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Problem statement

- Given a requester goal $G$, (semi)automatically find a service $S$ fulfilling $G$
  - See [Keller et al. 2005] for a detailed formalization
  - Content of goal $G$ can be driven by:
    - some human user objectives
      - Improvement wrt. current possibilities
    - some business objectives (part of a business process)
      - Necessary step towards dynamic integration
  - Semantic Web services are a good candidate technology
    - Framework should support the resolution of this problem
      - Automation of human users‘ goal resolution
      - Automation of business needs‘ resolution (dynamic configuration of services –providers- based on some business objectives)
Services vs. Web services

• **Service**
  – Provision of value in some domain [Preist, 2004]
    - Booking of a flight ticket from Madrid to Munich on May 8th, 2005
    - Independent on how the supplier and the requester interact

• **Web service**
  – Computational entity accessible over the Internet (using Web service standards and protocols) [Preist, 2004]
    - Software component provided by an airline and accessible via Web service standards to request the booking of flights
    - Means to request a service, not the service itself
Web service descriptions

• Web service must (semantically) describe the services it is able to provide
  – Web service will often be used to provide a set of related services
    • E.g. booking of flights from a given airline
  – Accurate description of such services has two major problems:
    • Information volume: duplication of the provider’s database
    • Dynamics: continuous updates of the Web service description
• Realistic expectation: static characterization of what services can be requested via a Web service (abstract service description)
  – Complete but not always correct [Preist, 2004]
Conceptual model – goal discovery

• Goals must be semantically described
  – What concrete service is sought in terms of
    • Information e.g. booking id
    • Real-world effects e.g. booking of a flight ticket
  – Unrealistic to expect user to formalize his goal
    • Pre-defined & generic (canned) goals
    • Goal discovery based on
      – Textual description
      – Goal browsing
    • Goal refinement (parameterization, subclassing)
      – Automatically from textual description
      – Supported by tools
Conceptual model – WS discovery

- Services as set of state transitions

- Final state will depend on
  - Initial state (including inputs)
  - Dynamic conditions

- Goals will describe the desired final state
Conceptual model – WS discovery (2)

- Determine whether, given an initial state, the final state reached fulfills the goal*
  
  * Dynamics not taken into account
  - Costly as the set of available services is potentially very big
  - Efficient pre-filtering needed
    - Abstract from state transitions and consider only sets of final states
    - Description logics are a good candidate for this
      - Computing of subsumption relations [Keller et al., 2005]
      - Good response times after classification [Li & Horrocks, 2003]
    - Goals also regarded as sets of desired final states
      - Pre-defined goals also classifiable
  
- No guarantees
Conceptual model – WS discovery (3)

- **Re-introduce state transition view**
  - Over a reasonably small set
  - Incorporate input information
    - In most cases will determine the post-state reached
    - Not provided with the goal but kept locally by the requester
  - Incorporate the relation between the pre-state and the post-state in the WS description
    - What post-state will be reached from the pre-state (input included)?
  - F-Logic + TR is seen as a good candidate formalism [Kifer et al., 2004]
  - Still no guarantees
Conceptual model – service contracting

- Interact with the provider to have a complete guarantee
  - Dynamic factors and possible incorrectness of WS descriptions
    - Communication needed
  - Communication will follow (formal) choreography interfaces
  - Information disclosure and trust policies become relevant
  - On successful contracting, there is a guarantee of the service provision
Conclusions

- Distinction between services and Web services
- Realistic expectations on Web service descriptions
- Distinction between Web service discovery and contracting
- Accurate but efficient discovery
- Frameworks for semantics in Web services should provide appropriate support
Acknowledgements

• Thanks to Uwe Keller, Holger Lausen and Axel Polleres for their contributions

• Thanks to Michael Kifer for the cooperation on TR-based discovery
Discovery and contracting of semantic Web services

W3C Workshop on Frameworks for Semantic in Web Services

Rubén Lara and Daniel Olmedilla
rlara ‘at’ afi.es, olmedilla ‘at’ l3s.de

May 9, 2005