

# Web Service Composition as a Planning Task

## Experiments Using Knowledge-Based Planning

Erick Martínez & Yves Lespérance

Department of Computer Science  
York University  
Toronto, Canada

# Motivation

- Next generation Web Services
  - Semantic Web
  - Reasoning / Planning
  - Automation
- Agent-oriented toolkit for advanced MAS / WSC and provisioning
- Previous results (knowledge-based planning)

# Automated Web Service Composition as Planning

- **WSC Problem:** given a set of Web services and some user defined task or goal to be achieved, automatically find a composition of the available services to accomplish the task.
- **WSC as a Planning Problem:**
  - Predefined available services as the building blocks of a plan
  - Many WS actions involve sensing
  - Large search space, incomplete information in the initial state
- **Planner that can generate conditional plans & supports sensing actions**

# PKS

(Petrack & Bacchus, 2003)

- Generalization of STRIPS *[Fikes & Nilsson, 1971]*
  - Four Dbs:  $K_F, K_W, K_V, K_X$
  - Actions:

Action	Precondition	Effects
<i>checkFlightSpace(n,d)</i>	<i>K(existsFlight(n,d))</i>	<i>add(Kw, availFlight(n,d))</i>

- DSURs:  $K(existsFlight(n,d)) \Rightarrow add(Kv, flightNum(n,d))$
- Goal
- Planning problem:  $\langle I, A, U, G \rangle$

# WSC in PKS

- PKS primitive actions correspond to WS
  - Knowledge-producing actions  $\leftrightarrow$  information gathering WS
  - Physical actions  $\leftrightarrow$  world-altering WS
- New WS becomes available  $\rightarrow$  add new primitive action to domain specification

# WS Representation in PKS

- For each action  $A_i$  :
  - encode user preferences / customization constraints using ***des*** $A_i$  fluent [McIlraith & Son, 2002]
  - encode domain specific search control constraints using ***ind*** $A_i$  fluent
- Generic domain specification
  - action specification (WS)
- Problem specification
  - goal + DSURs (addresses PKS limited expressiveness)

# PKS Spec. Example

## (Air Travel Domain)

Action	Precondition	Effects
<i>findRFlight(x)</i>	$K(airCo(x))$ $K(indFindRFlight(x))$ $K(desFindRFlight(x))$	$add(Kw, flightExists(x))$ $add(Kf, \neg indFindRFlight(x))$
<i>bookFlight(x)</i>	$K(airCo(x))$ $K(availFlight(x))$ $K(indBookFlight(x))$ $K(desBookFlight(x))$	$add(Kf, bookedFlight(x))$ $del(Kf, availFlight(x))$ $add(Kf, \neg indBookFlight(x))$

### Domain specific update rules (DSUR)

$$K(airCo(x)) \wedge \neg Kv(flightNum(x)) \wedge K(flightExists(x)) \Rightarrow add(Kv, flightNum(x))$$

1 explicit parameter: *company*

# PKS Goal Example (Prob. BMxF)

- Goal: book a flight with a price not greater than the user's maximum price

*/\* book company within budget \*/*

$\exists_K(x) [K(\text{airCo}(x)) \wedge K(\text{bookedFlight}(x)) \wedge$   
 $K(\neg \text{priceGtMax}(x))] \quad |$

*/\* no flight booked \*/*

*KnowNoBudgetFlight*    |

*KnowNoAvailFlight*    |

*KnowNoFlightExists*



# User Pref. / Customization Constraints Example (Prob. BMxF)

- DSUR 1:

$$K(\text{airCo}(x)) \wedge \neg Kw(\text{priceGtMax}(x)) \wedge \\ Kv(\text{userMaxPrice}) \wedge Kv(\text{flightCost}(x)) \\ \Rightarrow \text{add}(Kw, \text{priceGtMax}(x))$$

- DSUR 2:

$$K(\text{airCo}(x)) \wedge K(\neg \text{priceGtMax}(x)) \wedge \\ \neg Kw(\text{desBookFlight}(x)) \\ \Rightarrow \text{add}(Kf, \text{desBookFlight}(x))$$

# Experiments - Problem Set

- Set of 5 problems (air travel domain):
  - hard constraints
    - **BPF**: book preferred company, otherwise book any flight
    - **BMxF**: book any flight within budget
    - **BPMxF**: book flight within budget, favour preferred company
  - optimization constraints
    - **BBF**: book cheapest flight
    - **BBPF**: book preferred company, otherwise book cheapest flight

# Experimental Results with 1 param. using DFS (in Secs.) . . .

#Co.	BPF	BM <sub>x</sub> F	BPM <sub>x</sub> F	BBF	BPBF
2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.10
3	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.35	1.58
4	0.00	0.01	0.01	53.99	259.39
5	0.01	0.02	0.02	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
10	0.01	0.04	0.04	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
20	0.04	0.05	0.06	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
50	0.31	0.51	0.60	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
100	2.47	3.15	3.43	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>

Results with 1 explicit parameter: *company*  
 PKS v0.6-alpha-2 (Linux)  
 (t<sub>max</sub> = 300secs.)

# ... Experimental Results with 5 param. using DFS (in Secs.)

#Co.	BPF	BM <sub>x</sub> F	BPM <sub>x</sub> F	BBF	BPBF
2	0.17	0.21	0.37	1.27	8.42
3	0.58	0.72	1.20	24.02	109.33
4	1.45	2.20	3.71	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
5	3.76	4.33	4.65	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>
10	80.60	96.45	105.49	> t <sub>max</sub>	> t <sub>max</sub>

Results with 5 explicit parameters:  
*company, origin, destination, departure date, and arrival date*  
 PKS v0.6-alpha-2 (Linux)  
 (t<sub>max</sub> = 300secs.)

# Advantages of Our Approach

- Modularity and re-usability
- Can handle cases that previous approaches cannot (e.g., physical actions having direct effect on sensing actions) *[McIlraith & Son, 2002]*
- No need for pre-specified generic plans

# Open Problems and Future Work

- Customizing domain theory based on problem
  - DSURs generation (desc. goal + user pref.)
- Large search space, off-line
- Optimization constraints problems do not scale up well
- Representation of atomic services
- Translation of OWL, DAML-S, etc. into PKS/Golog specifications
- ***IG-JADE-PKSlib*** toolkit
- Experiments + case studies to validate performance and scalability of integrated framework
- Plan execution and contingency recovery

**Thank You!**