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1/5 Use Case and Problem Statement
First of all, let's introduce some basic terms that we are using throughout our presentation

- **Software Component**: A piece of software that conforms to a component model and provides and requires functionality by the concept of an interface.

- **Interface Description Language**: An Interface Description Language defines a set of functionality in a programming-language independent way.

- **Software Component Interoperability**: Software components are compatible if there exists a contract between their interfaces that maps all necessary interface description elements (i.e., they can be integrated). Semantic interoperability in distributed systems is mainly achieved by establishing semantic correspondences (i.e., mappings) between vocabularies of different services.

- **Semantic Component Interoperability**: Semantic Interoperability ensures that services and data exchanged between a provided and a required interface makes sense - that the requester and provider have a common understanding of the "meaning" of services and data.
Next, these definitions are applied on a use-case where a smart door should be replaced within an automation rule.

Is “close” to be translated with “next to (another object)” or with “close/opposite to open”?

For a human, this is an easy task. For a software component, this is hard.
2/5 Novel Integration Method
Semantic interoperability in distributed systems is mainly achieved by establishing semantic correspondences (i.e., mappings) between vocabularies of different services.
We call our novel Knowledge-driven Architecture Composition
3/5 Related Work
In contrast to existing work, we believe that our method is novel due to the following differences

**Software Engineering**
- 28 years of component-based software engineering
  - Vale 2015
- Component adaptation
  - Hummel 2008, Becker 2004
  - Using test-cases for creating (semantically) correct adapter
- Fuzzy Service matching
  - Platenius 2016
  - Combination of Fuzzy matching techniques

**Artificial Intelligence**
- Semantic Web Service Description Languages
  - e.g. WSDL-S 2004, SAWDSL 2007
  - Attach formalized "semantics" to interface
- Ontology Matching
  - Niepert 2011, Meilicke 2011
  - Match knowledge bases

**Our Method**
- Bottom-up instead of top-down
  - No predefined ontology at system design time
- Evolution instead of revolutionary
  - Incompleteness of integration knowledge is explicitly allowed
- Case-based instead of process between humans
  - Formalization effort is lowered as practitioners only formalize what they actually use
- Reuse allows for automated integration
4/5 Evaluation Design and Results
We evaluated our method with students by providing the following storyline

**Storyline**

A new automation rule has been downloaded to your home automation platform. However, the rule is not working as other devices have been initially used. Your task is to replace all data-channels until the graphical state visualization provided by the home automation platform of each device is acting accordingly to the meaning conveyed by the displayed automation rule.
The following logical architecture was implemented to support the knowledge-driven architecture composition method.
The following logical architecture was implemented to support the knowledge-driven architecture composition method.
The user interface for formalizing and storing integration knowledge as well as exporting adapted automation rules was kept simple.
During the evaluation, overall integration time for six automation rules were measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Reuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td>42 : 12</td>
<td>57 : 30</td>
<td>38 : 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>38 : 10</td>
<td>59 : 26</td>
<td>0 : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td>32 : 9</td>
<td>54 : 29</td>
<td>25 : 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4</td>
<td>31 : 10</td>
<td>43 : 18</td>
<td>0 : 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5</td>
<td>31 : 10</td>
<td>40 : 20</td>
<td>30 : 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 6</td>
<td>34 : 16</td>
<td>51 : 19</td>
<td>0 : 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average Time : Variance in seconds
- Baseline: Manual Integration
- Specification: Method-specific formalization of integration knowledge
- Reuse: Integration knowledge retrieved from knowledge base due to previous integration cases
During the evaluation, overall integration time for six automation rules were measured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Specification</th>
<th>Reuse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rule 1</td>
<td>318,3478571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 2</td>
<td>151,983315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 4</td>
<td>318,3478571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 5</td>
<td>151,983315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average Time: Variance in seconds
- Baseline: Manual Integration
- Specification: Method-specific formalization of integration knowledge
- Reuse: Integration knowledge retrieved from knowledge base due to previous integration cases
5/5 Discussion
Overall, the presented results can be regarded as evidence that the

**Internal Threats to Validity**
- Confounding variable: Use Interface Design
- Reusability of mappings was ensured early
- Only data mappings instead of services

**External Threats to Validity**
- Small population size (15 students) does not allow for generalization
- Situational factors: Students have been instructed in skype sessions and sometimes used multiple monitors
- Only one evaluation run
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Executive Summary of this paper

We applied and evaluated a novel integration method called Knowledge-driven Architecture Composition that explicitly allows for manual integration effort without sacrificing reliability. Therefore, we propose an architecture, provide tool support and empirically evaluate them with students.

In the future, we plan to expand our method towards HTTP services and more complex reusability principles
End – Thank you for your attention!
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Overall Average Participant Performance

- Average Time: 24.15 seconds
- Average Config Time: 10.87 seconds
- Average Testing Time: 49.15 seconds
- Average Spec. Time: 0 seconds

Legend:
- Average Config Time
- Average Testing Time
- Average Spec. Time