A service-oriented approach for the *i** framework

By Hugo Estrada Esquivel

PhD Thesis

Presented to the Department of Information Systems and Computation of the Valencia University of Technology, Spain, and to the Department of Information and Communication Technology of the University of Trento, Italy in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Computer Science

September 2008

A service-oriented architecture for the *i** Framework

Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 THE CONTEXT 1

1.2 THE PROBLEM 3

1.2.1 The lack of evaluations of the i framework 3*

1.2.2 The lack of methodological extensions to improve the i framework 4*

1.3 THE SOLUTION 4

1.3.1 The lack of evaluations of the i framework 4*

1.3.2 The lack of methodological extensions to improve the i framework 5*

1.4 INNOVATIVE ASPECTS 7

1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS 9

2. THE STATE OF THE ART 11

2.1 EVALUATIONS OF THE *I** FRAMEWORK 12

2.1.1 Shehory and Sturm research works 12

2.1.2 Dam and Winikoff research works 16

2.1.3 Sudeikat research works 17

2.1.4 Summary of issues in the evaluation of i 18*

2.2 GOAL MODELING PROPOSALS 19

2.2.1 The Teleological approach for business modeling (Loucopoulos and Kavakli 1995) 20

2.2.2 The GBRAM approach for requirements analysis (Anton 1996) ... *24*
2.2.3 KAOS: Goal-based requirements elicitation Dardenne, Lamsweerde and Fickas 1993) ... *26*
2.2.4 EKD: Enterprise Modeling (Bubenko and Kirikova 1995) ... *30*
2.2.5 Goal reasoning with Tropos (Giorgini et al. 2002) ... *32*
2.3 THE SERVICE-ORIENTED PROPOSALS ... 34
2.3.1 Services at the implementation level ... *34*
2.3.2 Services at the conceptual modeling level ... *36*
2.3.3 Services at the organizational modeling level: ... *38*
2.3.4 The i proposals for representing services* ... *42*
2.4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS ... 44
3. THE EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF THE *I FRAMEWORK ... 45**
3.1 INTRODUCTION ... 45
3.2 AN OVERVIEW OF THE *I** FRAMEWORK ... 46
3.2.1 The i modeling primitives* ... *46*
3.2.2 The i modeling diagrams* ... *47*
3.3 THE CONTEXT OF THE EMPIRICAL EVALUATION ... 50
3.3.1 Object Model ... *53*
3.3.2 Dynamic Model ... *53*
3.3.3 Functional Model ... *54*
3.3.4 Presentation Model ... *54*
3.4 THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE EMPIRICAL EVALUATION ... 55
3.5 TYPE OF EMPIRICAL EVALUATION ... 56
3.6 THE POPULATION BACKGROUND ... 56
3.7 EVALUATION DESIGN ... 57
3.8 THE SELECTED CASE STUDIES ... 58
3.9 THE EVALUATION FRAMEWORK ... 59
3.10 THE EVALUATION RESULTS ... 63

3.10.1 Feature: Refinement *65*
3.10.2 Feature: Modularity *66*
3.10.3 Feature: Repeatability: *68*
3.10.4 Feature Complexity Management: *69*
3.10.5 Feature Expressiveness: *70*
3.10.6 Feature: Traceability: *73*
3.10.7 Feature: Reusability: *74*
3.10.8 Feature: Scalability: *74*
3.10.9 Feature: Domain applicability: *75*
3.11 DISCUSSION 76
4. THE MODELING LANGUAGE DEFINITION 79
4.1 INTRODUCTION 79
4.2 THE *i** PRIMITIVE CONCEPTS 81
4.3 THE *i** ABSTRACTION MECHANISMS 81
4.4 THE STRATEGY TO CHARACTERIZE ABSTRACTION MECHANISMS 83
4.5 AGGREGATION (*PART-OF*) RELATIONSHIP 85
*4.5.1 A multi-property framework to characterize aggregation in i** *85*
4.5.2 Decomposition links as an aggregation mechanism *91*
4.5.3 The characterization of the decomposition based on the proposed framework for the aggregation *92*
4.5.3.1 The partAND relationship: 93
4.5.3.2 The partOR relationship: 93
4.5.4 Summary of decomposition as an aggregation relationship *101*
4.6 THE ASSOCIATION (MEMBER-OF) RELATIONSHIPS 102
*4.6.1 A multi-property framework for characterizing the association relationships in i** *102*
4.6.2 Means-End links as an association mechanism *103*
4.6.3 The characterization of the means-end link based on the proposed framework *104*

4.6.4 Summary of means-end as an association relation *111*
4.6.5 Contribution links as an association mechanism *111*
4.6.6 The characterization of the contributions link based on the proposed framework *112*
4.6.7 Summary of contribution link as an association relation ... *120*
4.6.8 Dependency as an association mechanism *120*
4.6.9 The characterization of dependency based on the proposed framework *121*
4.6.10 Summary of dependency as an association relationship ... *126*
4.7 THE GENERALIZATION (*IS-A*) RELATIONSHIP 128
*4.7.1 A multi-property framework for characterizing the generalization in i** *128*
4.7.2 The i is-a relationship* *129*
4.7.3 The characterization of generalization based on the proposed framework *130*
4.7.4 Summary of is-a as a classification relationship *133*
4.8 THE CLASSIFICATION (*INSTANCE-OF*) RELATIONSHIP 133
*4.8.1 A multi-property framework for characterizing the classification in i** *133*
4.8.2 The instance-of relationship as classification mechanism .. *133*
4.8.3 The characterization of classification based on the proposed framework *134*
4.9 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS 136
5. THE SERVICE-ORIENTED ARCHITECTURE FOR THE *I FRAMEWORK 139**
5.1 INTRODUCTION 139
5.2 THE PROPOSED SOLUTION: A BUSINESS SERVICE APPROACH FOR THE *I** FRAMEWORK 140
5.2.1 What is a service? *141*
5.2.2 Our conceptualization about business service *144*
5.2.3 Why a service orientation? *147*
5.2.4 The characteristics of business service orientation *148*

5.3 A BUSINESS SERVICE ARCHITECTURE FOR THE *i** FRAMEWORK . 151
5.3.1 The service-oriented strategy ... *152*
5.3.2 Overview of engaging a business service ... *154*
5.3.3 Implications of the service-oriented strategy ... *155*
5.3.4 The service-oriented components ... *157*
5.3.5 Intentional elements ... *157*
5.3.6 Actors ... *158*
5.3.5.1 Actor composite structure ... 159
5.3.5.2 Actor Types ... 162
5.3.7 Business Services ... *164*
5.3.6.1 Basic and composite business services ... 169
5.3.6.2 Offered and supporting business services ... 171
5.3.8 Requester(s) and Provider(s) ... *174*
5.3.9 Requesting a service ... *177*
5.3.10 Business processes ... *179*
5.3.11 Visibility rules ... *181*
5.3.10.1 Rules for service visibility ... 181
5.3.10.2 Rules for actor visibility ... 182
5.3.12 Delegation rules ... *183*
5.4 ARCHITECTURAL MODELS ... 185
5.4.1 The Global Model ... *185*
5.4.1.1 Abstract view of the global model ... 185
5.4.1.2 Concrete view of the global model ... 186
5.4.2 The Process Model ... *189*
5.4.2.1 Transactional and non-transactional processes ... 189
5.4.2.2 Authorized actors ... 190
5.4.2.3 Process execution order ... 191
5.4.3 The Protocol Model ... *192*
5.5 THE FORMALIZATION OF THE COMPONENTS OF THE PROPOSED SERVICE-ORIENTED APPROACH ... 194
5.5.1 Predicates ... *194*

5.5.2 Axioms for predicates *197*

5.6 OUR BUSINESS SERVICE APPROACH AS STARTING POINT FOR SERVICES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION LEVEL 198

5.7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS 202

6. THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD FOR THE *I FRAMEWORK 203**

6.1 INTRODUCTION 203

6.2 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED METHOD 204

6.3 THE STRATEGY OF THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD 208

6.4 DEFINING THE SERVICE GLOBAL MODEL 210

6.4.1 Defining the abstract view of the global model. *211*

Step 1: Eliciting business services 212

Step 2: Representing the service provider 213

Step 3: Representing the service requesters 213

Step 4: Representing the service dependency 214

Step 5. Defining composite and basic business services. 216

6.4.2 Defining the detailed view of the global model. *219*

Step 1. Defining the provider's needs and goals 220

Step 2. Defining the actors that are responsible for the service's goals. 225

Step 3. Detecting dependencies from the goal-refinement tree 228

Step 4. Reviewing the delegation schema 232

Step 5. Defining the visibility schema. 235

6.5 DEFINING THE PROCESS MODEL 240

Step 1. Determining business processes by refinement 241

Step 2. Determining process goals by abstraction 241

Step 3. Linking goals and processes with organization actors 241

Step 4. Reviewing the delegation schema 242

Step 5. Detecting dependencies from the goal-refinement tree 245

Step 6. Defining the visibility schema. 247

Step 7. Specifying process execution order 248

6.6 DEFINING THE PROTOCOL MODEL 250

Step 1. Determining business tasks by refinement 252
Step 2. Determining process goals by abstraction 252
Step 3. Linking the goals and process with organization actors 252
Step 4. Detecting dependencies from the goal-refinement tree 252
Step 5. Generating dependencies from the goal structure 254
Step 6. Generating a rationale model from goal structure 256
Step 7. Determining transactional business processes 257
6.7 THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD AS A MECHANISM TO ALIGN BUSINESS GOALS 258
6.8 ANALYZING THE FUTURE ENTERPRISE SITUATION 260
6.8.1 Analyzing the market conditions 260
6.8.2 Defining objectives to be satisfied 260
6.8.3 Adapting the enterprise to the selected alternative 262
6.9 SUMMARY 263
7. THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD: A CASE STUDY 265
7.1 INTRODUCTION 265
7.2 APPLYING THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD 266
7.3 ANALYZING THE PROPOSED SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD 293
7.4 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS 295
8. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK 297
8.1 THE EMPIRICAL EVALUATION OF THE *i** FRAMEWORK 297
8.2 THE DEFINITION OF THE MODELING LANGUAGE 298
8.3 THE SERVICE-ORIENTED ARCHITECTURE 299
8.4 THE SERVICE-ORIENTED METHOD 300
8.5 SUMMARY OF MAIN CONTRIBUTIONS 303
8.6 RELATED PUBLICATIONS 303
8.7 FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS 307
9. REFERENCES 308