

# A FORMAL MODELING APPROACH TO ONTOLOGY ENGINEERING

*MODELING, TRANSFORMATION & VERIFICATION*

YUAN FANG LI

*B.Sc.(Hons). NUS*

A THESIS SUBMITTED

FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE  
NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE

2006

# Acknowledgement

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere gratitude to those who assisted me, in one way or another, with my Ph.D. in the last four years.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my Honor's Year Project and Ph.D. advisor Dr. Dong Jin Song for his never-ending enthusiasm, guidance, support, encouragement and insight throughout the course of my post graduate study. His diligent reading and insightful and constructive criticism of early drafts and many other works made this thesis possible.

To my fellow students, Chen Chunqing, Sun Jun and my cousin Feng Yuzhang – your friendship, collaboration and funny chit chat gave me inspiration and helped me go through the long and sometimes not-so-smooth ride of Ph.D. study.

To my former lab mates Dr. Sun Jing and Dr. Wang Hai – for your suggestions on all aspects of research works and generous hospitality.

I am indebt to Dr. Bimlesh Wadha and Dr. Khoo Siau Cheng for the valuable comments on an early draft of this thesis. Dr. Wadha, in particular, carefully reviewed the entire thesis and corrected many language errors. I am sincerely grateful to her for the time and effort put into this.

I am also grateful to the external examiner and many anonymous reviewers who reviewed this thesis and previous publications that are part of this thesis and provided critical comments, which contributed to the clarification of many of the ideas presented in this thesis.

This thesis was in part funded by the “Defence Innovative Research Project – Formal Design Methods and DAML” by the Defence Science and Technology Agency of Singapore. The Advanced Study Institute of NATO Science Committee sponsored me for attending the 2004 Marktoberdorf Summer School. My gratitude also goes to Singapore Millennium Foundation and National University of Singapore for the generous financial support, in forms of scholarship, the President's Graduate Fellowship and conference travel allowance.

I wish to thank sincerely and deeply my parents who have raised me, taught me and supported me all these years and who always have faith in me.

Finally and most importantly, to my beloved wife Xing Meng Nan. Your ceaseless love, encouragement, patience and wonderful cooking have kept my morale and stamina high.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation and Goals . . . . .	1
1.2	Thesis Outline . . . . .	6
1.2.1	Chapter 2 . . . . .	6
1.2.2	Chapter 3 . . . . .	7
1.2.3	Chapter 4 . . . . .	7
1.2.4	Chapter 5 . . . . .	9
1.2.5	Chapter 6 . . . . .	10
1.2.6	Chapter 7 . . . . .	11
1.2.7	Chapter 8 . . . . .	11
1.3	Publications . . . . .	12
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1	The Semantic Web – Languages & Tools . . . . .	13
2.2	Semantic Web Services Ontology OWL-S . . . . .	25
2.3	Z & Alloy – Languages & Tools . . . . .	27
2.3.1	Z . . . . .	27
2.3.2	Alloy . . . . .	33
2.4	Institutions & Institution Morphisms . . . . .	37

<b>3</b>	<b>Checking Web Ontologies using Z/EVES</b>	<b>41</b>
3.1	Z Semantics for DAML+OIL . . . . .	42
3.1.1	Basic Concepts . . . . .	42
3.1.2	Class Elements . . . . .	43
3.1.3	Property Restrictions . . . . .	44
3.1.4	Property Elements . . . . .	45
3.1.5	Instances . . . . .	46
3.2	Import Mechanisms & Proof Support . . . . .	46
3.3	Military Plan Ontologies . . . . .	47
3.4	Transformation from DAML+OIL/RDF to Z . . . . .	49
3.5	Checking DAML+OIL Ontologies using Z/EVES . . . . .	51
3.5.1	Inconsistency Checking . . . . .	51
3.5.2	Subsumption Reasoning . . . . .	53
3.5.3	Instantiation Reasoning . . . . .	53
3.5.4	Instance Property Reasoning . . . . .	54
3.6	Chapter Summary . . . . .	55
<b>4</b>	<b>A Combined Approach to Checking Web Ontologies</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1	Alloy Semantics for DAML+OIL . . . . .	59
4.1.1	Import Mechanisms & Proof Support . . . . .	61
4.2	Z Semantics for SWRL . . . . .	61
4.3	Transformation from Web Ontologies to Z & Alloy . . . . .	63
4.3.1	Transformation from SWRL to Z . . . . .	63
4.3.2	Transformation from DAML+OIL to Alloy . . . . .	64
4.4	The Combined Approach to Checking Web Ontologies . . . . .	65

4.4.1	An Overview of the Combined Approach . . . . .	65
4.4.2	Checking Military Plan Ontology . . . . .	67
4.4.3	Reasoning About More Complex Properties . . . . .	72
4.5	Chapter Summary . . . . .	81
<b>5</b>	<b>Z Semantics for OWL: Soundness Proof Using Institution Morphisms</b>	<b>83</b>
5.1	The OWL Institution $\mathfrak{D}$ . . . . .	84
5.1.1	The Grothendieck Institution of OWL . . . . .	91
5.2	The Institution $\mathfrak{Z}$ . . . . .	92
5.2.1	The Use of the Mathematical Tool-kit . . . . .	94
5.3	Encoding $\mathfrak{D}$ in $\mathfrak{Z}$ . . . . .	95
5.4	Chapter Summary . . . . .	102
<b>6</b>	<b>The Tools Environment: SESeW</b>	<b>103</b>
6.1	Overview of SESeW . . . . .	104
6.2	Ontology Creation . . . . .	105
6.2.1	Performance Evaluation . . . . .	107
6.3	Ontology Querying . . . . .	108
6.4	Ontology Transformation . . . . .	110
6.5	External Tools Connection . . . . .	112
6.6	Chapter Summary . . . . .	113
<b>7</b>	<b>Simulating Semantic Web Services with LSCs and Play-Engine</b>	<b>115</b>
7.1	LSCs & Play-Engine . . . . .	116
7.2	Modeling OWL-S with LSCs . . . . .	118
7.2.1	Basics . . . . .	118

7.2.2	Processes . . . . .	120
7.3	Case Study . . . . .	124
7.3.1	System scenario . . . . .	124
7.3.2	Simulation . . . . .	127
7.4	Chapter Summary . . . . .	129
<b>8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>131</b>
8.1	Main Contributions of the Thesis . . . . .	131
8.2	Future Work Directions . . . . .	136
8.2.1	Further Development of SESeW . . . . .	136
8.2.2	Verification of Web Ontologies – Beyond Static Data . . . . .	137
8.2.3	Augmenting the Semantic Web with Belief . . . . .	139
<b>A</b>	<b>Glossary of Z Notation</b>	<b>155</b>
A.1	Definitions and Declarations . . . . .	155
A.2	Logic . . . . .	156
A.3	Sets . . . . .	157
A.4	Numbers . . . . .	158
A.5	Relations . . . . .	159
A.6	Functions . . . . .	160
A.7	Sequences . . . . .	162
A.8	Bags . . . . .	163
A.9	Axiomatic Definitions . . . . .	163
A.10	Generic Definitions . . . . .	164
A.11	Schema Definition . . . . .	165
A.12	Schema Operators . . . . .	165

A.13 Operation Schemas . . . . .	169
A.14 Operation Schema Operators . . . . .	170
<b>B Z Semantics for DAML+OIL</b>	<b>171</b>
B.1 Basic Concepts . . . . .	171
B.2 Class Elements . . . . .	172
B.3 Class Enumeration . . . . .	173
B.4 Property Restriction . . . . .	173
B.5 Property Elements . . . . .	175
B.6 Instances . . . . .	176
<b>C Z Semantics for OWL DL</b>	<b>179</b>
C.1 Basic Concepts . . . . .	179
C.2 Classes . . . . .	181
C.2.1 Class Descriptions . . . . .	181
C.2.2 Class Axioms . . . . .	185
C.3 Properties . . . . .	186
C.3.1 RDF Schema Property Constructs . . . . .	186
C.3.2 Relations to Other Properties . . . . .	187
C.3.3 Global Cardinality Constraints on Properties . . . . .	188
C.3.4 Logical Characteristics of Properties . . . . .	188
C.4 Individuals . . . . .	189
C.4.1 Individual Identity . . . . .	189

## Summary

The Semantic Web has been regarded by many as the new generation of the World Wide Web. It enables software agents on the Web to autonomously and collaboratively understand, process and aggregate information by giving Web resources well-defined and machine-interpretable markups, in the form of ontologies.

Ensuring the correctness of ontologies is very important as inconsistent ontologies may lead software agents to reason erroneously. Such tasks are non trivial as the more expressive ontology languages are, the less automated are the reasoners/provers and with the growth of the size of ontologies, locating inconsistencies is also more difficult.

Further, as the expressivity of these languages is also limited in more than one way, certain desirable ontology-related properties cannot be expressed in these languages. The ability to express and check these properties will make ontologies more accurate and more robust. It is therefore highly desirable.

Dynamic Web services help make the Web truly ubiquitous. In the Semantic Web, service ontologies describe the capabilities, requirements, control structures, etc., of Web services. Their consistency must also be guaranteed to ensure the correct functioning of software agents.

Software engineering and in particular formal methods are an active and well-developed research area. We believe that mature formal methods and their tool support can contribute to the development of the Semantic Web. This thesis presents a formal modeling approach for verifying ontologies. By defining semantics of ontology languages in expressive formal languages, their proof tools can be used to ensure the correctness of ontology-related properties.

The validity of the above approach entirely relies on the correctness of the semantics of ontology languages in formal methods. Hence, the other important topic in this thesis is the proof of such correctness. An abstract approach using institutions and institution morphisms is employed to represent and reason about ontology languages and formal languages. An integrated tools environment is also presented to facilitate the application of the verification approach.

**Key words:** Semantic Web, DAML+OIL, institutions, ontology, OWL, verification, Z, LSC



# List of Tables

2.1	Predefined Qualified Name Prefixes . . . . .	16
2.2	Strength & weakness of the reasoning tools . . . . .	36
4.1	SWRL rules atoms in Z . . . . .	63
4.2	Statistics of the ontology planA.daml . . . . .	75
7.1	A Partial Summary of the OWL-S constructs . . . . .	121



# List of Figures

1.1	Generic architecture of the Semantic Web . . . . .	2
2.1	A newly proposed layering of the Semantic Web . . . . .	22
2.2	Architecture of the OWL-S ontology . . . . .	26
3.1	Sample IE output . . . . .	48
4.1	Discovery of an unsatisfiable concept by RACER . . . . .	68
4.2	Alloy concepts related to the inconsistency . . . . .	69
4.3	Alloy Analyzer showing the source of unsatisfiability . . . . .	71
6.1	Main Window of SESeW . . . . .	104
6.2	Flow of Ontology Creation . . . . .	105
6.3	Creating Datatype Property . . . . .	106
6.4	Performance of Ontology Creation . . . . .	108
6.5	The Query Interface . . . . .	109
7.1	Holiday booking System . . . . .	125
7.2	LSC Example: Budget checking . . . . .	127
7.3	Simulation Screen Shot . . . . .	128