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Abstract—We describe a model-driven translation approach between Semantic Web Service based business process models in the context of the SUPER project. In SUPER we provide a set of business process ontologies for enabling access to the business process space inside the organisation at the semantic level. One major task in this context is to handle the translations between the provided ontologies in order to navigate from different views at the business level to the IT view at the execution level. In this paper we present the results of our translation approach, which transforms instances of BPMO to instances of sBPEL.
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I. INTRODUCTION

One of the concerns of Business Process Management (BPM) is to provide process modelling languages and tools to facilitate bridging between the business and Information Technology (IT) views. However, one major obstacle to the complete realization of BPM today is that the business process space inside the organisation, from the business expert perspective to the actual implementation is widely not accessible at the semantic level and thus neither to machine reasoning. The emerging Semantic Business Process Management (SBPM) research area [7] addresses this problem and proposes the use of ontologies and Semantic Web Services (SWS)[5] in order to provide a unified view on business processes in a machine understandable way.

Within the SUPER project[1], an approach to SBPM has been developed, which in particular provides a set of integrated ontologies developed in WSML​2 taking into account the use of Semantic Web Services for business process modelling. More specifically, we provide ontologies for a number of popular standards (e.g. BPMN, EPC, BPEL) as well as the novel Business Process Modelling Ontology (BPMO) [4], which provides a high-level model of business processes, integrating organisational aspects, process workflow and services. The goal is to support a number of BPM life-cycle activities at the semantic level, including modelling, querying, translation and execution. One major task within this approach is thus handling the translations between the provided ontologies in order to navigate from different views at the business level to the IT view at the execution level.

In this paper we describe a model-driven approach and implemented translator for transforming instances of BPMO to instances of an ontology for BPEL (sBPEL). In particular, our approach implements mappings using ATL​3 rules and uses the XML format of WSML as both source and target models of the ATL transformation engine. The result of the translation is a portable file containing a semantically annotated executable business process model.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the context and a subset of the business process ontologies used in the SUPER project. Section 3 describes the translation approach we adopted and the implementation of the BPMO2SBPEL translator. Section 4 describes a translation example from a use case. Finally, we present our conclusions and related work.

II. BUSINESS PROCESS ONTOLOGIES

As mentioned in the introduction, within the SUPER project we provide a set of integrated ontologies, which represent different views and levels of business process models. In Figure 1 we depict a subset of the available ontologies (rounded rectangles) for the purpose of explaining our translation approach. The main ontology is BPMO (see Section 2.A) to and from which corresponding translations are performed (large arrows in the picture). BPMO imports UPO (Upper-level Process Ontology), an ontology defining common business process concepts, shared by all ontologies. sEPC [6] and sBPMN [2] are the two ontologies created to semantically annotate the corresponding standard notations used to model process workflows at the business level. SBPEL [10] (see Section 2.B) is an ontology for the BPEL language (with extensions), which is used by IT experts to execute process workflows. These ontologies can be grounded to any tool-specific syntactic format of the respective notations (rectangles in the picture) via straightforward serializations.

This paper will focus on the translation between BPMO and sBPEL, taking advantage of the unambiguous meaning of

1 Semantics Utilised for Process Management within and between Enterprises (http://www.ip-super.org)
2 http://www.w3.org/Submission/WSML/
3 http://www.eclipse.org/M2M/ATL
constructs in the ontologies, in order to facilitate the navigation from the business level to the execution level.

Figure 1. Business Process Ontologies in SUPER

BPMO and the related ontologies mentioned above are publicly available at the SUPER website (http://www.ip-super.org/ontologies). Next, we describe relevant details of BPMO and sBPEL, which are the ontologies we use in this paper.

A. BPMO

BPMO\(^4\) is an ontology for high-level business process workflow models, abstracting from existing business process notations. Nevertheless, the workflow elements of a BPMO process diagram comply with a corresponding subset of BPMN control-flow elements [15] and are informed by, and named according to Workflow Patterns [1]. Moreover, BPMO concepts related to interaction activities (tasks) adopt a number of Web Service attributes also used in BPEL constructs.

Basically, a BPMO process description captures the business/organisational context of the modelled process and contains the process workflow, which represents the behaviour of the process (through control-flow and data-flow constructs) and process activities (through Tasks). BPMO process workflow elements are structured into a workflow container combining features of block-oriented and graph-oriented workflow patterns. The main purpose of block patterns is to explicitly represent structured elements and workflow patterns that can be used to facilitate process verification and the translation to notations in the execution level.

The Process concept (shown in Listing 1) defines several organisational attributes, by inheriting from BusinessActivity, according to the types BusinessDomain, BusinessFunction, BusinessStrategy, BusinessPolicy, BusinessProcessMetrics, BusinessProcessGoal and BusinessResource. These business-level concepts (attribute types) are primarily defined in external ontologies, which model a specific business domain and organisation. These ontologies are linked to the BPMO process by subclassing the UPO concept (note that upo\# is the prefix for the UPO namespace). As a result, we enable the querying of processes against organisational aspects by business analysts. The Process itself can also have a corresponding Web Service description (hasWSDescription attribute). In addition, the Process concept defines the process workflow (attribute hasWorkflow). The concept Workflow defines the first element of the workflow (hasFirstWorkflowElement). The workflow is modelled with Workflow Elements following the first element.

Listing 1. BPMO Process and Business Activity Concepts

```plaintext
concept BusinessActivity subConceptOf upo#BusinessActivity
    hasName ofType (0 1) _string
    hasDescription ofType (0 1) _string
    hasNonFunctionalProperties ofType (0 1) BusinessActivityNonFunctionalProperties
    hasBusinessDomain ofType upo#BusinessDomain
    hasBusinessFunction ofType upo#BusinessFunction
    hasBusinessStrategy ofType upo#BusinessStrategy
    hasBusinessPolicy ofType upo#BusinessPolicy
    hasBusinessProcessMetrics ofType upo#BusinessProcessMetrics
    hasBusinessProcessGoal ofType upo#BusinessProcessGoal
    hasBusinessResource ofType upo#BusinessResource

concept Process subConceptOf {BusinessActivity, upo#BusinessProcessModel}
    hasIDDescription ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability
    hasWorkflow ofType (0 1) Workflow

concept Workflow subConceptOf {upo#ProcessOrchestrationSpecification
    hasHomeProcess ofType (0 1) Process
    hasFirstWorkflowElement ofType (1 1) WorkflowElement
```

The concepts related to Semantic Web Services in BPMO are GoalTask, Receive, Send and ReceiveMessage Event (see Listing 2), which are subconcepts of Task. A Task is also a Business Activity (as in Listing 1). Tasks have attributes to represent information about the interaction with a partner process, such as partner role (hasPartnerRole), inputs (hasInputDescription) and outputs (hasOutput Description). Most attribute types in Tasks are defined as SemanticCapability which is a wrapper for abstracting over domain data instances or service descriptions.

Listing 2. BPMO Concepts Related to Interaction Tasks

```plaintext
concept BusinessRole subConceptOf upo#Role
    hasName ofType (0 1) _string
    hasDescription ofType (0 1) _string
    hasOrganisation ofType (0 1) upo#Organisation

concept GoalTask subConceptOf Task
    hasPartnerGoal ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability
    hasPartnerRole ofType (0 1) BusinessRole
    hasPartnerWebService ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability
    hasPartnerCounterpart ofType (0 1) Receive
    hasMessageType ofType (0 1) Receive
    hasMessageFrom ofType (0 1) Send
    hasInputDescription ofType SemanticCapability
    hasRequestCapability ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability

concept Send subConceptOf Task
    hasPartnerWebService ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability
    hasPartnerRole ofType (0 1) BusinessRole
    hasReceiveCounterpart ofType (0 1) Receive
    hasPartnerRole ofType (0 1) BusinessRole
    hasSendCounterpart ofType (0 1) Send
    hasMessageFrom ofType (0 1) Send
    hasInputDescription ofType SemanticCapability
    hasRequestCapability ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability

concept Receive subConceptOf Task
    hasPartnerWebService ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability
    hasPartnerRole ofType (0 1) BusinessRole
    hasSendCounterpart ofType (0 1) Send
    hasReceiveCounterpart ofType (0 1) Receive
    hasMessageFrom ofType (0 1) Receive
    hasOutputDescription ofType SemanticCapability
    hasProvideCapability ofType (0 1) SemanticCapability

concept ReceiveMessageEvent subConceptOf [IntermediateEvent, Receive]
```

\(^4\) http://ip-super.org/ontologies/process/bpmo/v2.0.1/bpmo
A GoalTask is an atomic activity, which can be automatically achieved through a SWS invocation (synchronous communication). The attribute hasPartnerGoal is used in this case to refer to a Goal (or request) description. The hasInputDescription and hasOutputDescription attributes refer to the semantic descriptions of request and response data respectively. The requestsCapability and providesCapability attributes refer to the semantic descriptions of Web Service operations related to request and response respectively. The Send and Receive tasks are similar to Goal tasks, but they are used for asynchronous communication. A Receive task can be associated with a Send in the same workflow via the hasSendCorrespondant attribute (and conversely for Send). ReceiveMessageEvent works as a Receive task, but is also associated to an event, which is triggered when a message is received.

B. SBPEL

Semantic BPEL (sBPEL)\(^5\) is an ontology for BPEL4SWS [11], which is an extension of BPEL4WS\(^6\), a language for specifying the composition of Web Services using a control-flow based approach. Control-flow constructs are either structured activities (e.g. sequence, flow, if), or basic activities including assign and interaction activities (e.g. receive, reply, invoke, pick). In addition, links (dependencies) can be added between activities within a flow (parallel execution) activity in a graph-based style. BPEL4SWS uses the extensibility elements of BPEL in order to add semantic annotations of data and services to the process. It also adds the Interaction and Conversation extension constructs, which can be used to group a number of interaction activities for modelling long running conversational interaction among partners.

Listing 3 sBPEL Concepts related to a Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>concept</th>
<th>SemanticProcess</th>
<th>subConceptOf</th>
<th>bpel#Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hasConversation</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hasPartner</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hasSemanticOnMessage</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>SemanticOnMessage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>Receive</td>
<td>subConceptOf</td>
<td>{bpel#Interaction, bpel#NewActivityType}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>doesCreateInstance</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>(0 1) boolean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>belongsToConversation</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>(1) Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hasVariable</td>
<td>ofType</td>
<td>(1) SemanticVariable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>hasName</td>
<td>(1) _string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>correspondsTo</td>
<td>ofType bpmo#Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>IncomingInterface</td>
<td>subConceptOf</td>
<td>InterfaceDescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hasWebServiceDescription</td>
<td>ofType (1) _string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>SemanticVariable</td>
<td>subConceptOf</td>
<td>bpel#Variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hasSemanticType</td>
<td>(1) _string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>hasName</td>
<td>(1) _string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hasBusinessEntity</td>
<td>ofType (0 1) _string</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hasConversation</td>
<td>ofType (1 *) Conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concept</td>
<td>ExtensionActivity</td>
<td>subConceptOf</td>
<td>bpel#BasicActivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hasActivity</td>
<td>ofType (1) NewActivityType</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For example, as shown in Listing 3, the Receive concept (sub-concept of Interaction and NewActivityType) ontologically represents one of the interaction activities of BPEL4SWS in sBPEL. The Receive activity can be added to the control-flow via the ExtensionActivity concept (hasActivity attribute). Receive must belong to a Conversation (belongsToConversation attribute), which in turn must define an interface (describesInterface attribute) that has a Semantic Web Service description (hasWebServiceDescription attribute). Note also that Receive (hasVariable attribute) uses SemanticVariable (hasSemanticType attribute) to annotate the data received. The example of an instance is given in Section 4.

III. TRANSLATION APPROACH

In this section we describe the implementation of the BPMO2SBPEL translator, which transforms between instances of a BPMO model and a sBPEL model. The translator takes as input a WSML file containing BPMO instances of an individual business process and then generates as output a WSML file containing corresponding sBPEL instances (see example in Section 4). The generated sBPEL file can be used in a later stage for serialization and then execution in an appropriate engine.

We have developed a standalone java API for BPMO2SBPEL (available at http://kmi.open.ac.uk/projects/super/BPMO2SBPEL-2.0.zip). This API uses the WSMO4J API (http://wsmo4j.sourceforge.net) to parse and serialize XML versions of WSML as required; creates the input files from the XML files; and launches the ATL engine.

Figure 2. ATL Transformation of WSML instances

The translator has been developed using EMF\(^7\) (Eclipse Modelling Framework). The translator rules are written in ATL\(^8\) (Atlas Transformation Language), which is a hybrid language (a mix of declarative and imperative constructors), designed to express model transformations. As illustrated in the diagram of Figure 2, the ATL engine requires meta-models in the ECORE format and conforming XMI source and target models for the transformation. Since our source and target models are in WSML, we create a WSML meta-model using a specific EMF tool, which takes a XSD file. We use the XML syntax of WSML\(^9\) in order to generate the meta-model (Wsm.core) from WSML XSD. In addition, the input WSML XMI instances are generated (programmatically) from given WSML XML instances. There is a small issue with mixed XSD types within WSML XSD, which cannot be processed by ATL. The work around this problem was to create another version of the WSML XSD and corresponding meta-model.

---

\(^5\) http://ip-super.org/ontologies/process/sbpel/v2.0.0/sbpel
\(^6\) http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsbpel2.0/wsbpel-v2.0.html
\(^7\) http://www.eclipse.org/modelling/emf
\(^8\) http://www.eclipse.org/M2M/ATL
\(^9\) http://www.wsmo.org/TR/d16/d16.1/v0.21/xml-syntax/wsml-xml-syntax.xsd
A translation from BPMO to sBPEL can be based on structured or graph elements. Our implementation for translating a structured BPMO process is restricted to structured and pattern-based elements of BPMO. That is, we consider BPMO diagrams (instances) which contain Tasks (GoalTask, Receive, Send, MediationTask), Events and block patterns between a StartEvent and an EndEvent or within an initial Sequence. The block patterns supported are: Sequence, ParallelSplitSynchronise, MultipleChoiceMerge, DeferredChoiceMerge, Exclusive, ChoiceMerge, Repeat and While. In addition, the branches can only contain recursive single block-patterns. In this case, the instances of BPMO and the translated instances of sBPEL are structured. Note that BPMO processes that need not be translated (executed), have no such restrictions. On the other hand, a graph-based BPMO processes that need not be translated (executed), have the translated instances of BPMO as structured or graph elements. Our implementation for this case is to detect the composed branches in BPMO and translate them into sequences in sBPEL.

The translation involves a number of mapping cases, expressed in the ATL rules: sBPEL Partner, Role and Conversation concepts are derived from diverse attributes in BPMO Tasks; BPMO Tasks can derive multiple chained target concepts in sBPEL; ordered elements in BPMO (from sequences and conditional branches) generate linked-lists in sBPEL; and some target concepts in sBPEL must point back to the source concept in BPMO. Otherwise, both ontologies are aligned in the capacity of handling ontological data, SWS descriptions and semantic based mappings.

IV. TRANSLATION EXAMPLE

In this section we present an example of a simple business process model in order to illustrate the translation from BPMO to sBPEL. Figure 3 depicts the workflow diagram of a business process taken from a use case in the telecommunication domain within SUPER. The Content Provision Process is the model of a Telco service provider for downloading Web content for a customer. This process diagram was created using WSMO Studio’s BPMO Modeller\(^ {10}\), which generates an initial set of BPMO instances corresponding to the process control-flow, to which the user can add attribute values (links to ontology instances and SWS descriptions) using the modeller’s property editor.

According to the process workflow the following tasks take place: a request is received (Receive); the input is mediated (mapped to inputs of next tasks) (MediationTask); two invocations (GoalTasks) in parallel (ParallelSplitSynchronise) are performed to get the license and URL of the content; outputs are mediated (aggregated); and finally the result is sent (Send) to the customer. The process (service provider) is in fact interacting with three partners: the content requester (customer), the license provider and the content provider.

The BPMO instance representing the first task (Receive Content Request) is shown in Listing 4, and the result of the corresponding translation is shown in Listing 5. The instance of Process in BPMO is translated to an instance of SemanticProcess in sBPEL. A SemanticProcess has more concepts than the corresponding BPMO, so attributes like hasPartner and hasConversation are generated from information from other elements such as Receive in BPMO. The structured Sequence concept in BPMO is translated to the Sequence concept in sBPEL, implemented as a linked list. The ParallelSplitSynchronise in BPMO is translated to Flow in sBPEL. The translation of Receive generates a chain of concepts in sBPEL, which are ExtensionActivity, Receive, Conversation and IncomingInterface. These correspond respectively to the translation of Receive_ContentRequest (BPMO) to the instances Receive_ContentRequest_sBPEL, Receive_ContentRequest_sBPELReceive, Receive_ContentRequest_sBPELConversation and Receive_ContentRequest_sBPELInterface. Similar chains of concepts are created for the translation of GoalTask and Send. Note also the use of the correspondsTo attribute to point back to the originating BPMO instance.

\(^{10}\) http://www.wsmostudio.org/
The concept SemanticCapability in BPMO translates to SemanticVariable in sBPEL. For example, the value of the attribute hasInputDescription, which provides the URL of the concept that describes the input message, is translated to SemanticCapability_ContentRequestMessage_sBPEL (hasVariable attribute) in sBPEL. This SemanticVariable (hasSemanticType attribute) has the translated value. Listing 5. Example of sBPEL instance generated by the translator

BPMO as a model which represents business processes at the business level supports constructs that might not apply to sBPEL. Thus, similar to the mappings between BPMN and BPEL [12], the mappings from BPMO to sBPEL can only be partial. For example, BPMO allows business analysts to create arbitrary cycles, which are not supported in sBPEL. The way to restrict the translation is to use only translatable constructs such as block patterns in BPMO or doing a pre-validation through the use of axioms, which can guarantee that a valid BPMO instance contains only suitable elements for the translation. These axioms can be contained in a separate ontology and imported for validation of the BPMO instance. This is based on the fact (see for example [9]) that there is no generic translation from a graph-based notation such as allowed in BPMO to one such as sBPEL, which provides mostly structured activities to model a process and some restricted use of links to enable a graph-based style.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we show that we can effectively translate a business-level process model annotated with BPMO to an executable process model annotated with sBPEL, using a model-driven approach based on ATL rules. We presented the two ontologies and discussed elements related to Semantic Web Services. The preliminary implementation of our translator is limited to structured, pattern-based elements of BPMO. We illustrated our work using an example from a use case, but the ontologies (http://www.ip-super.org) as well as the translator’s API and ATL rules are freely available in a distribution package with complete examples at http://kmi.open.ac.uk/projects/super/BPMO2SBPEL-2.0.zip.

Regarding the use of ATL rules, we recognize that we do not follow on the original prescribed use of models in ATL, since in our approach the two used models (BPMO and SBPEL) use the same metamodel (WSML). Thus, we get low type safety from the models, but compensate by relying on the semantics given by the ontologies. Yet, our approach has proven to be quite effective as ATL provides not only a rule engine but also constructs that allow us to replace names (including namespaces) and check model hierarchies. In previous work we provided a translation based on WSML rules, but there the mappings could only imply (sBPEL) instances, which would have to be consumed at runtime inside a WSML based environment. With the approach in this paper we are able to generate a new ontology (file) with mapped instances, which can be validated against the SBPEL ontology and later extended.

VI. RELATED WORK

There is substantial work discussing the translation and mismatches between BPMN and BPEL (e.g. [12], [13]), and more generically between block and graph oriented workflow notations [9], which have informed the implementation of our ontologies and BPMO2sBPEL translator. For instance, the translation exploits appropriate workflow pattern representations in BPMO to avoid workflows with acyclic loops and unsynchronised branches. One main difference from that work to ours, though, is that we use ontologies and extensions to support Semantic Web Services. The Semantic Web approach presented in [8] has similar goals to our approach using BPMO, as the authors there argue that the syntactic approach provided by BPEL4WS has shortcomings that limit its ability to provide seamless interoperability. They propose the use of semantic-based technologies (OWL-S) to support automated service discovery, customization and semantic translation for BPEL4WS based processes; however, their annotations for services and data are decoupled from the syntactic control-flow language. BPMO, instead, provides semantically annotated workflow activities coupled with semantic descriptions of data and services. In addition, BPMO allows for semantic data transformation by the use of Mediation Tasks with Data Mediators that can be translated to extended assign operations in sBPEL.

The translation approach presented in [3] provides mappings from BPEL4WS to OWL-S, aiming at providing semantics to business process models. This work presents a bottom-up translation, from the syntactic level to the semantic level; however, it shows that there are a number of constructs from BPEL, such as synchronization, external (event-based)
choices and handlers, which cannot be mapped to OWL-S. In addition, input and output parameters in the resulting ontology need to be annotated with domain ontologies by the user.
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