

Open SOA Ontology

Presentation for OMG
5 December 2006

THE *Open* GROUP

Dr Christopher J Harding

Forum Director

Tel +44 118 902 3018

Mobile +44 774 063 1520

c.harding@opengroup.org

Thames Tower
37-45 Station Road
Reading
RG1 1LX
UK

www.opengroup.org

THE *Open* GROUP
Making standards work®

The SOA Working Group

- ❑ The SOA Working Group contributes to the Open Group mission of Boundaryless Information Flow, by developing and fostering common understanding of SOA in order to facilitate alignment between the business and information technology communities.
- ❑ www.opengroup.org/projects/soa/

Why Develop an Ontology for SOA?

- ❑ More precisely define the concepts, terminology and semantics of SOA in both business and technical terms, in order to:
 - Create a foundation for further work in domain-specific areas,
 - Enable communications between business and technical people,
 - Enhance the understanding of SOA concepts in the business and technical communities, and
 - Provide a means to state problems and opportunities clearly and unambiguously to promote mutual understanding; and
- ❑ Potentially contribute to model-driven SOA implementation, which will facilitate SOA adoption.
- ❑ www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/

Working Methods

- ❑ Protégé approach and toolset
 - <http://protege.stanford.edu/>
- ❑ OWL delivery language
 - <http://www.w3.org/2004/OWL/>

Agenda

- Issues for OMG
 - Ontologies and MDA
 - Particularization of the generic SOA Ontology
 - Modeling information
- The draft Open SOA Ontology
- Discussion
 - Comments and feedback on the generic ontology
 - Relation to domain ontologies
 - How to model information
 - Next Steps

Issues for OMG

Ontologies as a Tool for MDA

- ❑ Ontologies can model the business concepts
- ❑ They can also model the architecture process
- ❑ Combining business and architecture models enables model-driven architecture

Model-Driven Architecture

- ❑ If the architecture model is sufficiently clear and detailed
- ❑ Then interface definitions – and perhaps building block implementations – can be generated automatically
- ❑ The web services model is sufficiently clear and detailed
- ❑ Clear and detailed models could be developed for other forms of SOA
- ❑ This ontology is a generic framework

Question for OMG

- How do ontologies relate to MDA/MOF?

Particularizing the Open SOA Ontology

- Specialized SOA Ontologies for flavors of SOA
 - Web Services (we should be compatible with OWL-S - <http://www.daml.org/services/owl-s/>)
 - ESB
 - . . .
- Domain ontologies for application of SOA to vertical market areas
 - Healthcare
 - . . .

Example Particularization for Healthcare

Open SOA Ontology

Service

Provider

Consumer

Example Particularization for Healthcare

**Open SOA
Ontology**

**Healthcare
Standards Body**

Service


Surgery

Provider

Hospital



Consumer

Patient



Example Particularization for Healthcare

Open SOA Ontology	Healthcare Standards Body	Acme Healthcare
Service	Surgery	Daycare Surgery
Provider	Hospital	Acme Hospital
Consumer	Patient	Private Patient



Subclassing and Properties

- Provider
 - is identified by
 - . . .

Subclassing and Properties

□ Provider

- is identified by
- . . .

□ Hospital

- is identified by
- . . .
- is located at
- has beds
- . . .

Subclassing and Properties

□ Provider

- is identified by
- . . .

□ Hospital

- is identified by
- . . .
- is located at
- has beds
- . . .

□ Acme Hospital

- is identified by
- . . .
- is located at
- has beds
- . . .
- is managed by
- . . .

Subclass and Instance Definition

- ❑ What are the instances?
 - *The Acme Hospital in Poughkeepsie?*
 - *John Doe?*
 - *Dialysis patient?*
- ❑ We don't know – and don't care
 - Different particularizations can choose different, perhaps conflicting, ways of defining instances
 - And of defining subclasses
 - Is *Private patient* a subclass or an instance?

What Do We Care About?

- ❑ We care about basic SOA classes and their properties
- ❑ We don't care about subclasses or instances in vertical areas or enterprises
- ❑ We don't care about properties or information specific to vertical areas or enterprises
- ❑ But we do care about how information is exchanged by services

La Trahison des Images



(This is not a pipe)

- ❑ This is not a picture painted by the Belgian surrealist René Magritte in 1928-9.


The Treachery of Information

- ❑ Services exchange information about the number of beds in a hospital
- ❑ We need a concept of
 - “this is information about the number of beds in a hospital”
- ❑ as distinct from
 - “this the number of beds in a hospital”
- ❑ Our ontology must contain *information about information about information*


The Draft Open SOA Ontology

Open SOA Ontology Symbolism

□ Class



□ Subclass




□ Property (or Relation)



These slides make many simplifications. They omit some classes and properties – particularly the inverse properties of those shown. See the OWL version on the web for the authoritative description.

Open SOA Ontology - Core Classes and Properties




Core Classes and Properties – Notes 1

- ❑ An *Actor* can be a person or an organization or a piece of technology – someone or something that does something
- ❑ In modeling, an *Actor* represents a role, or class, rather than an individual
 - Eg, “Barber”, rather than “Sweeney Todd”
 - Is our usage wider than this?
- ❑ An *Actor* can be a *Service*
 - Eg, a *Service* can consume another *Service*
 - Not all *Actors* are *Services*
 - Not all *Services* are *Actors*

Core Classes and Properties – Notes 2

- ❑ A *Service* represents a particular, described, pattern of behavior
 - Eg, “haircut”
- ❑ Not an instance
 - Eg, not “the haircut that I had yesterday”
- ❑ Different patterns of behavior can be different services or the same service, at the discretion of whoever is populating the ontology
 - Eg, “haircut” could include both “normal” and “demon barber” behavior patterns, or
 - “normal haircut” and “demon barber special” could be separate instances of *Service* – perhaps of a “Haircut” subclass of *Service*
- ❑ *Effect* is similar to OASIS *Real-World Effect*


Open SOA Ontology – Provider and Consumer



Provider and Consumer - Notes

- ❑ *Provider* and *Consumer* are subclasses of *Actor*
- ❑ *Provider* is domain of *provides*
- ❑ *Consumer* is domain of *consumes*
- ❑ *provides* and *consumes* are not just transient relations
 - *provides* includes *provides at this instant*, *has provided*, and *may in future provide*
 - *Consumes* is similar

Open SOA Ontology – Relation to TOGAF




Inherited from TOGAF

Relation to TOGAF - Notes

- ❑ TOGAF classifications of *Building Block* – *Business, Technology, Solution, Operation* etc. – define subclasses of *Service*
- ❑ TOGAF properties of Building Block – *continuum, domain, input elements*, etc. – are inherited by *Service*


Open SOA Ontology – Contract and Policy



Contract and Policy - Notes

- ❑ According to OASIS, a *Contract* is agreed between two or more parties, while a *Policy* is operated by a single party.
- ❑ An applicable *Policy* is not necessarily owned by a service *Provider* – or *Consumer*.
 - Eg, government food and hygiene policy (law) applies to provision of restaurant service
 - In an enterprise, corporate policy may apply to provision of services by divisions or departments
- ❑ A *Contract* may have *Mandatory* and *Optional Conditions*. An *Actor* can *accept Optional Conditions*
- ❑ The idea of a *Contract* or *Policy* having a *Description* has been omitted. This makes things simpler.


Open SOA Ontology - Visibility



Visibility - Notes

- Instances of *Visibility* could be “Public”, “Acme Inc Enterprise-Wide”, “Members of soa-ontology mail list”, etc.

Open SOA Ontology – Service Consumption



Effect

Effect

Return of
Information

Change of
State

Physical
Effect


Effect - Notes

- ❑ In the OASIS model, a *Real-World Effect* can consist of the return of *Information*.
- ❑ OASIS also identifies *Change of Shared State* as a possible *Real-World Effect*
- ❑ A *Physical Effect* is clearly another possibility
 - If I consume a haircut service, there is the physical effect that my hair is shorter

Viewpoints

- ❑ The preceding slides are all valid from business, technical, and operational viewpoints
- ❑ For a model-driven approach, we need to look specifically from a technical – *developer* - viewpoint
- ❑ Although we look from a technical viewpoint, implementation is not necessarily restricted to technology.
 - A service could still be provided by a person or organization, for example

Open SOA Ontology – Service Consumption: Developer Viewpoint



Web Resources – Open SOA Ontology and Healthcare Examples

- ❑ The Open SOA Ontology, Draft 0.6
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12147/soa.owl>
- ❑ Particular Example Ontology – Healthcare (imports the Open SOA Ontology)
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12148/healthcare.owl>
- ❑ Particular Example Ontology – Acme Healthcare (imports the Open SOA Ontology and the Example Healthcare Ontology)
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12149/acmehealth.owl>

Web Resources – Example Business Ontologies

- ❑ What kind of business service do I need?
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12150/business-types.owl>
- ❑ I know what kind of service I need - how do I find one?
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12151/businesses.owl>

(Very incomplete, but should indicate what such ontologies might look like)

Web Resources – Credit Risk Assessment

- ❑ Imports the Open SOA Ontology, but does not add any classes or properties
- ❑ Gives instances of two services:
 - a lending service operated by a bank and implemented through a combination of people and technology
 - a credit risk assessment service operated by a credit bureau and purely technology based, with a description in a service registry through which it can be discovered, and an interface via which it can be consumed.
- ❑ Includes instances of consumers, providers, policies and other concepts related to the service instances.
 - <http://www.opengroup.org/projects/soa-ontology/uploads/40/12152/risk-assessment.owl>




Discussion

Comments and Feedback on the Draft Open SOA Ontology



Relation to Domain Ontologies

Open SOA Ontology	Healthcare Standards Body	Acme Healthcare
Service	Surgery	Daycare Surgery
Provider	Hospital	Acme Hospital
Consumer	Patient	Private Patient



What is *Information*?

- ❑ Need to define subclasses and properties
- ❑ Beware of “the treachery of information” – we are modeling *information about information*
 - Do we need OWL-FULL?
 - To relate our *Information* class to RDF/OWL *Class* and *Property* classes
 - Do we use the approach of OWL-S – see <http://www.ai.sri.com/daml/services/owl-s/1.2/Process.owl>
 - Would an ISO 11179 approach help?



Next Steps

- The Open Group
 - Absorb feedback
 - Develop the generic ontology further
- The OMG
 - Ontologies and MDA
 - Healthcare ontology
- Collaboration
 - Relation of specific and generic
 - What is information?
 - Ongoing joint review and feedback

Open SOA Ontology

Thank you!