset is statistically representative because the relative ratios between students of the same sex and between students of the same major are identical when compared to the total set.

Challenges. Critical to this assessment is comparing the distribution of key characteristics in the given dataset against those of the total population.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-

A.23 Reputation

The reputation of data describes the trustworthiness of the data source and the content [45]. Data and data sources have a high reputation if they have already proven high quality in the past and over some time. Conversely, if no or only poor experience has been gained with them in the past, their reputation is low. In particular, if other data quality dimensions, such as accuracy, cannot be adequately measured, reputation can also be understood as the expected quality of data.

Challenges. Key assessment challenges are the subjective nature of reputation, the necessity of analyzing historical data for quality trends, and the dynamic nature of reputation over time. External factors such as media influence, public opinion, and cultural differences can significantly sway the perceived reputation, adding to the complexity. Moreover, the risk of confirmation bias and the need to balance historical reputation with current performance make the assessment even more complex.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	++	-	-	++

A.24 Security

Data security describes the extent of protection against unauthorized access to data [45]. Systems must guarantee correct access management; to maintain this guarantee, a system’s functional security is also relevant so that in the event of a functional failure, the system will still enter a defined state in which the data security is guaranteed.

For example, a customer of an online store should have access only to their orders and not to all orders of that store.

Challenges. An essential assessment challenge is ensuring that systems maintain security during diverse functional failures. To test this, several user-guided tests are needed. Assessing compliance with diverse legal and regulatory standards further complicates the process, as does addressing the human factor, which introduces significant vulnerabilities. Resource constraints add to the complexity, especially in implementing continuous monitoring and rapid response systems.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
-	-	++	-	++

A.25 Timeliness

The timeliness of data describes the difference in time between an electronically captured event in the real world and its digital representation in the data, considering the task at hand [10, p. 38].

Changes can result from new data being captured (e.g., a sale), existing data becoming outdated due to real-life events (e.g., a customer moving), or data being deleted (e.g., a company going bankrupt).

Challenges. The key assessment challenge is defining an acceptable time frame for various tasks and classifying how long data is considered up-to-date. This can vary depending on the application.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	++	-	++	-

A.26 Traceability

Traceability describes the ability to trace the origin of data and all transformations performed on data [57].

This facilitates the restoration of data to a previous state, e.g., using common version control systems or appropriate data sheets for documentation so that either the current version is replaced or different versions of the data exist in parallel.

Challenges. Information on the provenance of the data must be available and correct. Appropriate software or established processes are required to make this information accessible in the long term. Users from different user groups should be able to access the required information easily.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	+	++	-	-

A.27 Transparency

The transparency includes disclosure requirements about the origin of datasets, information about quality checks performed on datasets, who labeled the datasets, what the learning goals are, whether and to what extent source code can be viewed. Transparency enables individuals impacted by technical systems to make informed decisions and renders infringements to be identifiable and correctable. Transparency also facilitates societal debates and the building of trust.

Challenges. Assessment challenges include determining whether the disclosed information has been prepared in an understandable way for various stakeholders. Another point is the assessment of the compliance of the disclosure. It may be that the associated information may not be disclosed or only partially disclosed.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
+	++	-	-	++

A.28 Understandability

The understandability describes the extent to which a user can comprehend the information transmitted by the data semantically [39, 41].

For example, an online store’s data is understandable if the full names of articles are listed, so customers can immediately recognize them. Understandability is impaired, for instance, if only an article number is listed instead of the full name.

Challenges. Assessing the understandability of data encompasses numerous challenges, primarily stemming from the diversity of user backgrounds and the inherent complexity of information. Tailoring data presentations to be comprehensible across varied educational, cultural, and professional spectrums while maintaining accuracy and avoiding oversimplification is a key challenge. Using technical language and selecting appropriate visualization techniques requires careful consideration to avoid misinterpretation and cognitive overload. Additionally, ensuring cultural and contextual sensitivity in data presentation is essential, especially for global audiences.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	++

A.29 Uniqueness

Uniqueness considers if each entity in the real world is represented as, at most, by one entity in the data, meaning there are no duplicates [8].

For example, the same customer appears only once in a customer database.

Challenges. A definition is needed to determine when two entries are considered duplicates. The principle of exact duplicates exists in the literature, where entries must be completely identical. On the other hand, entries can be classified as duplicates based on a similarity function, even if they do not match exactly (fuzzy duplicates) [40, p. 1-3]. The granularity must also be defined, i.e., whether the uniqueness is measured at value, row, or column level or across entire datasets.

Data	Source	System	Task	Human
++	-	-	-	-