Zayed University ZU Scholars

All Works

1-1-2016

A MOF-based social web services description metamodel

Amel Benna Centre de Recherche sur l'Information Scientifique et Technique (CERIST)

Zakaria Maamar Zayed University

Mohamed Ahmed Nacer Université des Sciences et de la Technologie Houari Boumediene

Follow this and additional works at: https://zuscholars.zu.ac.ae/works

Part of the Computer Sciences Commons, and the Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons

Recommended Citation

Benna, Amel; Maamar, Zakaria; and Nacer, Mohamed Ahmed, "A MOF-based social web services description metamodel" (2016). *All Works*. 166. https://zuscholars.zu.ac.ae/works/166

This Conference Proceeding is brought to you for free and open access by ZU Scholars. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Works by an authorized administrator of ZU Scholars. For more information, please contact Yrjo.Lappalainen@zu.ac.ae, nikesh.narayanan@zu.ac.ae.

A MOF-based Social Web Services Description Metamodel

Amel Benna^{1,3}, Zakaria Maamar² and Mohamed Ahmed Nacer³

¹DSISM, CERIST, Algiers, Algeria

²College of Technological Innovation, Zayed University, Dubai, U.A.E. ³LSI Laboratory, USTHB, Algiers, Algeria

Keywords: MDA, MOF, Social Web Service, Metamodeling.

Abstract: To promote and support the development and use of social Web services by the IT community on the Web, both social Web service-based applications and their support platforms should evolve independently from each other while sharing a common model that represents the characteristics of these social Web services. To achieve this duality, this paper proposes a model-driven approach. First, the approach identifies a social Web service's properties. Then a Meta-Object-Facility (MOF)-based social Web services description metamodel is developed. Finally, a prototype illustrates how the MOF-based metamodel is used.

1 INTRODUCTION

Web services (WS)s offer a standardized way for deploying interoperable Web-based applications (Chung et al., 2003). However, several issues like discovery, composition, and monitoring continue to undermine their benefits. To address some of these issues, there is a research trend that looks into WSs from a social perspective (Xie et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2015).

A Social Web Service (SWS) is the result of blending social computing with service-oriented computing. Compared to regular WSs, SWSs "establish and maintain networks of contacts; count on their (privileged) contacts when needed; form with other peers strong and long lasting collaborative groups; and, know with whom to partner so that ontology reconciliation is minimized" (Maamar et al., 2011a). For instance, prepareJob SWS "likes" to collaborate with postJob SWS because of previous successful compositions and also "recommends", for similar reasons, planJob SWS as a replacement in the case of failure. postJob SWS and planJob SWS are part of prepare-Job SWS's "collaboration" and "substitution" networks, respectively.

The existing solutions for discovering and composing WSs from a social perspective (Maamar et al., 2011b; Chen et al., 2015; Maaradji et al., 2011), rely on a specific SWS's networks (e.g., substitution network) and specific platform (e.g., Java EE platform, and .Net). Therefore, the evolution and update (e.g., new social networks and platform update) of these existing solutions are difficult. There is a serious lack of a common model that permits to describe SWSs' properties (e.g., who are a SWS's contacts) across different stakeholders (e.g., designers, developers, providers, and users) and regardless of the platform used. Moreover, Web Service Description Language (WSDL) does not capture the "social" dimension of a WS in terms of who are the collaborators and substitutes, for example. What if we think of *S*-WSDL for Social-WSDL?

Our objective is to define S-WSDL; a common representation of SWS to be made available for all stakeholders regardless of the implementation platforms. S-WSDL enhances WSDL with a "social" dimension without altering WSDL's original con-This can be done using Model Driven Artent. chitecture (MDA). MDA represents everything from requirements to business modeling and to technology implementation (OMG, a). MDA requires models to be expressed in a Meta-Object-Facility (MOF)-based language (OMG, b). MOF is a standard for specifying, constructing, and managing technology neutral metamodels, i.e., models that describe other models. When a system model refers to a specific platform it is called Platform Specific Model (PSM). Contrarily, the model is called Platform Independent Model (PIM) (OMG, a). A model in PIM can be transformed into another PIM when it needs to be enhanced, filtered, or specialized or into one or more PSMs. PIM into PIM transformation represents model refinement.

Our approach refines WSDL metamodel, inde-

Benna, A., Maamar, Z. and Nacer, M.

A MOF-based Social Web Services Description Metamodel DOI: 10.5220/0005687302170224

In Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Model-Driven Engineering and Software Development (MODELSWARD 2016), pages 217-224 ISBN: 978-989-758-168-7

Copyright © 2016 by SCITEPRESS - Science and Technology Publications, Lda. All rights reserved

pendently of any platform. We inject some social elements into the description of this metamodel. The outcome called *S*-WSDL metamodel is MOF based. *S*-WSDL metamodel can serve different purposes such as specifying social elements of a WS (e.g., know with whom to partner and collaborate). Automatic transformation from WSDL PIM into *S*-WSDL PIM can be carried out using model-to-model transformation languages such as Queries, Views, and Transformations (QVT) (OMG, b). *S*-WSDL PIM generated can in turn be transformed into PSM.

Our main contributions in this paper are as follows: identification of SWSs' properties; adoption of MDA to develop *S*-WSDL metamodel (i.e., a way to abstract these properties), and demonstration of how *S*-WSDL metamodel based on MOF and QVT Relation supports automatic transformation of models.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of SWSs approaches and WSs models. Section 3 defines SWSs' properties and then illustrates SWS modeling. Section 4 discusses how the proposed model is instantiated. Finally Section 5 draws some conclusions.

2 RELATED WORK

We provide first a brief overview of SWSs and then a discussion on MDA use for WSs development.

2.1 Social Web Service Overview

A significant amount of research looks into blending social computing with service-oriented computing.

To perform WSs discovery, Maamar et al. develop LinkedWS, a social network discovery model that captures interactions between WSs (Maamar et al., 2011b). This network identifies collaborators and substitutes of WS. For a better quality of WS discovery, Chen et al. (Chen et al., 2015) construct a global social network of WSs. They transform WSs' WSDL and OWL-S descriptions on the Web into RDF descriptions. In this global social network, social links between WSs that can work together during composition are defined. Chen et al.'s network allows users to identify a WS as an entry point in the network and then navigate along social links to discover the WSs deemed necessary for composition. El-Goarany et al. propose a WS recommendation system within a social network of WSs that makes use of generated ontologies to discover similar and complementary WSs (El-Goarany et al., 2008). Maaradji et al. use information collected from a user's social networks so that WS composition schemas are recommended

(Maaradji et al., 2011). In (Maamar et al., 2012) Maamar et al. interleave social networks of users and social networks of WSs to support WSs composition, execution, and monitoring. To provide semantic WS composition, Xie et al. (Xie et al., 2008) define social networks based on trust relationship between users of WSs, providers of WSs, and WSs themselves. Xie et al's networks help select WSs or composition plans and make the search results meet users' requests. Last but not least, Bansal et al. (Bansal et al., 2010) present a framework for trust-based WS composition. This trust rating is used to filter composition results and then produce solutions that comprise WSs provided by trusted providers.

The aforementioned approaches use different representation of SWSs and depend on their platform support and technologies (e.g., Java, .Net, and Prolog) making it difficult to identify all WSs' social elements (e.g., trust and collaboration).

2.2 MDA for Web Services Development

MDA addresses specific issues related to WSs such as automating the generation of platform-specific implementations using WS models (Bézivin et al., 2004), extending WSDL for describing the qualities of WSs (D'Ambrogio, 2006), and promoting interoperability between WS_* protocols (Simon et al., 2013).

The adoption of MDA for describing WSs interactions is quite new and very few studies are available. Bouchakour et al. use MDA to develop SWSs (Bouchakour and Benslimane, 2013) in terms of building social networks from a log file that defines specific WSs interactions, assessing and modeling the social qualities of each WS, and then adding these qualities to a WSDL file using an XSLT template. However, social qualities update (e.g., new interactions between WSs) leads to rebuilding social networks, which is time consuming and error prone for SWSs developers, providers, and users. Zheng et al. (Zheng et al., 2012) extend OWL-S metamodel to support the description of WS providers social context.

It should be noted that (Bouchakour and Benslimane, 2013) and (Zheng et al., 2012) approaches do not embrace MDA principles (e.g., PIM and PSM) and standards (e.g., MOF and QVT). They do not consider the overall SWSs' properties, and do not allow incremental model transformation.

Contrarily, we propose to refine WSDL PIM in order to define a MOF-based *S*-WSDL metamodel, a model abstracting a WS's social elements. The use of QVT Relation language provides an automatic transformation of WSDL model into *S*-WSDL model, and support target incremental model transformation.

3 MODELING SOCIAL WEB SERVICE

This section identifies properties that should define WSDL description of SWS and describes the MDA approach for enriching WSDL with these properties.

3.1 Properties of Social Web Service

To identify SWSs' properties, we looked at the steps that Beydoun et al. peformed in order to define the concepts of a generic multiagent metamodel (Beydoun et al., 2009). These steps are summarized in Table 1 and are looked at from both bottom-up and top-down perspectives. The bottom-up perspective (Steps 1-4) identifies common SWSs' properties using the existing literature on SWSs. The top-down perspective (Step 5) validates the identified SWSs' properties with regard to the existing SWSs literature.

In Step 1, we investigate SWSs literature using academic library databases (e.g., Web of Science) and academic search engines (e.g., Google Scholar). SWSs approaches published in journals with high impact factors and in conferences with high ranking¹ are the measures taken into account in selecting the top n (n=10) SWSs approaches.

In Step 2, we decide on the general concepts relevant for SWSs. These concepts are selected on the basis of tasks that are necessary for building a concept dictionary in Methontology² method (Gómez-Pérez et al., 2004). The tasks are as follows:

- Task 1. Build a glossary of terms that includes all relevant terms for SWS like concepts, instances of concepts, attributes of concepts, and relations between concepts, their synonyms, and descriptions. To build this glossary, we capture and collect terms related to SWSs' social networks and social element from approaches identified in Step 1.
- Task 2. Build concept taxonomies to structure concepts. We select terms that are of type concept from the glossary of terms. Concepts are examined based on middle-out strategy used in Uschold and King's method for building ontology (Gómez-Pérez et al., 2004). This strategy recommends identifying first, the core of basic domain terms and then specifying and generalising them as required. In our case, we start by identifying the main concepts that define a SWS's social network. As social relations mean connecting parties together, graphs capture them (King et al., 2009) using *node* and *edge* between nodes. We

refer to *edge* as *relationship*. We have then generated top and bottom concepts for *node* and *relationship*. However, the existing SWS literature presents several terms that are similar and different, and sometimes overlap. To reach a consensus over SWS network community, we proceed as follows:

- Two concepts with overlapping or disjoint meanings have the same name. As in ONIONS³ method (Gómez-Pérez et al., 2004), we create a concept for each meaning. The new concepts are linked to others concepts through specialization or generalization (e.g., *trust* as rating of WS specializes *node degree* concept and is named *trust degree*, while *trust* between user and WS provider specializes *relationship type* concept and is named *trust relationship*).
- Same concepts having different names. As in ONIONS method (Gómez-Pérez et al., 2004), we adopt a name based on what is widely agreed upon in the domain (i.e., in social networking community). For instance, we adopt *relationship* concept name for relationship between nodes which is referred as *explicit relationship* (Maaradji et al., 2011).
- Some specific concepts are omitted, so they specialize more general concepts of the concept taxonomies. For instance, formulas for assessing *relationship weight* are omitted. These formulas can specialize *get relationship weight* concept which in turn specializes a *relationship weight* concept.
- Other specific concepts can be obtained from the concept taxonomies by specializing more general concepts. For instance, *collaboration* and *substitution* between WSs in (Maamar et al., 2011b) can be obtained by specializing *relationship type* concept.
- When a concept is closely related to a specific approach and cannot be obtained by specializing more concepts from concept taxonomies, we create this concept. For instance, *relationship dependency* concept is created to specify trust relationship between two WSs in (Xie et al., 2008).
- Implicit concepts are included in the concept taxonomies. For instance, *relationship duration* concept is inferred from (Chen et al., 2015) and (Maamar et al., 2011b) approaches that refer to update or management of relationship.

¹http://www.core.edu.au/

²Methontology enables building ontology from scratch

³ONIONS method define how to generate a unique ontology concepts from original ontologies concepts.

Step 1	Identify SWSs approaches from a literature search
Step 2	Extract general concepts related to SWS from approaches identified in Step 1
Step 3	Short-list candidate definitions of selected SWS concepts in Step 2
Step 4	Refine list of SWS concepts, their corresponding definitions and relationships: output of this
	step is the initial SWS properties
Step 5	Validate SWS properties by their instantiation on SWS approaches selected in Step 1

Table 1: Steps for identifying SWS properties.

Table 2: SWSs' properties defined and their use in the literature.

Bansal et al. (Bansal and and Bansal, 2011)Bansal, et al. (Bansal, 2010)Maamar et al. et al. (Maa- mar et al., 2011)Xie et et al. (Maa- mar et al., 2012)Chen et al., 2013)El- chan (Chen et al., 2013)Li et al. (Chen et al., 2013)NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS WS WSUser and WS wS's pro- vidersWS WS WS's wS's pro- vidersWS WS WS's wS's pro- vidersUser and chan wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's pro- widersCollabo- ration, substru- tion, and comf- dence of to a user, wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's pro- widersCollabo- ration, substru- tion, and confi- dence of to a user, wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's pro- widersCollabo- ration, substru- tion, and wS's to a between wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's pro- widersReco- relation mme- substru- dence of to a user, compe- tition, and user, wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's pro- widersTrust too too too wS's <th>SWS</th> <th colspan="10">Approaches</th>	SWS	Approaches									
et al. (Bansal and Bansal, 2011)et al. 	properties										
Image: Relationship Node degreeReputa- tion per WS(Bansal et al., 2010)(Maa- mar et al., 2011)(Maa- mar et al., 2011)(Maa- mar et al., 2011)(Maa- mar et al., 2012)(Chen et al., 2008)(Chen et al., 2008)(Chen et al., 2015)(Chen et al., 2010)(Chen et al., 2010)NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderUser and WS wSWS's wS wSUser, wS's user and WS wSUser, wS's user and WS wSWS WS wS, and ProviderWS WS wS wSWS WS wS wSUser and WS's user and WS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's widersCollabo- ration, and compe- tition, between wS'sReco- mme- mme- mar ndation of WS to a userTrust wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'sSimilar similar similar similar similar similar similar social user userSimilar social compe- tition, and and userSimilar social comple- tition, to a userWS wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS to a wS's to a userWS wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'sWS wS's wS's wS'sWS <br< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></br<>											
and Bansal, 2011)et al., 2010)mar et al., 2011), (Maa- mar et al., 2011).et al., 2011)2008)et al., 2015)Cl- Goarany 2008)2010) Coarany 2008)NodeWSWSUser and ProviderWS's WSUser and WSWS's WSUser, user and WSUser, wS, and ProviderWSWSUser and ProviderWS's user and WS's wS's pro- vidersWSUser and WS'sWSUser, user and WS's user and wS'sWSWSWSWSWSWSRelationship TypeTrust between wS's's pro- vidersTrust vidersCollabo- ration, substitu- tion, and compe- tition, edice of to a userReco- mme- ndation of WS userTrust social comple- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution, and sub- stitution, edice of to a userSe- stitution, and sub- stitution, and sub- stitution, and sub- stitution, edicab- of to a user and stitution, and sub- stitution, edicab- of to a stitution, edicab- of node of nodeNode stitution, edicab- edicab- of node of nodeNode stitution, edicab- of node of nodeNode stitution, edicab- edicab- of											
Bansal, 2011)2010)et al., 2011a, (Maa- mar et al., 2011b)2011)et al., 2012)2015)Goarany et al., 2008)NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderUser and WSWS's User and WSUser, WS WSUser, WS, and ProviderWS WSWS WSUser, wS, and ProviderWS WSWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderSimilar wS WS, and ProviderWS WS, and ProviderSimilar similar and social compe- tition wS wSWS WS WS tites of to a user compe- tition wSPattern of social tites of compe- tition wSWS WS WS tites of to a user compe- tition wSPattern of social tites of to a user, compe- tition wSPattern of social tites of to a user, compe- tition wSWS WSWS WSWS tites of object relation stitution between WSWS wSWS wSWS WSWS WSNode degree WSReputa- traing per WSTrust traing per WS× trust traing per WS× trust trust traing per WS× trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust trust <b< td=""><td></td><td>x</td><td>· ·</td><td>· ·</td><td>` 5</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></b<>		x	· ·	· ·	` 5						
2011)2011a, (Maa- mar et al., 201b)2012)et al., 2008)NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderUser and WSWS's WSUser, user and WSWS WS, and ProviderWS WS WS's user and wS's wS's wS's pro- vidersTrust VS's WS's pro- tion, and compe- tion, and social user, compe- tition, collab- of and wser, collab- compe- tition, collab- pro- vidersTrust Trust wS'swS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'swS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'swS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'swS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS'swS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS's wS					,		2000)	,		2010)	
NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderWS WSUser and WSWS'sUser, user and WS'sWS User, and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderRelationship TypeTrust between vidersTrust between vidersCollabo- ration, vidersReco- mme- ndation confi- dence of tion, and compe- tition, collab- of WS to a userTrust vidersPattern of and and social user, userSimilar and and social (e.g., WSWS WS wiersNode degree WSReputa- traing per WSTrust twigers \times twiers \times twiers<			2010)		2011)			2010)	2		
NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderUser and wSWS's user and WSUser, user and WSWS WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderRelationship TypeTrust betweenTrust vidersTrust vidersTrust vidersTrust vidersCollabo- ration, and confi- tion, and wSs's wSReco- mme- ndation of WS too, and confi- of WS too, and wsst vidersReco- mane- ndation confi- of WS widersTrust vidersPattern func- tion, and confi- tion, and wsst vidersSimilar func- tion, and confi- of WS wsst vidersWS too, a userTrust too, a wsst vidersReco- mane- ndation collab- oration, and sub- stitution tition, and sub- stitution per wsstTrust two dence of too, a wsst vidersTrust two dence of too, a wsst vidersReco- mane- ndation tion, and sub- stitution tition, and sub- stitution ing/Trust the rec trating per WSTrust two dence of tition, too the rec two dence of tition, too tition, and sub- stitution titind, the rec two dence tition, too tition, too too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too tition, too too too too too tition, too too too too too too too too too too 		- /									
NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderWS WSUser and WSWS's user and WSUser, wser and WSWS WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and WS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderWS WSUser, and providerPattern of and similar func- tional- titical titical titical titical compe- dence of tition wSReco- mme- ndation to a userPattern of and user, compe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSsPattern of and user, compe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSsPattern of and user, collab- oration, and substitu- titial, and the relation ships i and the relation social linkWSWSNode degree WSReputa- rating per WSTrust x××××Kepu- top of wS×Reputa- top top of mS×Reputa- top top tities condition tities condition tities condition top top top </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>`</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td></td>				`					,		
NodeWS ProviderWS ProviderWS ProviderUser and WSWS's user and WSUser, wS, and ProviderWS WSWS User and ProviderRelationship TypeTrust between WS'sTrust between wS'sCollabo- ration, workierReco- mme- ndation confi- dence of userReco- mme- ndation confi- of WS user, dence of userTrust wS'sPattern of similar and social userSimilar comple- tional- tional- tional- dence of userSe- quen- tion, and social userWS to a userSe- quen- tial, and social to a userWS to a userSe- quen- tial, and social to a userSe- quen- tial, and social time- tial, and the recompe- tition, collab- oration, worldNode degreeReputa- trust the recompe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSTrust \times the recompe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSWS to a userNode degreeNodeReputa- trust the recompe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSWS to a to a userWS to a userWS to a to a userWS to a to a userWS to a to a userWS to a to a userWS to a to a to a userWS to a to a to a to a to a to a to a to a to a tition, collab- to a tition, collab- to a tition, collab- to a				et al.,							
Provider Relationship TypeProvider ProviderWSuser and WSWS, and ProviderUser and ProviderRelationship TypeTrust between wts's vidersTrust WS's wts's vidersCollabo- ration, rust tion, and tition between tition wtiersReco- mme- ndation ndation of WS tities tition wts'sTrust wts's tities compe- tition wtiersPattern of and similar tities compe- tities tities tition wts'sWS wts's tities tition wts'sSec- (e.g., tities tities tities tities tities tities tition wts'sWS tities tities tities tities tities titionWS to a userTrust tities compe- tition, and sub- stitution tition, and sub- stitution titionNode tities tities tities tition, tities tition, and sub- stitution tition, and sub- stitution tition, tition, and sub- stitution tition, t											
Relationship TypeTrust between WSs's pro- vidersTrust between vidersCollabo- ration, substitu- ton, and compe- of wiss's or vidersReco- mme- mme- of of WS ton, and compe- dence of user, compe- tition, compe- tition, compe- tition, compe- tition, compe- tition, and ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- ton, and compe- tition, collab- oration, and compe- tition, collab- oration, and stitution between WSsProvider mme- mme- mme- of WS to a user, compe- tition, collab- oration, and stitution between WSsProvider me- me- social to a user, compe- tition, collab- oration, and stitution between WSsProvider me- me- social to a user, compe- tition, collab- oration, and stitution between WSsProvider me- social ing/ Out- of WS social linkand and social the red worldNode degree WSReputa- traing per WSTrust to traing per WS××××KKNode degree WSReputa- traing per WSTrust to <td>Node</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>WS</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>WS</td> <td>WS</td> <td></td>	Node			WS				WS	WS		
Image: constraint of the sector of the se		Provider	Provider		WS						
Relationship TypeTrust between WSs's pro- 						WS	Provider				
Typebetween WSs'sbetween substitu- pro- vidersration, substitu- ro- vidersmme- ration, pro- vidersmme- ration, ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- relationmme- ration, ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- relationof ration, ro- relationand ro- ro- ro- viderssubstitu- ro- ro- ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- ro- ro- ro- vidersmme- ration, ro- ro- vidersmme- ration, ration, ration, per WSmme- ration, ration, ration, ration, per WSmme- ration, ration, ration, ration, per WSmme- ro- r											
WSs's pro- vidersWSs's pro- viderssubstitu- tion, and compe- tition betweenndation confi- of WS to user, compe- tition, rotion, and user, compe- tition, rotion, and stitution betweenndation confi- of WS to a user, compe- tition, rotion, and stitution betweensocial rotion a time, time, titik see, quen, titian, rotion, and titian, titian, to a tition, rotion, and stitution betweensocial rotion a titik see, quen, titian, rotion, and stitution betweencompe- tition, rotion, and stitution betweensocial time, relation titian, titian, to and the rea worldNode degree tion per WSTrust rating per WSXXXXRepu- to tition, and sub- stitution between WSsTrust degree of WSdegree of WSXRepu- tition, of WSNode degree tion per WSTrust rating per WSXXXXXRepu- tition, of WSXRepu- tition, tition, tition, tition, tition, tition, titin, tition, ti							Trust				
pro- viderspro- viderspro- viderstion, and compe- titionconfi- dence of titionof WS to userlink to a user, compe- compe- tition, collab- oration, and stitution betweenlink to a (e.g., titics se- quen- titial, and choiceitional- ities object relation ships i the rec worldNode degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WSXXXXTrust to of WS to 	Туре										
vidersvidersviderscompetition tition betweendence of WSto a userto a user, competition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution betweento a and choiceWSities of object relation ships i and choiceNode degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WS \times											
Node degree WSReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WSXXXXXXXXXRepu- tilion, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSsSe- quen- tilon, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSsSe- quen- tila, and oration, and sub- stitution between WSsSe- quen- tila, and and ing/ Out- going social link)object relation ships i the res worldNode degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WS×××Repu- talion of WS of WS WS×Repu- talion of WS WS×Repu- talion of WS WS×Repu- talion of WS WS×Repu- talion talionRelationship weight×××××××Repu- talion talion××××××Relationship weight×××√√✓✓✓✓✓✓Relationship weight×××√√×××<									ws		
SectorMarkMarkbetween WSsusercompe- tition, collab- oration, and sub- stitution between WSsquen- tial, and choice ing/ Out- going social link)relation ships in the real worldNode degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust \times \times \times \times \times Reputa- tial ne \times Reputa- tation per WSTrust \times \times \times \times \times Reputa- tation of WS user and of WS Provider \times \times Reputa- tation of W provide \times <td></td> <td>viders</td> <td>viders</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>** 5</td> <td></td>		viders	viders						** 5		
Node degree tion per WSReputa- trating per WSTrust t t Node degreeTrust t rating per WS \times \times $\sqrt{\sqrt{1}}$ $\sqrt{\sqrt{1}$ $\sqrt{\sqrt{1}}$ $\sqrt{\sqrt{1}$											
Node degreeReputation per WSTrust rating per WS××× <td>SCIE</td> <td></td> <td>AND</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>J PU</td> <td></td> <td>ATIC</td> <td></td>	SCIE		AND				J PU		ATIC		
Node degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WS \times </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>/</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>the real</td>					/					the real	
Node degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WS \times </td <td></td>											
Node degreeReputation per WSTrust rating per WS \times <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Incom-</td><td></td><td></td></th<>								Incom-			
Node degreeReputa- tion per WSTrust rating per WS \times </td <td></td>											
Node degreeReputation per tion per WSTrust \times <td></td>											
Node degreeReputation per traing per WSTrust \times \times \times \times Trust degree of node of WS, of WS user and of WS \times \checkmark </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>WSs</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>						WSs					
Node degreeReputation per tion per WSTrust rating per WS \times \times \times \times \times Trust degree of NS, of WS user and of WS Providerdegree of node \times Reputation tation of W provideRelationship weight \times \times $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ Relationship weight \times \times $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$											
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $											
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Node degree			×	×	×			×		
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$								of node			
Relationship weight×× $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ Relationship weight×× $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ Relationship keta×× $$ $$ ×××××		ws	per WS								
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $										provider	
Relationship weight×× $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ Relationship kelationship×× $$ $$ ××××											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $											
weight \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot Relationship \times \times \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark \times \times \times	Relationship	×	×					./		./	
Relationship \times \times \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark \checkmark \times \checkmark \checkmark \times \times		~	~	V	v	V	v	v	V	V	
	Relationship	×	×	1/	1/	×	×	1/	×	×	
	duration			v	v			v			
Relationship $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ $$ \times \times \times								×	×	×	
transitivity v v v v v		v	Ť	Ť	·	v	¥				
Relationship \times \times \times $$ \times $$ \times $$	Relationship	×	×	×		×		×	×	\checkmark	
dependency	dependency										

legend: $\sqrt{}$ means available property in the approach and \times means the opposite.

• Task 3. Build a concept dictionary which will include all concepts, their corresponding definitions, their attributes, and relations.

In Step 3, we short-list the candidate definitions of the selected concepts in Step 2. This happens by identifying what knowledge the definition specifies and if the definition defines explicitly the word. For knowledge that is required in SWS social networks domain but not explicit, it is inferred from other definitions.

Differences between definitions were reconciled in order to ensure consistency across concept names. We adopt a definition that is most coherent to maintain generality when contradictory use of concepts between two or more literatures occurred. For instance, *node* refers to WS in (Chen et al., 2015) while it refers to WS and user in (Maamar et al., 2012) and to WS provider in (Bansal et al., 2010). Therefore, we define *node* as an entity that could be WS provider, WS consumer, or WS. The final output of Step 3 is a refinement of the list of concepts obtained in Step 2 with their corresponding definitions.

In Step 4, we refine the list of SWS concepts obtained in Step 3 and identify dependencies between SWS concepts. The final output of this step is the following defined key properties of SWS.

- Node refers to an entity (physical or moral) that could be WS provider (*e.g., organization*), WS consumer (*e.g., user*), or WS as well. In the rest of this paper, we use entities and nodes interchangeably.
- **Relationship** establishes a link (or association) between pairs of nodes. More than one relationship can exist between nodes (e.g., collaboration and substitution), whether the nodes are of the same kind or not. In the rest of this paper, we use relationship and association interchangeably.
- **Relationship Type** specifies the label of a relationship. For instance, *competition, collaboration, and recommendation* relationships between WSs, *trust* relationship between WSs customers, WSs providers, and WSs themselves, and *friendship* or *business partnership* relationships between WSs providers and WSs consumers.
- **Relationship Weight** evaluates the relationship between two nodes in terms of how collaborative they are, how cooperative they are, etc. This evaluation may depend on the number of interactions that involve nodes.
- **Relationship Duration** establishes how long a relationship between nodes will last. This could be *permanent* like similarity between WSs' functionalities or *temporary* like upon-request partnership.

- **Relationship Transitivity** determines relationship type that supports transitivity *like similarity between WSs.* Transitivity cycles may be limited by a threshold that is defined by WS provider.
- **Relationship Dependency** captures the reliance of a relationship on another. For instance, trust relationship between two WSs in (Xie et al., 2008) relies on existing relationships between their WS users and WS providers.
- Node Degree reflects the social qualities of a node as it interacts with other nodes. A social quality of node is a mapping between a set of social parameters (e.g., trustworthy, and cooperative) onto a set of their values. For instance, a node social quality can be used to build its reputation degree and help selection in the case of competition.

In Step 5, we validate the SWS properties by their instantiation on SWS approaches selected in Step 1. Table 2 summarizes how the defined SWS properties are mapped onto concepts reported in the SWS literature.

3.2 MDA for Social Web Service Description

In this section, we propose a MOF-based *S*-WSDL metamodel for abstracting SWS's properties. *S*-WSDL metamodel consists of refining WSDL metamodel at the PIM level. In MDA terms, WSDL model is an instance of WSDL metamodel. Likewise, *S*-WSDL model (i.e., WSDL model with social dimension) is an instance of *S*-WSDL metamodel. These metamodels are also instances of the MOF model (Fig. 1). A *S*-WSDL metamodel's concepts are identified and grouped according to *Interaction* and *service* views.

3.2.1 Interaction View

Interaction View models the aforementioned proposed SWS properties. The basic view of the *Interaction* metamodel is illustrated in Fig. 2. A metaclass defines the behavior of certain classes and their instances. 1 or 1..* cardinalities denote the required association, while 0..1 or 0..* cardinalities denote optional associations. 'SN" for "Social Network" is added as a prefix to name the new *Interaction* metamodel classes. The following outlines the role of the key metaclasses, their metaattributes, and metafunctions.

• *SNNode* refers to *node*. It is characterized by *name*, *state* and a set of *properties* represented by *SNProperty* metaclass.




Figure 1: Overview in using MDA for SWS description and transformation.




Figure 2: Interaction core metamodel View.

- SNAssociation_Type refers to relationship type and aims to identify the nature of the social relationships (e.g., collaboration and recommendation relationship as value instance of the SNAssociation_Type metaclass) and the representation of information regarding symmetry, transitivity, dependency, and temporal aspects.
- SNAssociation_Weight specializes the metaclass SNproperty. In this case, prop_name attribute refers to the label of association_weight (e.g., collaboration weight as value instance of association_weight metaclass) and Value attribute to its weight. This value depends on the relationship type and is calculated using the metafunction Get_ass_weight.

3.2.2 Service View

Service View extends WSDL metamodel with *Interaction* to create *S*-WSDL metamodel. WSDL metamodel is generated from WSDL 2.0 XML schema description. WSDL 2.0 XML schema allows elements representing a specific technology, called *extensibilityelements*, under various elements defined by WSDL. *S*-WSDL metamodel gives rise to social characteristics as an optional entry for WSDL metamodel. Thus, any service (*e.g., Prepare_Job*) can refer to services (*e.g., Post_Job, and Plan_Job*) with whom it has a relationship (*e.g., collaboration*) using *SNNode* and *SN_Association* metaclasses.

4 IMPLEMENTATION AND VALIDATION

In order to validate our proposed MOF-based

S-WSDL metamodel, we need to prove its completeness. However, incompleteness is a fundamental problem in an open environment such as the Social Web. In fact, we cannot prove the completeness of a proposed MOF-based S-WSDL metamodel nor the completeness of its definitions, but we can prove the incompleteness of an individual SWS property or its definition, and therefore we can deduce the incompleteness of the proposed metamodel if at least one SWS property definition is missing in the established S-WSDL metamodel. So, S-WSDL metamodel is complete if and only if all that is supposed to be in the SWS is explicitly stated in it, or can be inferred for various social WS scenarios.

We validate our *S*-WSDL metamodel by showing its applicability and relationships to existing SWS approaches such as (Maamar et al., 2011b) and (Xie et al., 2008) described in Table 2.

Upon MOF compliant metamodels for sources (e.g., WSDL, and Interaction metamodels) and target (e.g., S-WSDL metamodel) introduced, Model Transformation can be carried via transformation rules (not included here for space reasons) between MOF compliant metamodels, and implemented via a transformation engine (Fig. 1). Transformation rules are described in QVT Relation model transformation language. The use of QVT Relation language provides an automatic transformation of WSDL model into S-WSDL model, and support target incremental model transformation. Thus, the formal semantics of MOF and QVT Relation language reflects the conformance relation between models and metamodels, and the satisfaction of transformation rules between pairs of models (Calegari and Szasz, 2013).

We have implemented a prototype in Eclipse Modeling Framework $(EMF)^4$ and integrates *mediniQVT*⁵ plugin. This later supports transformations expressed in QVT Relation. The WSs models used are built on real-world WSs extracted from WS-DREAM⁶ a Web Service QoS Datasets (Zhang et al., 2010) and converted to XMI standard representation. XMI representation of Interaction models is created from Interaction Ecore diagram (e.g., using Eclipse Rich Client Platform). We executed our transformations on JVM version 1.8, running on MicrosoftWindows 7 Professional, in computer system of Intel(R)




Figure 3: An excerpt of Social_SOAP_engineer S-WSDL model.

Core (TM) i5-920CPU, running at 2.67 GHz, and 4 GB of RAM.

Transformation takes as inputs SOAP_engineer WSDL model and its Interaction model and returns Social_SOAP_engineer S-WSDL model (Fig. 3). QVT evaluation created 1 new element, set 19 features and takes 250 ms. Social_SOAP_engineer S-WSDL model is validated using EMF validation, as instances of WSDL metamodel.

The social dimension of *Social_SOAP_engineer S*-WSDL is described, as optional elements in WSDL, inside dash line shape in Fig. 3. It includes *Trust* property as in (Xie et al., 2008) approach and *Collaboration* and *Robustness* relationship type as in (Maamar et al., 2011b) social networks approach:

- Collaboration with JobAlert and JobSearch-Helper SWSs. The collaboration weight value between SOAP_engineer and JobAlert is labeled Job_alert_Coll_Weight, while collaboration weight value between SOAP_engineer and JobSearchHelper is labeled JobSearch-Helper_Coll_Weight.
- Robustness with *LookupSoap* SWS. The latter has similar functional and non-functional properties with *SOAP_engineer* and can replace it in case of failure. The robustness relationship weight value is labeled LookupSoap_Rob_weight.

⁴http://www.eclipse.org/modeling/emf/

⁵http://projects.ikv.de/qvt

⁶http://www.wsdream.net/

5 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we identified SWS properties and proposed a MOF-based S-WSDL metamodel for the description of SWS. S-WSDL metamodel is defined to ensure consistency between different SWS application models and extensibility in terms of new interactions, regardless of the implementation platform. MOF-based S-WSDL metamodel and QVT Relation are used to support automatic transformation from WSDL model into S-WSDL model (WSDL with social dimension) without altering the original content of WSDL model. We implemented a prototype to test our approach. The prototype illustrates how the MOF-based S-WSDL metamodel is defined and how to automate the transformation of a WSDL model into a S-WSDL model, using EMF and QVT Relation tools. Furthermore, the proposed S-WSDL can be applied to serve different purposes such as adding social dimension when querying WSs registries and mapping from WSs model (e.g., existing UML models of BPELs process) to WSs with social dimension. As future work, we aim to validate our metamodel in real-world use-cases.

REFERENCES

Object Management Group, MDA Guide Revision 2.0. Object Management Group, OMG Specifications.

- Bansal, S. K. and Bansal, A. (2011). Reputation-Based Web Service Selection for Composition. In World Congress on Services. IEEE.
- Bansal, S. K., Bansal, A., and Blake, M. B. (2010). Trustbased Dynamic Web Service Composition using Social Network Analysis. In Workshop on: Business Applications of Social Network Analysis. IEEE.
- Beydoun, G., Low, G. C., Henderson-Sellers, B., Mouratidis, H., Gómez-Sanz, J. J., Pavón, J., and Gonzalez-Perez, C. (2009). Faml: A generic metamodel for mas development. *IEEE Trans. Software Eng.*, 35(6).
- Bézivin, J., Hammoudi, S., Lopes, D., and Jouault, F. (2004). Applying MDA Approach for Web Service Platform. In 8th International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference. IEEE.
- Bouchakour, E. H. and Benslimane, S. M. (2013). Social Web Services Development Based on MDA:Extending WSDL to Inject Social-QoS. In 14th Arab Conference on Information Technology, Proceedings.
- Calegari, D. and Szasz, N. (2013). Institution-Based Semantics for MOF and QVT-Relations. In Formal Methods: Foundations and Applications. Springer.
- Chen, W., Paik, I., and Hung, P. C. K. (2015). Constructing a Global Social Service Network for Better Quality of Web Service Discovery. *IEEE Transactions on Ser*vices Computing, 8(2).

- Chung, J.-Y., Lin, K.-J., and Mathieu, R. G. (2003). Guest Editors'Introduction : Web Services Computing-Advancing Software Interoperability. *IEEE Computer*, 36(10).
- D'Ambrogio, A. (2006). A Model-driven WSDL Extension for Describing the QoS of Web Services. In *International Conference on Web Services*. IEEE.
- El-Goarany, K., Saleh, I., and Kulczycki, G. (2008). The Social Service Network - Web 2.0 Can Make Semantic Web Services Happen. In 10th Conference on E-Commerce Technology & Enterprise Computing, E-Commerce and E-Services. IEEE.
- Gómez-Pérez, A., Fernández-López, M., and Corcho, Ó. (2004). Ontological Engineering: With Examples from the Areas of Knowledge Management, e-Commerce and the Semantic Web. Springer.
- King, I., Li, J., and Chan, K. T. (2009). A brief survey of computational approaches in social computing. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*. IEEE.
- Li, S. and Chen, Z. (2010). Social Services Computing: Concepts, Research Challenges, and Directions. In Int'l Conference on Green Computing and Communications, & Int'l Conference on Cyber, Physical and Social Computing. IEEE.
- Maamar, Z., Faci, N., Sheng, Q. Z., and Yao, L. (2012). Towards a User-Centric Social Approach to Web Services Composition, Execution, and Monitoring. In *Web Information Systems Engineering*. Springer.
- Maamar, Z., Hacid, H., and Huhns, M. N. (2011a). Why Web Services Need Social Networks. *IEEE Internet Computing*, 15(2).
- Maamar, Z., Wives, L. K., Badr, Y., Elnaffar, S., Boukadi, K., and Faci, N. (2011b). LinkedWS: A Novel Web Services Discovery Model Based on the Metaphor of "Social Networks". *Simulation Modelling Practice* and Theory, 19(1).
- Maaradji, A., Hacid, H., Skraba, R., Lateef, A., Daigremont, J., and Crespi, N. (2011). Social-Based Web Services Discovery and Composition for Step-by-Step Mashup Completion. In *International Conference on Web Services*. IEEE.
- Simon, B., Goldschmidt, B., and Kondorosi, K. (2013). A Metamodel for the Web Services Standards. J. Grid Computing, 11(4).
- Xie, X., Du, B., and Zhang, Z. (2008). Semantic Service Composition based on Social Network. In *Proceedings of the 17th International World Wide Web Conference*. Springer.
- Zhang, Y., Zheng, Z., and Lyu, M. R. (2010). WSExpress: A QoS-aware Search Engine for Web Services. In International Conference on Web Services. IEEE.
- Zheng, X., Wu, Q., Ke, D., Li, H., and Shi, Y. (2012). Social Context Enabled Description Model for Web Services. In *Information Computing and Applications conference*. Springer.