

Web of Data: P2P Business domain translation of problem spaces. Semantic Business Integration (WIP draft)

© 2017. Sebastian Samaruga (ssamarug@gmail.com)

Copyright (c) 2017 Sebastian Samaruga

Permission is granted to copy, distribute and/or modify this document under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License, Version 1.3 or any later version published by the Free Software Foundation;

with no Invariant Sections, no Front-Cover Texts, and no Back-Cover Texts.

A copy of the license is included in the section entitled "GNU Free Documentation License".

GNU Free Documentation License:

<https://www.gnu.org/licenses/fdl-1.3.txt>

1 - Scope

Enable seamless integration of different datasources and services from different deployments and platforms to interoperate. A system A, for example, in the domain of CRM (Customer Relationship Management) and, a system B, in the domain of HMS (Healthcare Management System) would be able to be plugged into a 'bus'. Then, actions (CRUD, service invocations) in one system should have 'meaning' for the other (potentially many) systems.

2 - Introduction

The goal is to streamline and augment with analysis and knowledge discovery capabilities enhanced declarative and reactive event driven process flows of applications between frameworks, protocols and tools via Semantic Web backed integration and Big (linked) Data applications enhancements. Perform EAI / Semantics driven Business Integration (BI).

Provide diverse information schema merge and syndicated data sources and services interoperability (for example different domains or applications databases). Translate behavior in one domain context into corresponding behavior(s) in other context or domains via aggregation of domain data into knowledge facts.

Aggregate knowledge into components (metamodels) which can interact between each other (databases, business domain descriptions, services, etc) into a dialog-enabling manner via dataflow (activation) protocols which activates referrer / referring contexts with knowledge enabled from participating models.

Keywords

Semantic Web, RDF, OWL, Big Data, Big Linked Data, Dataflow, Reactive programming, Functional Programming, Event Driven, Message Driven, ESB, EAI, Inference, Reasoning.

Description

Current landscape: Document Web vs. Data Web applications.

The current Web (and the applications built upon it) are inherently 'document based' applications in which state change occurs via the navigation of hyperlinks. Besides some state transitions on the server side by means of 'application' servers, not much has changed since the web was just an 'human friendly' frontend of diverse (linked) resources for representation.

Even 'meta' protocols implemented over HTTP / REST are layers of indirection over this same paradigm. At the end we are all ending up spitting HTML in some form or another. And much of this seems like a workaround over another while we still trying to get some juice from 'documents'.

The Web of data is not going to change this. And it's not going to be widely adopted because the only thing it has in common with 'traditional' Web is the link(ed) part. No one will ever figure out how to build Web pages with 'Semantic' Web. It's like trying to build websites with CSV files. That's not the role in which SW will shine.

Semantic Web is a set of representation (serialization) formats and a bunch of (meta) protocols which excels for the modeling and accessing of graphs. Graphs of... well, graphs of anything (anything which may have an URI, at least). Let's call a graph a set of nodes and a set of arcs between nodes, these are Resources. A triple is a set of three Resources: a Subject Resource, a Predicate Resource and an Object Resource (SPO: node, arc, node). A Triple may have eventually a fourth Resource, a Context, then the Triple (Quad) has the form: CSPO.

Now imagine a CSV file (or a database engine) that given this input files could relate it with a lot of other files, 'calculates' missing fields or figures out new ones. It may also figure out new 'rows'. This is what Semantic Web has of 'semantic' and exactly what it has not of 'Web', in the traditional sense.

So, SW is a data exchange mechanism with formats and protocols. For user agent consumption it has to be rendered into some kind of document, like it is done for a (graph) database. But the real power of using the SW approach is for machine consumption. We'll be using it that way in our example approach of EAI / Business Integration as a metamodel encoding facility which will entail aggregation and reasoning of business domains facts and flows. We'll be using 'ontologies'. An 'ontology' is for SW format representations as a database schema is for queries / statements only that this schema is modelled as SW resources as well.

Declaratively stated 'purposes' (an ontology of task related flows, roles and goals) should abstract producer / consumer peer interfaces for interactions in message exchanges. An ESB implementation of metamodels representing various domains of knowledge (databases, services, learning and inference engines) and message routing between them will exploit the 'semantic' capabilities while keeping 'representation friendly' consumer agent exchange mechanisms.

Objectives

Inputs: Syndicated datasources, backends of diverse applications databases, services interfaces (REST / SOAP / JMS, for example) should be aggregated and merged (matching equivalent records, for example) via the application of 'Semantic' metamodels thus providing via virtualization and syncing interoperability between those applications.

Features: Once consolidated metamodels of the domains involved into the business integration process are available, services metamodels come into play providing alignment (ontology matching, augmentation and sorting), transformations and endpoint features.

Connectors: The goal, once source data / services are consolidated and aligned is to provide APIs for different languages / platforms which enable consumers of those data / services retrieve rich 'augmented' and enhanced knowledge that was not present in the original (integrated) backends.

Considerations:

Given applications (big or microservices) there should be a way, given its schemas, data and behavior to 'infer' (align into a semantic upper ontology) what this applications do (semantically speaking).

Given a business domain problem space (data, schema and behavior for an application, for example) a 'translation' could be made between other domain(s) problem spaces which encompasses a given set of data, schema and behavior instances (objectives) to be solved in the other domains in respect of the problems in the first domain.

This shall be accomplished by means of an event-driven architecture in a semantics aware metamodels layer which leverages diverse backend integration (sync) and schema merge / interoperability. Also, a declarative layer is provided for aggregation and composition of related event flows of various objectives to meet a given purpose.

An example: In the healthcare domain an event: flu diagnose growth above normal limits is to be translated in the financial domain (maybe of a government or an institution) as an increase of money amount dedicated to flu prevention or treatment. In the media or advertisement domain the objectives of informing population about flu prevention and related campaigns may be

raised. And in the technology sector the tasks of analyzing and summarizing statistical data for better campaigns must be done.

Purpose: Domain translation of problem spaces. Trays, flows. Messaging. Goal patterns. Prompts for state completion. Purpose goals driven domain use cases (DCI) application platform (services: data / schema for facts, information, behavior). Scoped contexts flows hierarchies.

Proposal

The proposed application framework to be implemented as mentioned in this document is thought to provide means for full stack deployments (from presentation through business logic to persistence) for semantically business integrated and enhanced applications.

The core components are distributed and functional in nature: REST endpoints, transformations layer, functional metamodels / node abstractions (profile driven discovery and service subscriptions) over an ESB implementation.

An important goal will be to be able to work with any given datasources / schemas / ontologies without the need of having a previous knowledge of them or their structures for being able to work and interact with them via some of the following features:

Feature: Data backends / services virtualization (federation / syndication / synchronization). Merge of source data and services.

Any datasources (backends / services) entities and schema regarded as being meaningful for a business domain translation and integration use case, regardless of their source format or protocol.

Business domain translation (dynamic templates). ESB customization features BI by means of abstract declarative layers of sources, processing and formatting of knowledge.

Feature: Schema (ontology) merge / match / alignment. Attributes / links inference. Contextual arrangement (sorting / comparisons). Metamodel services.

Diverse domain application data with diverse backend databases and services and diverse sources of business data (linked data ontologies, customers, product and suppliers among others) are to be aligned by merging matching entities and schema, once syndication and synchronization are available.

Examples: different names for the same entity, entity class or entity attribute. Type inference.

Identity alignment: merge equivalent entities / instances.

Attributes / Links alignment: resolution of (missing / new) attributes or links. Relationship type promotion.

Order (contextual sorting) alignment: given some context (temporal, causal, etc.) resolve order relations (comparisons).

Goal: 'enrich' applications actual services with domains knowledge. Query this knowledge by means of a dedicated endpoint for ad-hoc interaction contexts enhancements.

Goal: survey existing applications and components 'semantic' descriptors for integration in context of an ESB deployment which will provide their knowledge and behavior via 'facades' of those systems, which in turn will interact with the systems themselves.

Solution

MDM. Governance (client connectors). For schemas, data and behavior (plug in component / services for developing custom ad-hoc task apps integrated. platforms app devel toolkits).

Leverage existing solutions

Current needs / problems:

Current enterprise / business applications implementation technologies range from a very wide variety of vendor products or frameworks which handle different aspects of behavior and functionality needed for implementing use cases.

The current approach seems to be a 'divide and conquer' one. There is much effort being done in decomposing big applications into 'microservices' ones. But there remains being (small) black boxes which do 'something' (small). The semantics and discovery interoperations are left to the developer building apps that way.

The proposal here is to 'syndicate' (homologue) diverse systems backends and services for the sake of 'knowledge propagation' between diverse domains of diverse systems so behavior in one system is reflected in behavior in other domains.

A Metamodel abstraction takes care of semantically represent and unify, by means of an API and interfaces, the different datasources, backends, services, features (alignment, augmentation, reasoning, etc.) that may get integrated into an ESB deployment. Each Metamodel is plugged into contexts with pipes of message streams with endpoints collaborating for each Metamodel to perform its tasks plus aggregation and other Node(s) knowledge propagation.

Messages abstract Metamodels state in 'semantic' form. A metamodel has an ontology of resources which get 'activated' from messages and 'activates' (fires) new messages.

Metamodels provide (via Messages):

Datasource, backend, service bindings: IO. Virtualization, consolidation / syndication.
Synchronization and schema align and merge.

Core Functional Alignment:

Ontology (schema) merge. Type inference. Attributes and relationships alignment / augmentation. Relationship promotions.

Order inference. Contextual order inference alignment / augmentation (temporal, causal, containment, etc.).

Identity and instance equivalence inference. Determine whether two subjects (different schema / identifiers) refer to the same entities.

Infer business domain process semantics and operations / behavior from schema and data (and services). Aggregate descriptors (events, rules, flows).

Data, information and knowledge layers:

Data layer:

Example: (aProduct, price, 10);

Metamodel: TBD.

Information layer:

Example: (aProductPrice, percentVariation, +10);

Metamodel: TBD.

Knowledge (behavior) layer:

Example: (aProductPriceVariation, tendencyLastMonth, rise);

Metamodel: TBD.

Data: ([someNewsArticle] [subject] [climateChange]);

Information: ([someMedia] [names] [ecology]);

Knowledge: ([mention] [mentions] [mentionable]);

Metamodel layers:

Facts, Information, Knowledge.

TBD.

Enhanced deployments

Existing deployed solutions could leverage of the benefits the stated approach. Existing clients and services could retrieve knowledge augmented data from a service in the context of their interactions.

Applications 'plugged' in this semantic 'bus', their processes could trigger or be triggered from / to another applications processes (maybe orchestrated by some domain translation declarative template).

Dados los mecanismos actuales de manejo de información y de la gestión de los procesos asociados a dicha información se pretende proveer a las herramientas actuales de medios aplicativos de la llamada gestión de bases de conocimiento que brinden insights en tiempo real tanto de análisis como de explotación de datos que ayuden a enriquecer con mejoras tanto la utilización del conocimiento como la toma de decisiones.

Infer business domain processes semantics and operations / behavior from schema, data and services (interfaces). An ontology (domain description schema) should be provided / interpreted for new or existing applications and services. Aggregated metamodels (events, rules, flows) based on existing or newly deployed behavior are driven from this schemas.

P2P: Purpose and capabilities discovery driven domain translation of business problem spaces. Enterprise bus of pluggable ontology domains, topics and peers providing features as backends (Big Data), alignment, rules, workflows, inference, learning and endpoints. Due the distributed nature of SOA (ESB) a P2P Peer in some form of protocol could be implemented via messaging endpoints. 'Templates metadata'.

As mentioned before an existing deployed application could benefit from this framework integrating its data and services when plugged into the bus. It then may be enhanced using actual flows to consume augmented knowledge or being available to / for consumption by other applications or services.

2 - Metamodel

For enabling different sources of data and services behaviors to be treated in an uniform manner a fine grained metamodel of such artifacts should be done as for enable description and discovery of 'alignments' which are the means for one element understanding each other element behavior.

A Metamodel renders schema / instances of data, information and knowledge layers for a given

domain.

The 'class' hierarchy, modelled as RDF quads has the following pattern:

Classes and their instances are modelled as a quad hierarchy of OOP classes:

ClassName : (instanceURI, occurrenceURI, attributeURI, valueURI);

A quad context URI (instance / player) identifies an instance statement (in an ontology) of a given OOP class. All ontology quads with the same context URI represent the same 'instance' which have different attributes with different values for a given occurrence.

An instance (player) may have many 'occurrences' (into different source statements / quads). For example: a resource into an statement, a kind into a fact, etc.

For whatever occurrences a player instance may have there will be a corresponding set of 'attributes' and 'values' pairs determining, for example, if the player is having a subject role in an statement then the attribute is the predicate and the value is the object of the given statement, the aggregated pairs of those occurrences, in common with other instances, the 'subject kind' of the resource, thus performing basic type inference.

Metamodel abstractions are wrapped into Functional Programming 'monads' (Resource) with reactive dataflow event driven semantics. Dataflow graph encodes dependencies / dependents for activation graphs tracking (input, state, output). Publisher, subscriber, subscriptions and exchanged follow a DCI (TBD) design pattern.

Distance: Dimensional metadata of Functional result Resource. Comparable (order).

Dimensional (semiotic) statements pattern: reify x is y of z in w statements. A statement will hold references to this dimensional data in their occurrences.

Upper ontology. Reified Metamodel plus encoding (IPs). Classes / Function / Kinds as Resources.

Grammars. Kinds Statement patterns.

Sustantivar (S); Verbalizar (P); Adjetivar (O); Pasión, Acción, Estado.

Upper ontology: exchange, merge, align. ISO 4D (object, time, place, attribute, value).

Exchange of reified and instance metamodels (schema + instances). Vocabulary: semiotics sing + concept + language.

Normalize URIs hierarchy:

Normalize Metamodel hierarchy into Resource IDs aggregable statements.

Reify Metamodel hierarchy into Resource IDs aggregated statements.

Inferir / aggregate Kinds / Instances of compound URIs.

Example:

Topic: (Statement, URI, Metamodel);

Topic: Amor (Persona / Metamodel, Amante / URI, Pareja / Statement);

Reified Metamodel statements now could be aggregated for Resource ID inference.

Given that:

- Parent: superclass (occurrences).
- Attribute: Parent superclass (occurrences) attributes.
- Value: Parent superclass occurrences attributes values.

And the 'monadic' type which homologue all the hierarchy is of the form:

- Resource<Observable<T extends URI>> : T occurrences

The resulting 'class' hierarchy, given the following 'notation':

- Context (class) : Superclass (S, P, O);

is as follows:

- URI : (URI, URI, URI)
- URI (T): REST Semantics. HATEOAS / HAL, JSON-LD API. Reactive uniform representation API (HTTP verbs) through Resource monad.
- URI is the parent class of, for example, DBURI, RestURI, SPARQLURI, SoapURI, etc. which are the types that, wrapped by a monadic Resource, provides the connection mechanisms to the underlying protocols.
- Metamodel : URI (parent, attr, value);

A Metamodel is anything that could be modelled or represented by URI statements.

- Statement : Metamodel (parent, attr, value);

A Statement (reified) represents a Context Subject, Predicate, Object (CSPO) structure.

- Topic / Purpose : Statement (parent, attr, value);

A Topic is a set of Statements 'talking' about the same subject.

- Class : Topic (parent, attr, val);

A Class is the aggregated set of Topics 'talking' about the same kind of resources.

- Behavior : Class (parent, attr, val);

A Behavior represents an abstract 'action' which may be carried.

- Flow : Behavior (parent, attr, val);

A Flow is a concrete instance of a Behavior, for example a transition between Class attributes.

An aggregation algorithm is to be provided so it is possible to infer / aggregate topmost Flow(s) from original URI / Statement(s). Also, as Resource is a reactive designed monadic wrapper this algorithm performs in a publisher / subscriber manner and it is able to 'react' the underlying model given activation or inputs matching consumers which will propagate changes to its subscribers.

Metamodel specification:

(URI, URI, URI, URI);

(Statement : URI, URI, URI, URI);

Metamodel (domain): (Metamodel : URI, Statement, URI, URI);

(Topic : Metamodel, Metamodel, Statement, URI);

(Class : Topic, Topic, Metamodel, Statement);

(Behavior : Class, Class, Metamodel, Statement);

(Flow : Behavior, Behavior, Class, Metamodel);

Reified form (upper ontology domains): (Topic, Class, Behavior, Flow);

3 - Ontology Alignment

Datasource interoperability

Normalize input statements (URIs):

Translate any datasource to the following tabular roles:

Tabular roles: (Table, PK, Column, Value);

Statement roles: (Player, Occurrence, Attribute, Value);

Traversing quad elements:

Previous element in quad: metaclass.

Current element in quad: class.

Next element in quad: instance.

Aggregation: Same URIs parent / child of previous / next URIs.

Instance: current role URI / previous role aggregated URIs. Final: datatype / primitive. Example: age.

Kinds: current role same URIs / next role aggregated URIs. Example: Person. Final: Top (Object)

Alignment roles: (Datatype / Primitive, Kind / Instance, Kind / Instance, Kind / Instance).

From 2 datasources the final datatype / primitive 'aligns' sources statements (1 and 2 different sources to be merged):

Alignment roles 1: (Carpenter / Guiseppe, Grandparent / Giuseppe, Parent / Peter, Person / Joseph);

Alignment roles 2: (Carpenter2 / Giuseppe2, Grandparent2 / Guiuseppe2, Parent2 / Peter2, Person2 / Joseph2);

Context Kind / Context Instance: should be in both sources as the value of the player role of the statement. Metaclass of subject Kind.

Sliding (disambiguation):

Datatype / Primitives: regarding Context: Carpenter / Profession 'slides' to subject position, Bronx / Town occupies context (sliding till reach primitives).

Chained Kind (SPOs): Identify lowermost (top superclasses, objects) of Kind hierarchies. Aggregate Kind / sub Kind hierarchies. Sub Kinds: attributes are superset of those of super Kind.

Assign instance, class, metaclass and player roles. Player role: Datatype / Primitive or Kind / Instance.

If player role ends in Datatype / Primitive alignment could be performed.

If player role ends in Kind / Instance a new statement should be made 'sliding' player to class and recalculating hierarchies.

Match Datatype / Instance are the same values: Training. Mappings: learn hierarchies for known matching players. Semiotic alignment (sign is object for context in concept).

Semiotic Function: Languages: terms, semiotic mappings. Augmented dictionary (a is b in ctx for d).

Match Datatype / Instance are the same values: same Kind / Instance hierarchies taxonomy (graph shape). Abstract graph of models nodes (Kind roles: previous, current, next). Merge aggregated graphs augmenting Kind with attributes (Instance lattice). Attribute similarity function.

Alignments (merge):

- ID / Type merge: matching resources: same entities.
- Link / Attribute merge: matching resources sharing unknown attributes in context augmentation.
- Order / Context merge: matching resources with 'wildcards' in contexts / CSPO axes which respect Kind / Instance hierarchies. Wildcards will be provided with a comparator function.

Reifying Metamodel: Normalize Metamodel hierarchy into Resource IDs (Metamodel) aggregable statements.

4 - Algorithmic Alignment

Objective: encode URI statement quads into numeric quads (ResourceIDs) for, for example, Machine Learning algorithms or virtual network addressing (IPs) for resources.

The idea is being able to use a fixed length quad of fixed length components being able to 'reuse' a same numeric identifier with another meaning in another quad / component position. This could be used for virtual network addressing of statements for enabling protocols and operations.

As quads components are themselves metamodels (quads) this process could recursively

encode a vast amount of information in a reduced fashion and enable, by the use of an identification algorithm, the use of known Machine Learning tools for processing large amounts of data.

Statement (C, S, P, O):
(meta:(super:(class:inst)))

- inst: Primes sequence count (InstanceID)
 - class: InstanceID product by corresponding InstanceID next primes (ClassID).
 - super: ClassID product by corresponding InstanceID next primes (SuperID).
 - meta: SuperID product by corresponding ClassID next primes (MetaID).
 - Next prime is in relation with parent prime: parents aggregate child primes count.
 - If element repeats, same prime is used as in first occurrence.
-
- Example
 - (Carpenter, Grandfather, Father, Person);
 - (FirstBorn, Brother, Son, Person);
 - FirstBorn and Carpenter shares Person factor(s). Different identifiers in different contexts will preserve this characteristic.
-
- Reduce quad products disambiguating common factors.
 - Primes may be mapped to their position in primes list: (1, 2), (2, 3), (3, 5), (4, 7), (5, 11), etc. Encode / decode from mappings for succinct representation.

Ontology Alignment from Algorithmic Alignment:

Reify Metamodel hierarchy into Resource IDs aggregated statements. Each Metamodel subclass entity has its corresponding (normalized) aggregable Metamodel statement.

Inferir / aggregate Kinds / Instances of compound URIs.

Example:

Topic: (Statement, URI, Metamodel);

Topic: Amor (Persona / Metamodel, Amante / URI, Pareja / Statement);

Reified Metamodel hierarchy statements now could be aggregated for Resource ID inference. Alignment with (upper) ontologies could be done using ID, Link, Context ordering functions.

4 - Functional Alignment

Monadic wrapping of hierarchy elements allow for the application of the above alignment mentioned methods by means of functional composition.

By means of monadic application of different alignment functions, Ontology Alignment and Algorithmic Alignment may be used, the first to perform the desired alignment operation on Resource(s) and the later for the comprobation of correctness in the reasoning / inference process.

Core alignment functions are: Identity alignment (to identify equivalent entities), Link and attribute augmentation and contextual ordering / sort function. Also CSPO 'getters' functions and RESTful HATEOAS functions (by means of HAL or JSON-LD) should be provided.

Because Metamodel(s) aggregate knowledge in such a way, 'model' functions may exist which, for example, reifies the application of a Behavior to an entity instance (a Flow).

Semiotic Function: Languages: terms, semiotic mappings. Augmented dictionary (a is b in ctx for d). Grammars (ontology Kinds aggregation).

Verification of Ontology Alignments:

ID / Type align augmentation: ResourceID patterns. Applied Functions:
Resource.fmap(AlignFunction<Resource, Resource>).fmap(MergeFunction<Resource, Resource>) : returns merged Resources.

Order in context align augmentation: ResourceIDs order in context / role (attribute, value axis).
Applied Functions: Resource.fmap(OrderFunction<Resource, Resource>).fmap(ContextFunction<Resource, Resource>) : returns first.

Attribute / Link: align augmentation: common shared factors. Applied Functions:
Resource.fmap(TypeFunction<Resource, Resource>).fmap(AttributeFunction<Resource, Resource>) : returns attributes.

Resource Functions: repository of functions (Dataflow specs, DSLs). Core Functions / declarative functions namespace for retrieving from exchanges and templates.

5 - Solution Architecture

The proposed solution architecture is the implementation of custom extensions to an ESB (Enterprise Service Bus) platform which allows for the deployment of custom URI(s) (DB, service, connector, etc.) implementations metamodel components.

By means of declarative 'templates' the platform will be allowed to specify and compose diverse source / service components (local or remote) enabling them to interact with each other. Interactions will implement the 'domain translation' pattern thus enabling gestures / behaviors in one domain to be translated into corresponding actions into other domains.

Declarative DCI Templates: Java / XML - XSL implementations (www.cactoos.org).

Layers (schema / instances):

Data
Information
Knowledge

Protocol:

Routes
Dialog
Activation Graphs (reactive)

Strategy patterns in functional composition.

Server less (distributed command message pattern).

Integration with documents / office platforms. Forms. Templates.

Monads: TBD.

Type constructor.
Unit.
Map / flatMap
Sequence (apply to list)
Chaining of mappings of functions.
Predicates.
Selectors (patterns).
Stream operations.

Functions:

Domain (Resource(s) URI hierarchy).
Namespaces (Java / Templates).
Resource(s) as functions: Inferred functions from domain. runtime merges function / Resource streams.

Activation

Dataflow

Functional 'DOM' (Java / Templates)

CRUD: Immutable Resource(s). Changes creates new entities in new contexts (axes).

Implementation roadmap:

Core Bundles: Peer. Node. Metamodel (messaging, blueprint, containers).

Core Peer. Customized Camel routing messaging schemes / exchanges (APIs plugins / templates).

Core Node. Blueprint declarative API. Endpoints (backend / connectors) plugins.

Core Metamodel. Align. Node's model container (Peer's / Node's Message dispatch: reactive activation dataflows).

Java / ServiceMix. XML / XSLT. Javascript (Node.js Bundles) plugins / templates.

5 - Deployment

Deployment of the solution is aggregated into three kind of nesting entities scopes (ESB bundles): Peers, Nodes and Metamodels which, through messaging, templates and endpoints constitute the solution proposed runtime.

Templates are declarative entities which may be 'plugged' in any message exchange at any entity level scope (Peer, Node, Metamodel). Implementation may vary from Java classes implementing some interface, XSLT templates or 'special' Node.js bundles.

Templates are plugged declaratively through Node(s) declaration blueprint or may be registered and invoked by an event filtering mechanism. Templates may use any of the Functional namespace registered operations / alignments and also 'selector' predicates over Resource monadic type.

Template(s) metadata is the notion of a domain business, its data, information, knowledge and behavior schema / instances represented as a 'purposes upper ontology' Metamodel.

Scopes, domains, purpose, etc. Metadata share / merge (TBD).

Alignment, Functional domains and aggregation are performed through templates.

Peers:

P2P Bundles. Aggregates Node(s). Define custom ESB URI scheme for handling of routes and exchanges of entity scopes layers.

Discovery. Advertisements. Dynamic bindings (containers) of other scopes entities. Peer scope (dynamic) routes (topics / queues + templates). URI namespaces.

Peer Templates: 'hooks' according each exchange semantics. Inputs, functional transforms, outputs (TBD).

Nodes:

Endpoint / Peer binding scopes. A declarative blueprint in the ESB instantiates a Node which, through an Endpoint, populates / sync and provides reactive activation of a Metamodel.

Namespaces: Node 'scopes' which determines metadata of, for example, domains of business of Node's Metamodels for enabling metadata interoperability (templates metadata).

Scopes (Message flow IO):

Peer namespaces.

Node Connector (Endpoint).

Metamodel Connection.

Connector (Domain. Template metadata).

Session (Connection).

Dialog (Metamodel).

Metamodels:

Metamodels are the internal representation of an instance of a Node regarding one Endpoint as declared into a Peer.

Instantiation. Factory. Population. Aggregation. Activation / Sync / IO (TBD).

Messages / Event IO (metamodel layers, peer components, functions / alignment). (TBD).

Templates: activation routes. Template API spec over ESB routes (class / pattern). Transforms, filter, etc. Functions available in contexts (Java, XSLT, Node.js).

Function encoded as Resource. Parser. Materialized results (patterns / grammars).

Function: resulting Resource semantics. Contained result Metamodel type. Concat function expressions.

Endpoints (backend connectors / client connectors)

APIs: JDBC / JAF / JCA. DCI. REST HATEOAS (HAL / JSON-LD).

Kind of 'drivers' for Node Metamodel(s). IO Connectors (backend / client) interactions modelled as service interactions (homologous). Rendering services (bundles) for UX.

Messaging: handle sync / knowledge propagation (TBD).

Connector examples:

Client connectors (protocol):

REST HATEOAS (HAL / JSONLD). LDP.

SOAP.

OData.

SPARQL.

Clients connectors (platform APIs):

Java EE (JCA / JAF).

JavaScript (browser).

JavaScript (Node JS).

PHP.

.Net (LINQ).

Backend connector examples:

RDBMSs.

LDAP / JNDI / JCR.

Services (REST / SOAP).

Streams (Big Data).

BI: OLAP / Mining.

Indexing.

Machine learning

Rules engine.

QA.

Peer, Node, Metamodel Template API

Message exchanges between scoped entities (Peer, Node, Metamodel) handled by custom URI namespaces (defined at Peer level) are 'augmented' by 'wrapper' Template(s) regarding the inputs, transforms and outputs / routing results of the exchange.

Activation and Dialog Protocol: Messages 'activates' Metamodel Resource(s) in respect to matching of input patterns, which produces into the Message exchange response the 'activated' Resource(s) to be provided by means of Template(s) manipulation.

A 'Dialog Protocol' is established in the connection / session / dialog scopes Message exchanges which allows for wildcards, variables and placeholders to be progressively 'populated' in a request / response cycle. (TBD: Functional alignments, aggregation and patterns).

Normalized message format which may encode / activate Resource / behavior in any route(s) layer. Message determines routes itself. Referrer semantics (contexts). Aggregates activated

knowledge (routes / payloads) in its exchanges (browsing / discovery agent). Relative to its 'referrer' (Context: 'Developer', 'Peter', 'Work' -> 'Peter Working as a Developer').

Message: Metamodel Resource instance (Data routes facade, Information and knowledge payload body / template). Activation / aggregation determines Message facade state for further routing / payloads. Goal: fulfill specific template.

Template metadata: Upper Ontology. Domain Flows (scenario / context, roles, state, transitions). Ontology aligned Messages. DCI: Data (Metamodel, Message), Context (sharing scopes, subscriptions, roles inferred from data / referrer), Interactions (declaratively stated in routes APIs). (TBD).

Dialog Protocol

Scopes. Wildcards. Variables. Placeholders. QA request / response.

Domain Metamodel. Connection driven. Shared (scope context attribute). Template metadata driven exchanges.

Purpose: Notion of Template metadata upper ontology Metamodel. Shared (scope context attribute).

Metamodel layers: Data (Resource, Flow), Information (Kind, Class), Knowledge (Statement, Rule). FIXME. TBD.

Activation: Dataflow graph from Resource parents / occurrences. Dialog flow (apply / templates).

Activation: Dependencies. Selector. Events.

Activation: Dependants. Selector. Events.

Messages, Routes, Activation / Templates

Between Peer(s), Node(s), Metamodel(s). TBD.

Topic / Queue / PTP. P2P Transparent.

Distributed Dataflow Activation Graph:
Input, State, Output graph (dependent / dependants). Encoded in Metamodel DCI Subscriptions (dependencies / dependants).

Location transparent (Docker, Kubernetes). Dynamic IP space mapped to CSPO Resource. Algorithmic ResourceIDs as RESTful addresses.

Events.

Command pattern.

Normalized Message Resource Monads.

Protocol 'agents': activation, routes, payload is Message encoded logic.

Sync: listeners (dependencies / dependants).

Change propagation: aggregate (ctx:msg) tuples for which if a tuple holds the other tuples must hold too.

Purpose / Metadata (domains): Change propagation + Template metadata.

Semantic activation patterns:

Event source (criteria)

Event destination (profile)

Dialog: Placeholders, wildcards, variables: resolve from context (previous named field inputs, referrer, history).

Activation, Aggregation, Alignment, Layers and Functional domains: Dynamic upper ontology

Metamodel Resource(s) get 'activated' (maybe in some 'degree' or 'distance' which is another Resource) when matched with another Resource (pattern) obtaining this way some kind of 'criteria' or 'comparison' result.

A full match returns the same Resource when other degrees of matching depends on comparisons between CSPO components of Resources in a given sort of criteria (order or comparison of quad elements and then sorting, for example).

Dynamic upper ontology:

If models shared by Peers share some common underlying 'upper' ontology, this could be aggregated, aligned and matched by only Metamodel data itself. That means no 'hard-coded' upper ontology but one that is dynamically shared and exported to other formats if necessary.

Upper ontology: Aggregate Metamodel(s) Metamodels. Peer Node level. Reify Metamodel hierarchy into Metamodel statements for each class. 'Dynamic': alignment methods between Peer(s). Align to OWL / RDFS models (SPARQL / endpoint).

Access control. Scopes. Domains. Roles (upper purpose ontology).

Upper purpose ontology: Modelled in Metamodel (reification). Constraints. Restrictions.
Temporal / dimensional parts. ISO like 'templates', OWL, RDFS Metamodel IO export / import
(endpoint).

(TBD).