

PRIVACY-PRESERVED SECURITY-CONSCIOUS FRAMEWORK TO  
ENHANCE WEB SERVICE COMPOSITION

HOMA MOVAHEDNEJAD

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy (Computer Science)

Faculty of Computing  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

JULY 2016

To my GOD, **ALLAH**, who is always with me in every moment

To our prophet, **Mohammad**, the messenger of truth, fraternization and kindness

To **Mahdi** the promised saviour, looking forward to his arrival

To my dear and beloved **husband** who encouraged and supported me

To my dears **mother, father, sisters**, and **brothers**

To my dears **mother-, father-,** and **sister-in-law**

And to all who supported me in my study, especially my **supervisor**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful. I thank Allah S.W.T for granting me perseverance and strength I needed to complete this thesis.

In preparing this thesis, I was in contact with many people, researchers, academicians, and practitioners. They have contributed towards my understanding and thoughts. First and foremost, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my thesis supervisor, Prof. Dr. Suhaimi Ibrahim, for encouragement, guidance, and critics. He has built and directed an environment that granted me an opportunity to learn and practice research skills, meet and collaborate with brilliant researchers, and transfer the long journey of PhD to a great and lovely experience. I would like to thank Assoc. Prof. Dr. Harihodin Selamat, my project leader for his support during my study. I am also indebted to Universiti Teknologi Malaysia (UTM) and the Ministry of Education (MOE), Malaysia for funding my PhD study.

In particular, I would like to express my gratitude towards Dr. Mohammad Mahdi Taheri from University of Illinois at Chicago, Dr. Sayed Gholam Hassan Tabatabaei from Isfahan University of Technology, Dr. Arash Habibi Lashkari from University of New Brunswick, and Dr. Mahmoud Danaee from University of Malaya who closely collaborated with me. Moreover, I am very thankful to Dr. Ali Keyvanfar, and Dr. Arezou Shafaghat from Universiti Teknologi Malaysia for their supports and friendships.

I would particularly like to thank my parents and my husband's parents, who deserve my gratitude for their inseparable prayer, encouragement and endless patience. Words fail me in expressing my deepest appreciation to my husband, Mahdi, whose encouragement and love gave me confidence. My thesis would not have been possible without his support. Thank you.

## ABSTRACT

The emergence of loosely coupled and platform-independent Service-Oriented Computing (SOC) has encouraged the development of large computing infrastructures like the Internet, thus enabling organizations to share information and offer value-added services tailored to a wide range of user needs. Web Service Composition (WSC) has a pivotal role in realizing the vision of implementing just about any complex business processes. Although service composition assures cost-effective means of integrating applications over the Internet, it remains a significant challenge from various perspectives. Security and privacy are among the barriers preventing a more extensive application of WSC. First, users possess limited prior knowledge of security concepts. Second, WSC is hindered by having to identify the security required to protect critical user information. Therefore, the security available to users is usually not in accordance with their requirements. Moreover, the correlation between user input and orchestration architecture model is neglected in WSC with respect to selecting a high performance composition execution process. The proposed framework provides not only the opportunity to securely select services for use in the composition process but also handles service users' privacy requirements. All possible user input states are modelled with respect to the extracted user privacy preferences and security requirements. The proposed approach supports the mathematical modelling of centralized and decentralized orchestration regarding service provider privacy and security policies. The output is then utilized to compare and screen the candidate composition routes and to select the most secure composition route based on user requests. The D-optimal design is employed to select the best subset of all possible experiments and optimize the security conscious of privacy-preserving service composition. A Choreography Index Table (CIT) is constructed for selecting a suitable orchestration model for each user input and to recommend the selected model to the choreographed level. Results are promising that indicate the proposed framework can enhance the choreographed level of the Web service composition process in making adequate decisions to respond to user requests in terms of higher security and privacy. Moreover, the results reflect a significant value compared to conventional WSC, and WSC optimality was increased by an average of 50% using the proposed CIT.

## ABSTRAK

Kemunculan ikatan pasangan yang longgar dan platform bebas Pengkomputeran Berorientasikan Perkhidmatan (SOC) telah menggalakkan pembangunan infrastruktur komputeran yang besar seperti Internet, oleh itu ia membolehkan organisasi untuk berkongsi maklumat dan menawarkan perkhidmatan nilai tambah sesuai dengan keperluan pengguna yang luas. Komposisi Khidmat Laman Sesawang (WSC) memainkan peranan utama dalam merealisasikan wawasan untuk melaksanakan hampir semua proses perniagaan yang kompleks. Walaupun komposisi perkhidmatan menjamin cara yang kos efektif untuk mengintegrasikan aplikasi terhadap Internet, ia kekal sebagai satu cabaran penting dari pelbagai perspektif. Keselamatan dan rahsia adalah antara masalah yang menghalang lebih banyak aplikasi WSC. Pertama, pengguna memiliki pengetahuan awal yang terbatas mengenai konsep keselamatan. Kedua, penggunaan WSC tergendala disebabkan terpaksa mengenal pasti keselamatan yang diperlukan untuk mengawal maklumat pengguna yang kritikal. Oleh itu, keselamatan yang sedia ada pada pengguna biasanya tidak selari dengan keperluan mereka. Malah, hubung kait antara input pengguna dan model senibina orkestra diabaikan dalam penggunaan WSC bagi memilih proses pelaksanaan komposisi yang berprestasi tinggi. Rangka kerja yang dicadangkan bukan sahaja memberi peluang untuk memilih perkhidmatan yang selamat dalam proses komposisi tetapi juga mengendalikan keperluan kerahsiaan khidmat pengguna. Segala kemungkinan keadaan input pengguna dimodelkan dari segi keutamaan kerahsiaan pengguna dan keperluan keselamatan. Pendekatan yang dicadangkan menyokong pemodelan matematik terhadap orkestra berpusat dan tidak berpusat yang berkaitan dengan kerahsiaan khidmat pengguna dan polisi keselamatan. Hasil kerja kemudian digunakan untuk membanding dan menapis laluan komposisi calon dan memilih laluan komposisi yang terselamat berdasarkan permintaan pengguna. Reka bentuk optimum-D digunakan untuk memilih subset yang terbaik terhadap semua kemungkinan eksperimen dan meningkatkan kesedaran keselamatan terhadap komposisi perkhidmatan kekal rahsia. Jadual Indeks Koreografi (CIT) dirangka bagi memilih model koreografi yang sesuai untuk setiap input pengguna dan mencadangkan model yang dipilih kepada aras koreografi. Hasilnya menunjukkan rangka kerja yang dicadang boleh meningkatkan aras koreografi terhadap proses komposisi khidmat sesawang dalam membuat keputusan yang sesuai dengan permintaan pengguna dari segi keselamatan dan rahsia yang mantap. Juga, keputusan menggambarkan nilai yang signifikan apabila dibandingkan dengan WSC konvensional, dan keoptimuman WSC didapati bertambah sebanyak 50% dengan menggunakan CIT yang dicadangkan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER  | TITLE                            | PAGE      |
|----------|----------------------------------|-----------|
|          | <b>DECLARATION</b>               | ii        |
|          | <b>DEDICATION</b>                | iii       |
|          | <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>           | iv        |
|          | <b>ABSTRACT</b>                  | v         |
|          | <b>ABSTRAK</b>                   | vi        |
|          | <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>         | vii       |
|          | <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>            | xiii      |
|          | <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>           | xv        |
|          | <b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>           | xix       |
|          | <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>     | xxi       |
|          | <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>        | xxiv      |
| <b>1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>              | <b>1</b>  |
|          | 1.1 Overview                     | 1         |
|          | 1.2 Background of the Problem    | 3         |
|          | 1.3 Statement of the Problem     | 6         |
|          | 1.4 Purpose of the Research      | 8         |
|          | 1.5 Objectives of the Research   | 9         |
|          | 1.6 Scope of the Research        | 10        |
|          | 1.7 Significance of the Research | 11        |
|          | 1.8 Thesis Organization          | 11        |
| <b>2</b> | <b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>         | <b>13</b> |
|          | 2.1 Introduction                 | 13        |

|         |  |    |
|---------|--|----|
| 2.2     | Web Service Concept                                      | 14 |
| 2.3     | Web Service Reference Model                              | 15 |
| 2.4     | Web Service Reference Standardization                    | 17 |
| 2.4.1   | Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP)                     | 17 |
| 2.4.2   | Web Service Description Language (WSDL)                  | 18 |
| 2.4.3   | Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) | 19 |
| 2.5     | Web Service Stack and Key Dimensions                     | 19 |
| 2.6     | Web Service Classification                               | 23 |
| 2.7     | Web Service Composition (WSC)                            | 24 |
| 2.7.1   | Business Process Modeling                                | 25 |
| 2.7.1.1 | Web Service Orchestration                                | 25 |
| 2.7.1.2 | Web Service Choreography                                 | 26 |
| 2.7.2   | Web Service Composition Lifecycle                        | 27 |
| 2.7.3   | Web Service Composition Modeling                         | 29 |
| 2.7.3.1 | Syntactic-based  | 30 |
| 2.7.3.2 | Semantic-based   | 31 |
| 2.7.3.3 | Goal-Oriented  | 32 |
| 2.7.4   | Challenges in Web Service Composition                    | 34 |
| 2.7.4.1 | Secure Service Composition                               | 35 |
| 2.7.4.2 | Pervasive Service Composition                            | 36 |
| 2.7.4.3 | Dependable Service Composition                           | 36 |
| 2.7.4.4 | Adaptable and Autonomous Service Composition             | 37 |
| 2.7.4.5 | Support of RESTful Services                              | 38 |
| 2.8     | Quality of Service (QoS)                                 | 38 |
| 2.8.1   | Security   | 41 |
| 2.8.1.1 | Data Security  | 41 |
| 2.8.1.2 | Access Control   | 46 |
| 2.8.2   | Privacy  | 52 |
| 2.8.2.1 | Data Privacy Model                                       | 52 |
| 2.8.2.2 | Service Privacy Model                                    | 54 |
| 2.8.2.3 | User Privacy Model                                       | 54 |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
|          | 2.8.2.4 Operation Privacy Model                 | 55        |
|          | 2.8.3 Performance                               | 55        |
|          | 2.8.4 Reliability                               | 56        |
|          | 2.8.5 Price                                     | 58        |
|          | 2.8.6 Trustworthiness                           | 58        |
|          | 2.8.7 Safety and Correctness                    | 58        |
| 2.9      | QoS-based Web Service Selection and Composition | 59        |
| 2.10     | Multi-Criteria Decision-Making (MCDM)           | 64        |
|          | 2.10.1 Compensatory Methods                     | 65        |
|          | 2.10.2 Non-Compensatory Methods                 | 66        |
|          | 2.10.2.1 Dominance Method                       | 66        |
|          | 2.10.2.2 Maxmin and Maxmax Methods              | 66        |
|          | 2.10.2.3 Conjunctive Constraint Method          | 67        |
|          | 2.10.2.4 Disjunctive Constraint Method          | 67        |
|          | 2.10.2.5 Lexicographic Method                   | 68        |
| 2.11     | Design of Experiment (DOE)                      | 68        |
|          | 2.11.1 Full Factorial Design                    | 69        |
|          | 2.11.2 Fractional Factorial Design              | 69        |
|          | 2.11.3 Response Surface Methodology (RSM)       | 69        |
|          | 2.11.4 Taguchi Method                           | 70        |
|          | 2.11.5 D-Optimal                                | 71        |
| 2.12     | Related Works                                   | 71        |
| 2.13     | Summary   | 84        |
| <b>3</b> | <b>RESEARCH METHODOLOGY</b>                     | <b>85</b> |
|          | 3.1 Introduction                                | 85        |
|          | 3.2 Research Scheme Overview                    | 86        |
|          | 3.3 Research Scheme Phases                      | 88        |
|          | 3.3.1 Phase 1: User Input Modeling              | 90        |
|          | 3.3.2 Phase 2: Web Service Composition Modeling | 92        |
|          | 3.3.3 Phase 3: Selection and Screening Process  | 95        |
|          | 3.3.4 Phase 4: Statistical Modeling             | 98        |



|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| 3.4      | Experimental Setup of the Research                           | 100        |
| 3.5      | Design of Experiment   | 101        |
| 3.6      | Result Validation  | 103        |
| 3.7      | Operational Framework  | 103        |
| 3.8      | Summary  | 105        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>SECURITY-CONSCIOUS PRIVACY-ENABLED<br/>MODELING</b>       | <b>106</b> |
| 4.1      | Introduction   | 106        |
| 4.2      | Concept of the Web Service Composition Process               | 106        |
| 4.2.1    | Component Web Service  | 107        |
| 4.2.1.1  | Goal   | 108        |
| 4.2.1.2  | Required Data Items  | 108        |
| 4.2.1.3  | Security   | 108        |
| 4.2.2    | Provider   | 109        |
| 4.2.3    | Orchestration  | 109        |
| 4.2.3.1  | Centralized Orchestration                                    | 110        |
| 4.2.3.2  | Decentralized Orchestration                                  | 110        |
| 4.2.4    | Choreographed Composite Service                              | 111        |
| 4.2.5    | Provider Privacy Policy and User Privacy Preference          | 111        |
| 4.2.5.1  | Provider Privacy Policy                                      | 112        |
| 4.2.5.2  | User Privacy Preference                                      | 112        |
| 4.3      | Assumptions  | 114        |
| 4.4      | Framework of the Proposed Approach                           | 116        |
| 4.5      | Mathematical Modeling of the Web Service Composition Process | 118        |
| 4.5.1    | Mathematical Modeling of Provider Privacy Policy             | 119        |
| 4.5.2    | Mathematical Modeling for User Privacy Preference            | 119        |
| 4.5.3    | Mathematical Modeling for Orchestration                      | 123        |
| 4.5.4    | Comparison   | 125        |
| 4.5.5    | Screening Process  | 126        |

|          |  |            |
|----------|--|------------|
| 4.6      | Empirical Analysis                                     | 130        |
| 4.7      | Algorithms   | 131        |
| 4.8      | Choreography Index Table (CIT)                         | 148        |
| 4.9      | Summary  | 149        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>EVALUATION AND DISCUSSION</b>                       | <b>150</b> |
| 5.1      | Introduction   | 150        |
| 5.2      | Applicability and Feasibility of the Proposed Approach | 150        |
| 5.2.1    | User Input   | 151        |
| 5.2.2    | Centralized Orchestration                              | 152        |
| 5.2.3    | Decentralized Orchestration                            | 157        |
| 5.3      | Experiments  | 161        |
| 5.3.1    | Experimental Design                                    | 161        |
| 5.3.2    | Centralized Empirical Model                            | 163        |
| 5.3.2.1  | ANOVA Analysis for ARN                                 | 165        |
| 5.3.2.2  | ANOVA Table for ARN                                    | 170        |
| 5.3.2.3  | ANOVA Analysis for ARQ                                 | 177        |
| 5.3.2.4  | ANOVA Table for ARQ                                    | 182        |
| 5.3.3    | Decentralized Empirical Model                          | 188        |
| 5.3.3.1  | ANOVA Analysis for ARN                                 | 188        |
| 5.3.3.2  | ANOVA Table for ARN                                    | 194        |
| 5.3.3.3  | ANOVA Analysis for ARQ                                 | 202        |
| 5.3.3.4  | ANOVA Table for ARQ                                    | 207        |
| 5.3.4    | Validation Results                                     | 213        |
| 5.3.5    | Optimization   | 217        |
| 5.4      | Discussion   | 220        |
| 5.5      | Summary  | 226        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>CONCLUSION</b>                                      | <b>228</b> |
| 6.1      | Introduction   | 228        |
| 6.2      | Objectives Revisited                                   | 229        |
| 6.3      | Contributions of the Research                          | 232        |
| 6.4      | Limitation of the Research                             | 233        |

|                   |                                 |            |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|------------|
| 6.5               | Recommendations for Future Work | 234        |
| 6.6               | Closing Remarks                 | 235        |
| <b>REFERENCES</b> |                                 | <b>238</b> |
| Appendices A-B    |                                 | 259-277    |

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE   | PAGE |
|-----------|---|------|
| 2.1       | Encryption Algorithm Security Strength for Applying Confidentiality   | 44   |
| 2.2       | Security Strengths of Digital Signature Algorithms for Applying Integrity and Non-Repudiation                                 | 45   |
| 2.3       | QoS-based Web Service Selection Approaches – Part 1   | 62   |
| 2.4       | QoS-based Web Service Selection Approaches – Part 2   | 63   |
| 2.5       | Summary of Existing Works Supporting Security and Privacy Aware WSC   | 83   |
| 3.1       | Variable Parameters Levels  | 103  |
| 3.2       | Operational Framework   | 104  |
| 4.1       | Specified Weights for Each Data Item  | 115  |
| 4.2       | Specified Weights for Each Data Item Considering the Modify Action  | 115  |
| 4.3       | Descriptions of Symbols of All Elements Used in Web Service Composition Modeling  | 118  |
| 4.4       | Data Item Weights with Respect to Item Significance   | 121  |
| 4.5       | Weights of ‘Read-only’ and ‘Modify’ Actions for each Data Item  | 122  |
| 4.6       | User Input and Provided Service Routes  | 126  |
| 4.7       | Screening Process   | 127  |
| 5.1       | Experimental Range and Independent Variable Levels  | 161  |
| 5.2       | ARQ Parameter Descriptions  | 162  |
| 5.3       | Part of D-Optimal Design Consisting of 373 Experiments for the Study of Four Experimental Factors (Centralized Orchestration) | 164  |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.4  | ANOVA Table for ARN (Centralized Model)   | 170 |
| 5.5  | Model Coefficient Estimations by Regression for ARN<br>(Centralized Model)  | 171 |
| 5.6  | ANOVA Table for ARQ (Centralized Model)   | 183 |
| 5.7  | Model Coefficient Estimations by Regression for ARQ<br>(Centralized Model)  | 184 |
| 5.8  | Part of D-Optimal Design Consisting of 373 Experiments<br>for the Study of Four Experimental Factors<br>(Decentralized Orchestration) | 190 |
| 5.9  | ANOVA Table for ARN (Decentralized Model)   | 195 |
| 5.10 | Model Coefficient Estimations by Regression for ARN<br>(Decentralized Model)  | 196 |
| 5.11 | ANOVA Table for ARQ (Decentralized Model)   | 208 |
| 5.12 | Model Coefficient Estimations by Regression for ARQ<br>(Decentralized Model)  | 209 |
| 5.13 | Validation Test for Available Route Number (ARN) –<br>Centralized Orchestration   | 214 |
| 5.14 | Validation Test for Available Route Quality (ARQ) –<br>Centralized Orchestration  | 215 |
| 5.15 | Validation Test for Available Route Number (ARN) –<br>Decentralized Orchestration   | 216 |
| 5.16 | Validation Test for Available Route Quality (ARQ) –<br>Decentralized Orchestration  | 217 |
| 5.17 | Goals for Centralized Orchestration Model Optimization  | 218 |
| 5.18 | Solution for Centralized Orchestration Model Optimization   | 219 |
| 5.19 | Goals for Decentralized Orchestration Model Optimization  | 219 |
| 5.20 | Solution for Decentralized Orchestration Model Optimization   | 220 |
| 5.21 | Part of the Choreography Index Table  | 223 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE   | PAGE |
|------------|---|------|
| 2.1        | Web Service Architecture                                | 16   |
| 2.2        | SOAP Message  | 18   |
| 2.3        | WSDL Example  | 19   |
| 2.4        | Web Service Stack and Key Dimensions                    | 21   |
| 2.5        | Web Service Management System (WSMS) Architecture       | 23   |
| 2.6        | Web Service Classification                              | 24   |
| 2.7        | Service Orchestration and Service Choreography          | 26   |
| 2.8        | Orchestration and Choreography Interrelation            | 27   |
| 2.9        | Web Service Composition Lifecycle                       | 28   |
| 2.10       | Classification of Web Service Composition Modeling      | 29   |
| 2.11       | Web Service Composition Challenges                      | 35   |
| 2.12       | Quality of Web Service Taxonomy                         | 40   |
| 2.13       | Security and Privacy Taxonomy                           | 42   |
| 2.14       | Authentication Strength Evaluation                      | 48   |
| 2.15       | Multi-Criteria Decision-Making Approaches               | 65   |
| 2.16       | Discovery Framework                                     | 73   |
| 2.17       | SWS-Broker Framework                                    | 74   |
| 2.18       | High-Level Architecture of the SCAIMO Framework         | 75   |
| 2.19       | Privacy-Aware Service Composition and Ranking Framework | 77   |
| 2.20       | PAIRSE Global Framework                                 | 78   |
| 2.21       | Privacy-Conscious Service Composition Framework         | 79   |
| 2.22       | Privacy-Aware Selection and Provisioning Framework      | 79   |
| 2.23       | Service Choreography Scenario for Service Selection     | 80   |
| 2.24       | Security Policy Composition Framework                   | 81   |

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| 2.25 | Secure Web Service Composition Framework   | 82  |
| 3.1  | Execution Process Modeling   | 87  |
| 3.2  | Research Design  | 89  |
| 3.3  | User Input Modeling Process  | 91  |
| 3.4  | Centralized Orchestration Modeling Process   | 93  |
| 3.5  | Decentralized Orchestration Modeling Process   | 94  |
| 3.6  | Selection and Screening Process for Centralized Orchestration  | 96  |
| 3.7  | Selection and Screening Process for Decentralized Orchestration  | 97  |
| 3.8  | Statistical Modeling Process for Centralized Orchestration   | 99  |
| 3.9  | Statistical Modeling Process for Decentralized Orchestration   | 100 |
| 4.1  | Web Service Composition Process  | 107 |
| 4.2  | Provider Policy Model  | 109 |
| 4.3  | Centralized Orchestration Model  | 110 |
| 4.4  | Decentralized Orchestration Model  | 111 |
| 4.5  | Proposed Framework for Security-Conscious Privacy-<br>Preserving Service Composition                           | 117 |
| 5.1  | User Input States  | 151 |
| 5.2  | Fragment of Computed Composition Routes for Centralized<br>Orchestration                                       | 153 |
| 5.3  | Part of the Composition Routes Selected with Respect to Each<br>User Input State (Centralized Orchestration)   | 154 |
| 5.4  | Screened Composition Routes with Respect to Each User Input<br>State (Centralized Orchestration)               | 155 |
| 5.5  | Example of Composition Route Selection with Respect to<br>User Input   | 156 |
| 5.6  | Part of the Computed Composition Routes for Decentralized<br>Orchestration                                     | 158 |
| 5.7  | Part of the Composition Routes Selected with Respect to Each<br>User Input State (Decentralized Orchestration) | 159 |
| 5.8  | Part of the Screened Composition Routes with Respect to Each<br>User Input State (Decentralized Orchestration) | 160 |
| 5.9  | Normal Probability Plot of Residuals for ARN<br>(Centralized Model)  | 165 |

|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.10 | Plot of Residuals vs. Predicted Response for ARN<br>(Centralized Model)                           | 166 |
| 5.11 | Main Effect Plot for Purpose (Centralized Model -<br>ARN Response)                                | 166 |
| 5.12 | Main Effect Plot for Data Items (Centralized Model -<br>ARN Response)                             | 167 |
| 5.13 | Main Effect Plot for Role of Provider (Centralized Model -<br>ARN Response)                       | 168 |
| 5.14 | Plot of Interaction between Role of Provider and Purpose<br>(Centralized Model - ARN Response)    | 169 |
| 5.15 | Plot of Interaction between Data Items and Role of Provider<br>(Centralized Model - ARN Response) | 169 |
| 5.16 | Normal Probability Plot of Residuals for ARQ<br>(Centralized Model)                               | 177 |
| 5.17 | Plot of Residuals vs. Predicted Response for ARQ<br>(Centralized Model)                           | 178 |
| 5.18 | Plot of Interaction between Purpose and Data Items<br>(Centralized Model - ARQ Response)          | 179 |
| 5.19 | Main Effect Plot for Data Items (Centralized Model -<br>ARQ Response)                             | 179 |
| 5.20 | Main Effect Plot for Action Types (Centralized Model -<br>ARQ Response)                           | 180 |
| 5.21 | Main Effect Plot for Role of Provider (Centralized Model -<br>ARQ Response)                       | 181 |
| 5.22 | Plot of Interaction between Purpose and Action Type<br>(Centralized Model - ARQ Response)         | 181 |
| 5.23 | Plot of Interaction between Data Items and Action Type<br>(Centralized Model - ARQ Response)      | 182 |
| 5.24 | Normal Probability Plot of Residuals for ARN<br>(Decentralized Model)                             | 189 |
| 5.25 | Plot of Residuals vs. Predicted Response for ARN<br>(Decentralized Model)                         | 189 |
| 5.26 | Main Effect Plot for Purpose (Decentralized Model -<br>ARN Response)                              | 191 |



|      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| 5.27 | Main Effect Plot for Data Items (Decentralized Model - ARN Response)  | 192 |
| 5.28 | Main Effect Plot for Role of Provider (Decentralized Model - ARN Response)                                    | 192 |
| 5.29 | Plot of Interaction between Purpose and Role of Provider (Decentralized Model - ARN Response)                 | 193 |
| 5.30 | Plot of Interaction between Role of Provider and Data Items (Decentralized Model - ARN Response)              | 194 |
| 5.31 | Normal Probability Plot of Residuals for ARQ (Decentralized Model)  | 202 |
| 5.32 | Plot of Residuals vs. Predicted Response for ARQ (Decentralized Model)  | 203 |
| 5.33 | Plot of Interaction between Purpose and Data Items (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)                       | 204 |
| 5.34 | Main Effect Plot for Data Items (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)  | 204 |
| 5.35 | Main Effect Plot for Action Type (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)   | 205 |
| 5.36 | Plot of Interaction between Purpose and Action Type (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)                      | 206 |
| 5.37 | Main Effect Plot for Role of Provider (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)                                    | 206 |
| 5.38 | Plot of Interaction between Data Items and Action Type (Decentralized Model - ARQ Response)                   | 207 |
| 5.39 | Proposed Mechanism for the Choreography Index Table   | 221 |
| 5.40 | User Requests Handled by Centralized and Decentralized Orchestration with Respect to Requested Purpose        | 224 |
| 5.41 | User Requests Handled by Centralized and Decentralized Orchestration with Respect to the Number of Data Items | 225 |
| 5.42 | User Requests Handled by Centralized and Decentralized Orchestration with Respect to Action Type              | 225 |
| 5.43 | User Requests Handled by Centralized and Decentralized Orchestration with Respect to Service Provider Role    | 226 |

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

|                 |   |                                 |
|-----------------|---|---------------------------------|
| $g$             | - | Goal                            |
| $rdi$           | - | Required data item              |
| $\mathcal{S}$   | - | Security                        |
| $\mathcal{C}$   | - | Confidentiality                 |
| $\mathcal{I}$   | - | Integrity                       |
| $\mathcal{A}$   | - | Availability                    |
| $\mathcal{P}$   | - | Provider                        |
| $r$             | - | Role                            |
| $dl$            | - | Delegation                      |
| $\mathcal{P}_O$ | - | Orchestrator                    |
| $p$             | - | Purpose                         |
| $adi$           | - | Available data items            |
| $a$             | - | Action                          |
| $v$             | - | Visibility                      |
| $se$            | - | Sensitivity                     |
| $ri$            | - | Risk                            |
| $\mathcal{UP}$  | - | User privacy preference         |
| $se_H$          | - | Highest value of sensitivity    |
| $C_L$           | - | Confidentiality at low level    |
| $C_M$           | - | Confidentiality at medium level |
| $C_H$           | - | Confidentiality at high level   |
| $ri_H$          | - | Highest value of risk           |
| $I_L$           | - | Integrity at low level          |

|               |   |  |
|---------------|---|--|
| $I_M$         | - | Integrity at medium level                                |
| $I_H$         | - | Integrity at high level                                  |
| $l$           | - | Depth level  |
| $M_{Orch-Ce}$ | - | Centralized orchestration model                          |
| $M_{Orch-De}$ | - | Decentralized orchestration model                        |
| $n_{CL}$      | - | Number of confidentiality at low level                   |
| $n_{CM}$      | - | Number of confidentiality at medium level                |
| $n_{CH}$      | - | Number of confidentiality at high level                  |
| $w_{CL}$      | - | Weight of confidentiality at low level                   |
| $w_{CM}$      | - | Weight of confidentiality at medium level                |
| $w_{CH}$      | - | Weight of confidentiality at high level                  |
| $n_{IL}$      | - | Number of integrity at low level                         |
| $n_{IM}$      | - | Number of integrity at medium level                      |
| $n_{IH}$      | - | Number of integrity at high level                        |
| $w_{IL}$      | - | Weight of integrity at low level                         |
| $w_{IM}$      | - | Weight of integrity at medium level                      |
| $w_{IH}$      | - | Weight of integrity at high level                        |
| $UI$          | - | User input   |
| $PP$          | - | Privacy policy of provider                               |
| $ARQ_i$       | - | Available route quality for composition route $i$        |
| $N_D$         | - | Number of delegation                                     |
| $N_{Rp}$      | - | Number of requested purposes by service user             |
| $N_{Op}$      | - | Number of offered purposes in composition route          |
| $N_p$         | - | Number of providers involved in composition route        |
| $C_R$         | - | Confidentiality level required based on user preferences |
| $C_P$         | - | Confidentiality level provided by composition route      |
| $I_R$         | - | Integrity level required based on user preferences       |
| $I_P$         | - | Integrity level provided by composition route            |
| $N_R$         | - | Number of routes   |
| $CS$          | - | Component web service                                    |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|          |   |  |
|----------|---|--|
| ABAC     | - | Attribute-Based Access Control Model         |
| ACL      | - | Access Control List                          |
| AHP      | - | Analytical Hierarchy Process                 |
| ANOVA    | - | Analysis of Variance                         |
| Anti-DoS | - | Anti-Denial of Service                       |
| BBD      | - | Box-Behnken Designs                          |
| BPMN     | - | Business Process Modeling Notation           |
| B2C      | - | Business-to-Consumer                         |
| CCD      | - | Central Composite Design                     |
| CIA      | - | Confidentiality, Integrity, and Availability |
| CIT      | - | Choreography Index Table                     |
| DaaS     | - | Data-as-a-Service                            |
| DAC      | - | Discretionary Access Control Model           |
| DM       | - | Dominance Method                             |
| DOE      | - | Design of Experiments                        |
| IBAC     | - | Identity Based Access Control Model          |
| IDS      | - | Intrusion Detection System                   |
| IPS      | - | Intrusion Prevention System                  |
| IoT      | - | Internet of Things                           |
| MAC      | - | Mandatory Access Control Model               |
| MADM     | - | Multi Attribute Decision Making              |
| MCDM     | - | Multi Criteria Decision Making               |

|               |   |   |
|---------------|---|---|
| MODM          | - | Multi Objective Decision Making                   |
| NIST          | - | National Institute of Standards and Technology    |
| PBAC          | - | Policy-Based Access Control Model                 |
| PN            | - | Private Negotiator                                |
| QoS           | - | Quality of Service                                |
| RAdAC         | - | Risk Adaptive Access Control Model                |
| RBAC          | - | Role-based Access Control Model                   |
| RE            | - | Requirement Engineering                           |
| RFID          | - | Radio-Frequency Identification                    |
| RSM           | - | Response Surface Methodology                      |
| RTD           | - | Round Trip Delay                                  |
| SAW           | - | Simple Additive weighting                         |
| SI*           | - | Secure i*   |
| SOA           | - | Service Oriented Architecture                     |
| SOC           | - | Service Oriented Computing                        |
| SOAP          | - | Simple Object Access Protocol                     |
| TBAC          | - | Task Based Access Control Model                   |
| UDDI          | - | Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration |
| URI           | - | Universal Resource Identifier                     |
| URL           | - | Universal Resource Locator                        |
| OWL-S         | - | Web Ontology Language for Web Services            |
| WS-BPEL       | - | Web Services Business Process Execution Language  |
| WSC           | - | Web Service Composition                           |
| WS-CDL        | - | Web Service Choreography Description Language     |
| WSDL          | - | Web Service Description Language                  |
| WS-Federation | - | Web Service Federation                            |
| WSML          | - | Web Service Modeling Language                     |

|             |   |                               |
|-------------|---|-------------------------------|
| WSMO        | - | Web Service Modeling Ontology |
| WSMS        | - | Web Service Management System |
| WS-Security | - | Web Service Security          |
| WS-Trust    | - | Web Service Trust             |
| XML         | - | eXtensible Markup Language    |

**LIST OF APPENDICES**

| <b>APPENDIX</b> | <b>TITLE</b>  | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| A               | Experimental Plan Recommended by D-Optimal Design for Centralized Empirical Model   | 259         |
| B               | Experimental Plan Recommended by D-Optimal Design for Decentralized Empirical Model | 269         |

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Overview

Service-Oriented Computing (SOC) has adapted new ways of software application design, delivery, and use over the last decade. SOC relies on services as fundamental elements that promise the development of rapid and low-cost distributed applications in heterogeneous environments (Yu *et al.*, 2008). The goal of SOC is to achieve platform-independent, standard-based and loosely coupled distributed computing. To realize this aim, an architectural model is established with Service-Oriented Architecture (SOA) that organizes software infrastructures and applications into a set of interacting services. These services can be published, discovered, and used by other services. The most promising choice in accomplishing SOA objectives is Web service technology (Papazoglou and van den Heuvel, 2007). Sheng *et al.* (2014b) defined a Web service as “a semantically well-defined abstraction of a set of computational or physical activities involving a number of resources, intended to fulfil a customer need or a business requirement”. Standard-based languages and Internet-based protocols have been utilized to describe, advertise, and discover Web services.

A sizable body of literature has investigated service composition as a key challenge of SOC and SOA (Bouguettaya *et al.*, 2014g). The basic blocks of service computing are atomic services whose interoperations realize distributed applications. SOC cannot achieve its full potential unless the service composition challenge is appropriately addressed to provide more powerful value-added services and applications. Service composition enables organizations and enterprises to outsource functionalities, form alliances, and deliver professional services to their customers. It



leads to reduce their cost and risk in building new business applications (Sheng *et al.*, 2014b).

Although service composition promises cost-effective means of integrating applications over the Internet, it remains an important challenge from a the non-functional perspective known as Quality of Service (QoS) (Halvard, 2009). Different aspects of non-functional properties of a service are presented in its QoS. The literature features various QoS considerations. According to Liu *et al.* (2012), ISO 840216 and ITUE.80017 are utilized to model QoS metrics of a service. They may include but are not limited to success rate, response time, availability, reliability, cost, privacy, trustworthiness, and security. Among these QoS metrics, security and privacy are of great importance to adopting service composition considering the fact that SOC environments are becoming more dynamic and open (Bouguettaya *et al.*, 2014a; Noor *et al.*, 2013; Satoh and Tokuda, 2011).

Secure service computing is increasingly gaining momentum in ensuring that users' private data are securely processed and handled. A Number of Web service standards have been proposed by industry and academia including WS-Security (OASIS, 2006), WS-Federation (OASIS, 2009), and WS-Trust (OASIS, 2007b). Nonetheless, they have not fully paved the way to secure service composition yet, the reason being that they were originally proposed for atomic services and cannot address the challenges related to composite services (Sheng *et al.*, 2014b). A few works have mainly concentrated on secure service composition (Brucker *et al.*, 2013; Dragovic *et al.*, 2014; Karatas *et al.*, 2015). However, privacy concerns are neglected in existing works (Costante *et al.*, 2013c). Therefore, the current research investigates the problem of secure service composition and introduces an integrated approach to address this challenge from two key perspectives: security and privacy. This study not only provides an opportunity to securely select services for use in the composition process but also to handle service users' privacy requirements.

The remainder of this chapter explains the need for secure and private service composition. The research problem, objectives, and scope are also discussed, respectively. The significance of the research and the thesis organization are presented in the final section of this chapter.

## 1.2 Background of the Problem

Service-Oriented Computing (SOC) is facing the growth of the everything-as-a-service (or X-as-a-service) phenomenon, resulting in the significant evolution of system integration in Business-to-Consumer (B2C) and Business-to-Business (B2B) applications. Web service coordination and deployment as a process of making a service ready to be used is crucial to fully realizing this promising phenomenon (Dastjerdi, 2013). It comprises several steps including discovery, selection, composition, and execution.

Web service discovery is responsible for publishing service descriptions and details in Universal Description, Discovery, and Integration (UDDI) repositories so those services are discoverable by potential consumers. Service discovery may return several web services that provide the same functionality (da Silva *et al.*, 2011). Therefore, selecting the best candidate services among numerous functionally-equal services discovered is a primary mission of Web service selection. To achieve this goal, service selection involves non-functional properties of Web services known as Quality of Service (QoS) metrics (Moghaddam and Davis, 2014; Raj and Sasipraba, 2010). However, component services cannot generally satisfy user demands. A process is necessary to combine existing services to fulfil the requested goals. Hence, a value-added service, namely composite service, is created in the Web service composition step using selected component services (Carminati *et al.*, 2015). The composite service created is finally implemented to address user requirements in the Web service execution step.

As Web services are progressively adopted for Internet-based applications, QoS-aware service selection and composition has become a well-known research problem in the service computing area (Barakat *et al.*, 2014; Zheng *et al.*, 2011). A wealth of literature has addressed this problem (D'Mello and Ananthanarayana, 2010; Strunk, 2010; Sun *et al.*, 2011). Different aspects of the QoS-aware service selection and composition challenge have been investigated and referred in existing approaches (El Hadad *et al.*, 2010; Ngu *et al.*, 2010; Zheng *et al.*, 2013). However, privacy and security as two imperative aspects of QoS have attracted less attention. Critical private and business data and information are transferred in service workflows either directly

or indirectly. This fact highlights the importance of security in SOC (Karatas *et al.*, 2015). Moreover, sensitive information exchanges between parties involved in the process of service composition raises the issue of service users' information privacy (Carminati *et al.*, 2015; Sun *et al.*, 2014).

The problem of security and privacy is a well-known research problem in the service computing field (Bouguettaya *et al.*, 2014a; Carminati *et al.*, 2015; Satoh and Tokuda, 2011). A number of research and standardization efforts have been proposed to deal with these matters. WS-Federation (OASIS, 2009), WS-Security(OASIS, 2006), and WS-Trust (OASIS, 2012) are instances of such efforts. However, the applicability and feasibility of these standards have not been fully proven for service composition, as they were originally devised for single component services (Sheng *et al.*, 2014b). In fact, the majority of early works have focused on handling security and privacy issues for single atomic services. With the increasing importance of service composition, a considerable number of research works are investigating the problem of security and privacy for composite services in recent years. Different security matters, including integrity, confidentiality, and accountability i.e., authentication and authorization are highlighted in several research works (Alrifai *et al.*, 2012; Immonen and Pakkala, 2014; Tabatabaei *et al.*, 2010). Trustworthy and privacy-preserving service composition is also investigated in existing research (Costante *et al.*, 2013c; Dalpiaz *et al.*, 2014; Tbahriti *et al.*, 2011; Tbahriti *et al.*, 2013; Zhang *et al.*, 2014).

Although only security or privacy is necessary, but they are insufficient to accomplish secure private service composition. Fulfilling security requirements does not guarantee that all privacy dimensions of user information will be covered and vice versa. Some literature considers privacy as a sub-class of security (W3C, 2003a, 2004c), while a number of studies deem security a sub-class of privacy (Carminati *et al.*, 2015; Squicciarini *et al.*, 2013). Nevertheless, security and privacy are interrelated, as defined by OASIS (2010), and need to be considered together to protect sensitive information. An appropriate mechanism to support security-aware and privacy-enabled service composition should be proposed. Different elements are involved in providing a new value-added composite service for solving the more complex problems with respect to the security and privacy constraints required (Sheng *et al.*, 2014b). All these elements play an important role in accomplishing the task and affect

the composition process in specific ways. To investigate the effect of each element on the service composition process, statistical analysis is normally utilized. It is necessary to propose mathematical modeling of each element to conduct a statistical analysis on the service composition process. Statistical analysis necessitates the proposed mathematical models to examine the effectiveness of each element with respect to the security-aware privacy-enabled service composition. Proposing an appropriate modeling mechanism to handle this matter is considered the first research gap identified in this study.

From a service users' point of view, protecting their in-transit sensitive data is of paramount importance in unpredictable and open SOC environments. Users often express concerns via declared privacy preferences. At the same time, the privacy policies of service providers must comply with the expressed user privacy preferences. Moreover, service providers' privacy policies are grounded on security concepts while service users declare their preferences based on the privacy dimensions. As a result, two heterogeneous concepts render the compliance process more complicated. In addition, the intrinsic complexity of security concepts poses many difficulties for service users who have limited knowledge of security requirements. Such complexities necessitate a methodology to bridge security requirements based on the modeled privacy preferences expressed. Thus, bridging the gap can help non-expert users protect critical information while not compelling them to have prior knowledge of security concepts. It can also facilitate the compliance process between required service user preferences and existing service provider policies. It is expected this bridge will eliminate the subject of heterogeneity in the compliance process. Addressing this issue is the second research gap that needs to be filled in this study.

Furthermore, service composition is often modeled in either centralized or decentralized orchestration. Centralized orchestrated service composition is grounded on centralized architecture, whereby the central entity coordinates interactions between the entities involved in accomplishing the required task. On the other hand, decentralized orchestrated service composition is based on the distributed architecture, where the entities involved collaborate toward achieving a predefined goal without the presence of a centralized coordinator. The choreographed composite services may choose either of these composition modeling types with respect to their specific

advantages and privileges. Some research works (Chafle *et al.*, 2004; Ghosal and Mann, 2012) offer the decentralized orchestration model as a model with improved performance in terms of lower response time and higher scalability and throughput. Other researchers (Schonberger and Wirtz, 2012) believe that centralized orchestration guarantees higher levels of security as sensitive information is exposed to fewer entities.

The current literature suffers from overlooking two matters. First, they only investigate whether the proposed composition model fulfils the security requirements with respect to direct user requests. They do not consider selecting a model that provides the higher possible security level(s). Second, making a trade-off between performance and security in choosing a suitable composition execution process is a demanding task that is ignored in existing approaches. Therefore, it is important to select a high performance composition execution process while maintaining the higher possible security level(s). Addressing the abovementioned concerns is considered as filling the third research gap in this study.

### **1.3 Statement of the Problem**

Distributed computing has witnessed a new generation of platforms with the help of SOC concepts in heterogeneous environments, wherein interoperable services facilitate low-cost and rapid development of distributed applications (Moghaddam and Davis, 2014). WSC, as one of the core concepts of SOC, has been widely utilized, enabling existing services to create new value-added services and share autonomously and independently (El Hadad *et al.*, 2010; Wu *et al.*, 2014). Due to the significance of WSC, it has been heavily investigated in both academia and industries. Despite the progressive improvement, a number of issues have not been appropriately addressed (Bouguettaya *et al.*, 2014a; Sheng *et al.*, 2014b).

Security and privacy are among the problematic barriers that prevent the wider application of WSC and still need to be investigated. They have attracted a great deal of interest in the WSC context. A wealth of literature has explored the secure service composition problem (Brucker *et al.*, 2013; Carminati *et al.*, 2014; Karatas *et al.*, 2015;

Pino and Spanoudakis, 2012; Satoh and Tokuda, 2011). Several research efforts have also been devoted to addressing privacy in service composition (Carminati *et al.*, 2015; Costante *et al.*, 2013a; Jensen, 2013; Squicciarini *et al.*, 2013; Tbahriti *et al.*, 2014). As discussed in the previous section, security and privacy are interrelated, but no existing research works address the problem of security and privacy-based service composition in an interactive manner, which is the focus of this research. The general research question to be answered through this research is:

***“How can a security-conscious privacy-preserving service composition be achieved by linking users’ security requirements with their privacy preferences; integrating modeling of users’ privacy preferences, service providers’ privacy policies, and the composition execution process; and selecting the most secure possible composition route(s)?”***

On a journey towards security-conscious privacy-preserving service composition, the following questions arising in each phase need to be addressed:

**RQ1:** How can user input that preserves privacy preference be appropriately modeled? (User input modeling phase)

The proposed solution should be able to answer the following sub-questions raised regarding user input modeling process:

- i. How are security requirements inferred based on the privacy preferences expressed by users without their interventions?
- ii. How can all possible user input states be mathematically modeled with respect to the defined privacy dimensions?

**RQ2:** How can the composition execution process be properly modeled to preserve the privacy policies of service providers? (Web service composition modeling phase)

The proposed solution should be able to answer the following sub-question raised regarding modeling of the Web service composition execution process:

- i. How can centralized and decentralized orchestration execution be mathematically modeled with respect to all possible states of service providers' privacy policies?

**RQ3:** How can the most secure possible composition route(s) be selected to preserve both privacy preferences and privacy policies of service users and providers, respectively? (Selection and optimization phase)

The proposed solution should be able to answer the following sub-questions raised regarding the service comparison and selection process:

- i. How can the modeled user input be matched against the modeled composition execution processes (i.e., centralized and decentralized orchestration) based on the defined security requirements and privacy preferences?
- ii. How can a multi-criteria selection mechanism be proposed for the matched candidate services to screen and then select composition route(s) with the highest possible security?
- iii. How can the power of the empirical optimization technique be employed in selecting a high-performance composition model (i.e., centralized or decentralized orchestration) based on user requests while maintaining the highest possible security level(s)?

#### **1.4 Purpose of the Research**

The purpose of this research is to design a security-conscious and privacy-preserving service composition for use in service deployment and coordination for SOC environments. Mathematical modeling of service user privacy preferences in the

form of user input, mathematical modeling of service providers' privacy policies in the form of centralized and decentralized orchestration is introduced, and an empirical optimization technique is presented.

### **1.5 Objectives of the Research**

The main objective of this study is to model all states of user input and the Web service composition process and then introduce an approach to identify the desired route(s) in an appropriate execution model (centralized or decentralized orchestration) in terms of security requirements and privacy preferences. Therefore, the sub objectives of this research are outlined as follows:

1. To identify the required security based on user privacy preference.
2. To develop a mathematical model for user input that can fulfil all states of privacy preference.
3. To develop mathematical models for centralized and decentralized orchestrations that include all states of service providers' privacy policy.
4. To develop a mathematical model to compare the developed user input state with the developed centralized and decentralized orchestration states in terms of the required security and privacy identified.
5. To employ a multi-criteria decision-making method on the outcome of comparison model to find the composition route(s) with the highest possible security.
6. To develop empirical models that represents the relationship between independent variables (including purposes, available data items, action types and roles) and dependent variables (including Available Route



Number (ARN) and Available Route Quality (ARQ)) for centralized and decentralized orchestrations to be used for optimization.

## 1.6 Scope of the Research

This research was inspired by four research directions, namely service selection and composition, security and privacy, multi-criteria decision-making, and statistical-based optimization. In this research:

1. The Web service composition process is limited to the two, choreographed and execution process levels.
2. The information that users can provide as user input are purpose, available data items, visibility, and actions (read-only, modify).
3. The security of the Web service composition process is limited to the CIA principles i.e., confidentiality, integrity, and availability in the orchestration model.
4. The features designed for providers are based on the user inputs and include the goal, requested data items, role, and defined security.
5. The privacy extracted from user input is restricted to the sensitivity and risk concepts, which are directly related to the availability of data items and their actions.
6. The user input states and modeled composition routes of orchestrations (centralized and decentralized) are compared against user request, extracted privacy and defined security criteria.
7. The empirical models are designed based on the D-Optimal method and are employed to optimize the dependent variables (purposes, available data items, action types and roles) and independent variables (including ARN and ARQ).

The choreographed level in this study is assumed to illustrate the service composition architecture and to demonstrate the empirical model's outcome to select the best composition execution process. Investigating choreographed level details is beyond the scope of this research.

## 1.7 Significance of the Research

The emergence of loosely coupled and platform-independent SOC eventuates building large computing infrastructures like the Internet, which enable organizations to share information and offer value-added services tailored to all variant needs of users. Web service composition plays a key role in realizing this vision of implementing almost any complex business process (Carminati *et al.*, 2014; Costante *et al.*, 2013c; Karatas *et al.*, 2015).

A growing number of services provide the same functionalities and variant QoS, resulting in a sizable body of literature on QoS-aware service composition. Despite the massive improvements, service composition suffers from improperly addressed challenges. Privacy and security are the two most important challenges that have attracted less attention owing to their complexity. Therefore, security and privacy-aware service composition is still considered a complicated task

Moreover, the increase in newly emerging SOC paradigms such as cloud computing, and Internet of Things imposes new, unaddressed privacy and security challenges, requiring revisiting the previously addressed problems to propose new outperforming solutions. This research endeavours to open a new horizon for security-conscious privacy-preserving service composition to more securely and privately serve user requests.

## 1.8 Thesis Organization

This chapter fully discussed the nature of the research, the research gaps and problems faced, the research purpose and objectives, how these research gaps and problems will be addressed, as well as the research scope and significance. The remainder of this thesis is organized as follows:

The second chapter describes a background on research directions, explains the unaddressed challenges, and presents a literature review of existing works on service selection and composition. The proposed research methodology is discussed in

Chapter 3 by providing an overview of the research phases, operational framework, and explanations on the validation and evaluation of these phases.

The fourth chapter presents the research design and implementation by introducing the mathematical modeling of the security-conscious privacy-preserving Web service composition process. The proposed techniques and algorithms are described in detail.

The experimental results and a discussion are provided in Chapter 5 to indicate the applicability and feasibility of the proposed approach and investigate its evaluation and validation. Finally, a summary and conclusions of the thesis are provided in Chapter 6 by discussing the contributions of this research and suggesting for potential future research directions.

## REFERENCES

- Acampora, G., Gaeta, M., Loia, V., and Vasilakos, A. V. (2010). Interoperable and Adaptive Fuzzy Services for Ambient Intelligence Applications. *ACM Trans. Auton. Adapt. Syst.*, 5(2), 1-26.
- Aggarwal, R., Verma, K., Miller, J., and Milnor, W. (2004). *Constraint Driven Web Service Composition in Meteor-S*. IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC 2004), 23-30.
- Ahmed, A. N., and Azam, F. (2014). Selection of Web Services by Using Diversified Service Rank. *International Journal of Software Engineering & Its Applications*, 8(4), 169-179.
- Al-Sharawneh, J., Williams, M. A., and Goldbaum, D. (2010). *Web Service Reputation Prediction Based on Customer Feedback Forecasting Model*. The 14th IEEE International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference Workshops (EDOCW 2010), 33-40.
- Alrifai, M., and Risse, T. (2009). *Combining Global Optimization with Local Selection for Efficient Qos-Aware Service Composition*. The 18th International conference on World Wide Web, 881-890.
- Alrifai, M., Risse, T., and Nejdil, W. (2012). A Hybrid Approach for Efficient Web Service Composition with End-to-End Qos Constraints. *ACM Transactions on the Web*, 6(2).
- Anderson, M. J., and Whitcomb, P. J. (2000). Design of Experiments. *Kirk-Othmer encyclopedia of chemical technology*.
- Anderson, R. J. (2008). *Security Engineering: A Guide to Building Dependable Distributed Systems*. USA: Wiley.
- Asuncion, C. H. (2009). *Goal-Driven Service Mediation Solution*. University of Twente, Netherlands.
- Atkinson, A., and Donev, A. (1992). *Optimum Experimental Designs*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- BangYu, W., Chi-Hung, C., and Shijie, X. (2007). *Service Selection Model Based on Qos Reference Vector*. IEEE Congress on Services, 270-277.
- Barakat, L., Miles, S., and Luck, M. (2014). Efficient Adaptive Qos-Based Service Selection. *Service Oriented Computing and Applications*, 8(4), 261-276.
- Barbir, A. (2013). Multi-Factor Authentication Methods Taxonomy. Retrieved November, 2015, from [www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/48334/OASIS-3rd-deliveatble-start.pptx](http://www.oasis-open.org/committees/download.php/48334/OASIS-3rd-deliveatble-start.pptx)
- Barhamgi, M., Benslimane, D., Oulmakhzoune, S., Cuppens-Boulahia, N., Cuppens, F., Mrissa, M., et al. (2013). Secure and Privacy-Preserving Execution Model for Data Services. In *Advanced Information Systems Engineering* (Vol. 7908, pp. 35-50): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Barker, E., Barker, W., Burr, W., Polk, W., and Smid, M. (2012). *Recommendation for Key Management*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Barker, E. B. (2009). *Recommendation for Digital Signature Timeliness*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Barker, K., Askari, M., Banerjee, M., Ghazinour, K., Mackas, B., Majedi, M., et al. (2009). A Data Privacy Taxonomy. In *Dataspace: The Final Frontier* (pp. 42-54): Springer.
- Beek, M. T., Bucchiarone, A., and Gnesi, S. (2007). *Web Service Composition Approaches: From Industrial Standards to Formal Methods*. The Second International Conference on Internet and Web Applications and Services (ICIW '07), 15-21.
- Bell, D. E., and La Padula, L. J. (1976). *Secure Computer System: Unified Exposition and Multics Interpretation*. Technical Report. DTIC Document
- Benatallah, B., Dumas, M., and Sheng, Q. (2005). Facilitating the Rapid Development and Scalable Orchestration of Composite Web Services. *Distributed and Parallel Databases*, 17(1), 5-37.
- Berbner, R., Spahn, M., Repp, N., Heckmann, O., and Steinmetz, R. (2006). *Heuristics for Qos-Aware Web Service Composition*. The International Conference on Web Services (ICWS '06), 72-82.
- Berners-Lee, T., Fielding, R., and Masinter, L. (2004). Uniform Resource Identifier (Uri): Generic Syntax. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc3986>

- Bertino, E., Martino, L., Paci, F., and Squicciarini, A. (2009). *Security for Web Services and Service-Oriented Architectures*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bertino, E., Martino, L., Paci, F., and Squicciarini, A. (2010). Standards for Web Services Security. In *Security for Web Services and Service-Oriented Architectures* (pp. 45-77): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Bezerra, M. A., Santelli, R. E., Oliveira, E. P., Villar, L. S., and Escalera, L. A. (2008). Response Surface Methodology (RSM) as a Tool for Optimization in Analytical Chemistry. *Talanta*, 76(5), 965-977.
- Beznosov, K., Flinn, D. J., Kawamoto, S., and Hartman, B. (2005). Introduction to Web Services and Their Security. *Information Security Technical Report*, 10(1), 2-14.
- Bichier, M., and Lin, K. J. (2006). Service-Oriented Computing. *Computer*, 39(3), 99-101.
- Binder, W., Constantinescu, I., and Faltings, B. (2006). *Decentralized Orchestration of Composite Web Services*. International Conference on Web Services (ICWS '06), 869-876.
- Boualem Benatallah, F. C., Paolo Traverso. (2005). *Service-Oriented Computing*: Springer.
- Bouguettaya, A., Sheng, Q. Z., and Daniel, F. (2014a). *Advanced Web Services*: Springer.
- Bouguettaya, A., Sheng, Q. Z., and Daniel, F. (2014g). *Web Services Foundations*: Springer.
- Bourne, S., Szabo, C., and Sheng, Q. (2012). Ensuring Well-Formed Conversations between Control and Operational Behaviors of Web Services. In *Service-Oriented Computing* (Vol. 7636, pp. 507-515): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Box, G. E., and Draper, N. R. (1987). *Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces* (Vol. 424).
- Brezillon, P., and Mostefaoui, G. K. (2004). *Context-Based Security Policies: A New Modeling Approach*. The Second IEEE Annual Conference on Pervasive Computing and Communications Workshops 154-158.
- Bronsted, J., Hansen, K. M., and Ingstrup, M. (2010). Service Composition Issues in Pervasive Computing. *IEEE Pervasive Computing*, 9(1), 62-70.

- Brucker, A. D., Malmignati, F., Merabti, M., Shi, Q., and Zhou, B. (2013). *A Framework for Secure Service Composition*. IEEE International Conference on Social Computing (Socialcom), 647-652.
- Carminati, B., Ferrari, E., Bishop, R., and Hung, P. C. K. (2007). *Security Conscious Web Service Composition with Semantic Web Support*. IEEE 23rd International Conference on Data Engineering Workshop, 695-704.
- Carminati, B., Ferrari, E., and Hung, P. C. K. (2006). *Security Conscious Web Service Composition*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2006), Los Alamitos, 489-496.
- Carminati, B., Ferrari, E., and Ngoc Hong, T. (2014). *Secure Web Service Composition with Untrusted Broker*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2014), 137-144.
- Carminati, B., Ferrari, E., and Tran, N. H. (2015). *A Privacy-Preserving Framework for Constrained Choreographed Service Composition*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2015), 297-304.
- Carstensen, B. (2010). Repeatability, Reproducibility and Coefficient of Variation. In *Comparing Clinical Measurement Methods* (pp. 107-114): John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Casati, F., and Shan, M.-C. (2001). Dynamic and Adaptive Composition of E-Services. *Information Systems*, 26(3), 143-163.
- Castro, J., Kolp, M., and Mylopoulos, J. (2002). Towards Requirements-Driven Information Systems Engineering: The Tropos Project. *Information Systems*, 27(6), 365-389.
- Chafle, G. B., Chandra, S., Mann, V., and Nanda, M. G. (2004). *Decentralized Orchestration of Composite Web Services*. The 13th International Conference on World Wide Web 134-143.
- Charfi, A., Dinkelaker, T., and Mezini, M. (2009). *A Plug-in Architecture for Self-Adaptive Web Service Compositions*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2009), 35-42.
- Chung, L., Nixon, B. A., Yu, E., and Mylopoulos, J. (2012). *Non-Functional Requirements in Software Engineering* (Vol. 5): Springer Science & Business Media.

- Costante, E., Paci, F., and Zannone, N. (2013a). *Privacy-Aware Web Service Composition and Ranking*. 2013 IEEE 20th International Conference on Web Services (ICWS), 131-138.
- Costante, E., Paci, F., and Zannone, N. (2013c). Privacy-Aware Web Service Composition and Ranking. *International Journal of Web Services Research*, 10(3), 1-23.
- Cysneiros, L. M., Werneck, V., Amaral, J., and Yu, E. (2005). *Agent/Goal Orientation Versus Object Orientation for Requirements Engineering: A Practical Evaluation Using an Exemplar*. Workshop in Requirements Engineering, 123-134.
- D'Mello, D. A., and Ananthanarayana, V. S. (2010). Dynamic Selection Mechanism for Quality of Service Aware Web Services. *Enterprise Information Systems*, 4(1), 23-60.
- D'Mello, D. A., Ananthanarayana, V. S., and Santhi, T. (2008). *A Qos Broker Based Architecture for Dynamic Web Service Selection*. The Second Asia International Conference on Modeling & Simulation (AICMS 08), 101-106.
- Dalpiaz, F., Brucker, A. D., Meland, P. H., Giorgini, P., and Rios, E. (2014). *Secure and Trustworthy Service Composition*: Springer.
- Dastjerdi, A. V. (2013). *Qos-Aware and Semantic-Based Service Coordination for Multi-Cloud Environments*. The University of Melbourne, Australia.
- De Castro, V., Marcos, E., and Sanz, M. L. (2006). *Service Composition Modeling: A Case Study*. The Seventh Mexican IEEE International Conference on Computer Science (ENC '06), 101-108.
- Ding, S., Yang, S., Zhang, Y., Liang, C., and Xia, C. (2014). Combining Qos Prediction and Customer Satisfaction Estimation to Solve Cloud Service Trustworthiness Evaluation Problems. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 56(0), 216-225.
- Douligeris, C., and Ninios, G. P. (2006). Security in Web Services. In *Network Security* (pp. 179-204): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dragovic, I., Turajlic, N., Radojevic, D., and Petrovic, B. (2014). Combining Boolean Consistent Fuzzy Logic and Ahp Illustrated on the Web Service Selection Problem. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 7, 84-93.



- Dragović, I., Turajlić, N., Radojević, D., and Petrović, B. (2014). Combining Boolean Consistent Fuzzy Logic and Ahp Illustrated on the Web Service Selection Problem. *International Journal of Computational Intelligence Systems*, 7, 84-93.
- Driss, M., Moha, N., Jamoussi, Y., Jézéquel, J.-M., and Ben Ghézala, H. (2010). A Requirement-Centric Approach to Web Service Modeling, Discovery, and Selection. In *Service-Oriented Computing* (Vol. 6470, pp. 258-272): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Dustdar, S., and Schreiner, W. (2005). A Survey on Web Services Composition. *International journal of web and grid services*, 1(1), 1-30.
- El Hadad, J., Manouvrier, M., and Rukoz, M. (2010). Tqos: Transactional and Qos-Aware Selection Algorithm for Automatic Web Service Composition. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 3(1), 73-85.
- Elshaafi, H., and Botvich, D. (2013). Trustworthiness Inference of Multi-Tenant Component Services in Service Compositions. *Journal of Convergence*, 4(1), 31-37.
- Feier, C., Roman, D., Polleres, A., Domingue, J., and Fensel, D. (2005). *Towards Intelligent Web Services: Web Service Modeling Ontology (Wsmo)*. International Conference on Intelligent Computing (ICIC 2005), 1-10.
- Fensel, D., Lausen, H., Polleres, A., de Bruijn, J., Stollberg, M., Roman, D., et al. (2006). *Enabling Semantic Web Services: The Web Service Modeling Ontology*: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fisher, R. A. (1936). Design of Experiments. *British Medical Journal*, 1(3923), 554.
- Frankova, G., Massacci, F., and Seguran, M. (2007). From Early Requirements Analysis Towards Secure Workflows. In *Trust Management* (Vol. 238, pp. 407-410): Springer US.
- Gabrel, V., Manouvrier, M., and Murat, C. (2013). A New Linear Program for Qos-Aware Web Service Composition Based on Complex Workflow. *Journal of Université Paris-Dauphine*, 339-348.
- Gallege, L. S., Gamage, D. U., Hill, J. H., and Raje, R. R. (2013). *Trustworthy Service Selection Using Long-Term Monitoring of Trust Contracts*. The 17th IEEE International Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference (EDOC 2013), 195-200.

- Gang, W., Li, Z., Jing, J., and Wei, J. (2013). *Qos-Based Service Composition under Various Qos Requirements*. The 20th Asia-Pacific Software Engineering Conference (APSEC 2013), 67-74.
- Gatti, C. (2014). *Design of Experiments for Reinforcement Learning*: Springer.
- Geiger, O. (1997). Statistical Methods for Fermentation Optimization. *Fermentation and biochemical engineering handbook, 2nd edn*. Noyes Publications, Westwood.
- Ghosal, S., and Mann, V. (2012). Decentralized Orchestration of Composite Web Services. Retrieved November, 2015, from [http://researcher.ibm.com/researcher/view\\_group.php?id=3844](http://researcher.ibm.com/researcher/view_group.php?id=3844)
- Gilmore, S., Gönczy, L., Koch, N., Mayer, P., Tribastone, M., and Varró, D. (2011). Non-Functional Properties in the Model-Driven Development of Service-Oriented Systems. *Software & Systems Modeling*, 10(3), 287-311.
- Giorgini, P., Massacci, F., Mylopoulos, J., and Zannone, N. (2005). *Modeling Security Requirements through Ownership, Permission and Delegation*. The 13th IEEE International Conference on Requirements Engineering, 167-176.
- Giorgini, P., Massacci, F., Mylopoulos, J., and Zannone, N. (2006). Requirements Engineering for Trust Management: Model, Methodology, and Reasoning. *International Journal of Information Security*, 5(4), 257-274.
- Goettelmann, E., Fdhila, W., and Godart, C. (2013). *Partitioning and Cloud Deployment of Composite Web Services under Security Constraints*. The IEEE International Conference on Cloud Engineering (IC2E 2013), 193-200.
- Guarda, P., and Zannone, N. (2009). Towards the Development of Privacy-Aware Systems. *Information and Software Technology*, 51(2), 337-350.
- Guinard, D., and Trifa, V. (2009). *Towards the Web of Things: Web Mashups for Embedded Devices*. The Workshop on Mashups, Enterprise Mashups and Lightweight Composition on the Web (MEM 2009) in International World Wide Web Conferences, Madrid, Spain, 15-23.
- Gunther, N. J. (1997). *The Practical Performance Analyst: Performance-by-Design Techniques for Distributed Systems*: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Hafner, M., and Breu, R. (2009a). *Security Engineering for Service-Oriented Architectures*: Springer Science & Business Media.

- Hafner, M., and Breu, R. (2009f). Soa -Standards & Technology. In *Security Engineering for Service-Oriented Architectures* (pp. 15-25): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Haibo, Z., and Doshi, P. (2009). *Towards Automated Restful Web Service Composition*. The IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2009), 189-196.
- Halvard, S. (2009). Modeling Trust Negotiation for Web Services, *42*, 54-61.
- Hang, C. W., Kalia, A. K., and Singh, M. P. (2012). *Behind the Curtain: Service Selection Via Trust in Composite Services*. IEEE 19th International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2012), 9-16.
- Hang, C. W., and Singh, M. P. (2011). Trustworthy Service Selection and Composition. *ACM Trans. Auton. Adapt. Syst.*, *6*(1), 1-17.
- Hewett, R., and Kijisanayothin, P. (2010). Privacy and Recovery in Composite Web Service Transactions. *International Journal for Infonomics*, *3*(2), 240-248.
- Hu, V. C., Ferraiolo, D., Kuhn, R., Schnitzer, A., Sandlin, K., Miller, R., et al. (2014). *Guide to Attribute Based Access Control (Abac) Definition and Considerations*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Huang, A. F. M., Lan, C.-W., and Yang, S. J. H. (2009). An Optimal Qos-Based Web Service Selection Scheme. *Information Sciences*, *179*(19), 3309-3322.
- Immonen, A., and Pakkala, D. (2014). A Survey of Methods and Approaches for Reliable Dynamic Service Compositions. *Service Oriented Computing and Applications*, *8*(2), 129-158.
- Jensen, M. (2013). Towards Privacy-Friendly Transparency Services in Inter-Organizational Business Processes. *IEEE 37th Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference Workshops (COMPSACW 2013)*, 200-205.
- Jing, L., Dianfu, M., Lusong, L., and Hong, Z. (2008). *Aadss: Agent-Based Adaptive Dynamic Semantic Web Service Selection*. The 4th International Conference on Next Generation Web Services Practices (NWESP '08) 83-89.
- Joshi, J. B., Aref, W. G., Ghafoor, A., and Spafford, E. H. (2001). Security Models for Web-Based Applications. *Communications of the ACM*, *44*(2), 38-44.
- Johty Rosenberg, D. R. (2004). Basic Concepts of Web Services Security. In *Securing Web Services with Ws-Security*: SAMS Publishing.

- Jungmann, A., Brangewitz, S., Petrljic, R., and Platenius, M. C. (2014). *Towards a Flexible and Privacy-Preserving Reputation System for Markets of Composed Services*. The Sixth International Conferences on Advanced Service Computing (Service Computation 2014) 49-57.
- Kalasapur, S., Kumar, M., and Shirazi, B. (2007). Dynamic Service Composition in Pervasive Computing. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 18(7), 907-918.
- Karatas, F., Fischer, L., and Kesdogan, D. (2015). Service Composition with Consideration of Interdependent Security Objectives. *Science of Computer Programming*, 97, 183-201.
- Kawamoto, J., and Yoshikawa, M. (2009). *Security of Social Information from Query Analysis in Daas*. The 2009 EDBT/ICDT Workshops, Saint-Petersburg, Russia, 148-152.
- Khadka, R. (2010). *Model-Driven Development of Service Compositions: Transformation from Service Choreography to Service Orchestrations*. University of Twente, Netherlands.
- Khan, H., Zahid, U., and Zahid, H. (2010). Comparative Study of Authentication Techniques. *International Journal of Video & Image Processing and Network Security IJVIPNS*, 10(04).
- Kissel, R. (2013). *Glossary of Key Information Security Terms*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Kongdenfha, W., Motahari-Nezhad, H. R., Benatallah, B., Casati, F., and Saint-Paul, R. (2009). Mismatch Patterns and Adaptation Aspects: A Foundation for Rapid Development of Web Service Adapters. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 2(2), 94-107.
- Kreger, H. (2001). Web Services Conceptual Architecture (Wscs 1.0). *IBM Software*, 5, 1-41.
- Lapouchnian, A. (2005). *Goal-Oriented Requirements Engineering: An Overview of the Current Research*. Technical Report. University of Toronto
- Lécué, F., Silva, E., and Pires, L. (2008). A Framework for Dynamic Web Services Composition. In *Emerging Web Services Technology* (pp. 59-75): Springer.
- Leitner, P., Hummer, W., and Dustdar, S. (2013). Cost-Based Optimization of Service Compositions. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 6(2), 239-251.

- Li, X., Fan, Y., Madnick, S., and Sheng, Q. Z. (2010). A Pattern-Based Approach to Protocol Mediation for Web Services Composition. *Information and Software Technology*, 52(3), 304-323.
- Liu, D. R., and Shih, Y. Y. (2005). Integrating Ahp and Data Mining for Product Recommendation Based on Customer Lifetime Value. *Information & Management*, 42(3), 387-400.
- Liu, M., Wang, M., Shen, W., Luo, N., and Yan, J. (2012). A Quality of Service (Qos)-Aware Execution Plan Selection Approach for a Service Composition Process. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 28(7), 1080-1089.
- Liu, Y., Ngu, A. H., and Zeng, L. Z. (2004). *Qos Computation and Policing in Dynamic Web Service Selection*. The 13th international conference on World Wide Web, 66-73.
- Lotfi, F. H., and Fallahnejad, R. (2010). Imprecise Shannon's Entropy and Multi Attribute Decision Making. *Entropy*, 12(1), 53-62.
- Mabrouk, N. B., Beauche, S., Kuznetsova, E., Georgantas, N., and Issarny, V. (2009). Qos-Aware Service Composition in Dynamic Service Oriented Environments. In *Middleware 2009* (Vol. 5896, pp. 123-142): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Mahfouz, A., Barroca, L., Laney, R., and Nuseibeh, B. (2009). Requirements-Driven Collaborative Choreography Customization. In *Service-Oriented Computing* (Vol. 5900, pp. 144-158): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Manoharan, R., Archana, A., and Cowlagi, S. N. (2011). Hybrid Web Services Ranking Algorithm. *International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, 8, 83-97.
- Massacci, F., Mylopoulos, J., and Zannone, N. (2007). An Ontology for Secure Socio-Technical Systems. In *Handbook of Ontologies for Business Interaction* (Vol. 1, pp. 469): IGI Global.
- Massacci, F., Mylopoulos, J., and Zannone, N. (2010). Security Requirements Engineering: The Si\* Modeling Language and the Secure Tropos Methodology. In *Advances in Intelligent Information Systems* (Vol. 265, pp. 147-174): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Mathew, S., Atif, Y., Sheng, Q., and Maamar, Z. (2013). The Web of Things - Challenges and Enabling Technologies. In *Internet of Things and Inter-Cooperative Computational Technologies for Collective Intelligence* (Vol. 460, pp. 1-23): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- Maximilien, E. M., and Singh, M. P. (2004). *Toward Autonomic Web Services Trust and Selection*. The 2nd international conference on Service oriented computing, New York, USA, 212-221.
- Medjahed, B. (2004). *Semantic Web Enabled Composition of Web Services*. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Virginia, USA.
- Medjahed, B., and Atif, Y. (2007). Context-Based Matching for Web Service Composition. *Distributed and Parallel Databases*, 21(1), 5-37.
- Medjahed, B., Bouguettaya, A., and Elmagarmid, A. (2003). Composing Web Services on the Semantic Web. *The VLDB Journal*, 12(4), 333-351.
- Mehdi, M., Bouguila, N., and Bentahar, J. (2012). *Trustworthy Web Service Selection Using Probabilistic Models*. The 2012 IEEE 19th International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2012), 17-24.
- Mehdi, M., Bouguila, N., and Bentahar, J. (2013). *A Qos-Based Trust Approach for Service Selection and Composition Via Bayesian Networks*. The 2013 IEEE 20th International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2012), 211-218.
- Menascé, D. A., Casalicchio, E., and Dubey, V. (2010). On Optimal Service Selection in Service Oriented Architectures. *Performance Evaluation*, 67(8), 659-675.
- Michlmayr, A., Rosenberg, F., Leitner, P., and Dustdar, S. (2009). *Comprehensive Qos Monitoring of Web Services and Event-Based Sla Violation Detection*. The 4th International Workshop on Middleware for Service Oriented Computing, 1-6.
- Michlmayr, A., Rosenberg, F., Leitner, P., and Dustdar, S. (2010). End-to-End Support for Qos-Aware Service Selection, Binding, and Mediation in Vresco. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 3(3), 193-205.
- Moghaddam, M., and Davis, J. G. (2014). Service Selection in Web Service Composition: A Comparative Review of Existing Approaches. In *Web Services Foundations* (pp. 321-346): Springer.
- Mokarizadeh, S., Dokoohaki, N., Matskin, M., and Kungas, P. (2010). Trust and Privacy Enabled Service Composition Using Social Experience. In *Software Services for E-World* (Vol. 341, pp. 226-236): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Monfroy, E., Perrin, O., and Ringeissen, C. (2008). *Modeling Web Services Composition with Constraints*. The Colombian Conference on Computer Science (3CCC 2008), 173-179.
- Montgomery, D. C. (2008). *Design and Analysis of Experiments*: John Wiley & Sons.

- Mosincat, A., Binder, W., and Jazayeri, M. (2012). Achieving Runtime Adaptability through Automated Model Evolution and Variant Selection. *Enterprise Information Systems*, 8(1), 67-83.
- Myers, R. H., Montgomery, D. C., and Anderson-Cook, C. M. (2009). *Response Surface Methodology: Process and Product Optimization Using Designed Experiments* (Third ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Nezhad, H. R. M., Xu, G. Y., and Benatallah, B. (2010). *Protocol-Aware Matching of Web Service Interfaces for Adapter Development*. The 19th International Conference on World wide web, Raleigh, North Carolina, USA, 731-740.
- Ngu, A. H. H., Carlson, M. P., Sheng, Q. Z., and Hye-young, P. (2010). Semantic-Based Mashup of Composite Applications. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 3(1), 2-15.
- NIST. (2009). A Survey of Access Control Models. Retrieved November, 2015, from [http://csrc.nist.gov/news\\_events/privilege-management-workshop/PvM-Model-Survey-Aug26-2009.pdf](http://csrc.nist.gov/news_events/privilege-management-workshop/PvM-Model-Survey-Aug26-2009.pdf)
- Noor, T. H., Sheng, Q. Z., Zeadally, S., and Yu, J. (2013). Trust Management of Services in Cloud Environments: Obstacles and Solutions. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 46(1), 1-30.
- O'Gorman, L. (2003). Comparing Passwords, Tokens, and Biometrics for User Authentication. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 91(12), 2021-2040.
- O'Neill, M. (2003). *Web Services Security*: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- OASIS. (2004). Universal Description, Discovery and Integration Specification 3.0.2. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.uddi.org/pubs/uddi-v3.0.2-20041019.htm>
- OASIS. (2006). Oasis Web Services Security. Retrieved July, 2015, from [https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc\\_home.php?wg\\_abbrev=wss](https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/tc_home.php?wg_abbrev=wss)
- OASIS. (2007a). Oasis Web Services Business Process Execution Language Version 2.0. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsbpel/2.0/OS/wsbpel-v2.0-OS.html>
- OASIS. (2007b). Oasis Ws-Trust 1.3. Retrieved July, 2015, from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-sx/ws-trust/200512>
- OASIS. (2009). Oasis Web Services Federation Language (Ws-Federation) Version 1.2. Retrieved July, 2015, from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsfed/federation/v1.2/os/ws-federation-1.2-spec-os.html>

- OASIS. (2010). Web Services Quality Factors. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/wsqm/wsrf/v1.0/WS-Quality-Factors-v1.0-cd02.html>
- OASIS. (2012). Ws-Trust 1.4. Retrieved December, 2014, from <http://docs.oasis-open.org/ws-sx/ws-trust/v1.4/ws-trust.html>
- Oh, S. C., Lee, D., and Kumara, S. R. T. (2008). Effective Web Service Composition in Diverse and Large-Scale Service Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 1(1), 15-32.
- OMG. (2014). Business Process Model and Notation. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.bpmn.org/>
- Ono, K., Nakamura, Y., Satoh, F., and Tateishi, T. (2014). Method for Model Based Verification of Security Policies for Web Service Composition: Google Patents.
- Paja, E., Dalpiaz, F., and Giorgini, P. (2014). Sts-Tool: Security Requirements Engineering for Socio-Technical Systems. In *Engineering Secure Future Internet Services and Systems* (pp. 65-96): Springer.
- Papazoglou, M., and van den Heuvel, W.-J. (2007). Service Oriented Architectures: Approaches, Technologies and Research Issues. *The VLDB Journal*, 16(3), 389-415.
- Papazoglou, M. P., Traverso, P., Dustdar, S., and Leymann, F. (2008). Service-Oriented Computing: A Research Roadmap. *International Journal of Cooperative Information Systems*, 17(02), 223-255.
- Paradesi, S., Doshi, P., and Swaika, S. (2009). *Integrating Behavioral Trust in Web Service Compositions*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2009), 453-460.
- Parashar, M., and Hariri, S. (2006). *Autonomic Computing: Concepts, Infrastructure, and Applications*: CRC press.
- Pautasso, C., Zimmermann, O., and Leymann, F. (2008). *Restful Web Services Vs. "Big" Web Services: Making the Right Architectural Decision*. The 17th International conference on World Wide Web.
- Peijie, H., Piyuan, L., and Hong, P. (2010). *Grid-Cloud: It Platform for Service Science*. The 2nd International Conference on Future Computer and Communication (ICFCC 2010), 143-147.



- Peltz, C. (2003). Web Services Orchestration and Choreography. *Computer*(10), 46-52.
- Ping, W. (2012). *A Trust-Based Selection Approach for Qos-Aware Service Composition Provisions*. The 6th International Conference on New Trends in Information Science and Service Science and Data Mining (ISSDM 2012), 1-6.
- Ping, W., Kuo-Ming, C., Chi-Chun, L., Farmer, R., and Pu-Tsun, K. (2009). *A Reputation-Based Service Selection Scheme*. IEEE International Conference on e-Business Engineering (ICEBE '09), 501-506.
- Pino, L., and Spanoudakis, G. (2012). *Constructing Secure Service Compositions with Patterns*. IEEE Eighth World Congress on Services (SERVICES 2012), 184-191.
- Plebani, P., Cappiello, C., Comuzzi, M., Pernici, B., and Yadav, S. (2012). Micromais: Executing and Orchestrating Web Services on Constrained Mobile Devices. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 42(9), 1075-1094.
- Pop, C. B., Chifu, V. R., Salomie, I., Dinsoreanu, M., David, T., and Acretoaie, V. (2010). *Ant-Inspired Technique for Automatic Web Service Composition and Selection*. The 12th International symposium on Symbolic and Numeric Algorithms for Scientific Computing (SYNASC 2010), 449-455.
- Pramodh, N., Srinath, V., and Sri Krishna, A. (2012). Optimization and Ranking in Web Service Composition Using Performance Index. *International Journal of Engineering and Technology (IJET)*, 4, 208-213.
- Rabanal, P., Rodr'guez, I., Mateo, J. A., and D'az, G. (2012). Improving the Automatic Derivation of Choreography-Conforming Web Services Systems. *Procedia Computer Science*, 9, 449-458.
- Rahimi, M. R., Venkatasubramanian, N., Mehrotra, S., and Vasilakos, A. V. (2012). *Mapcloud: Mobile Applications on an Elastic and Scalable 2-Tier Cloud Architecture*. The 2012 IEEE/ACM Fifth International Conference on Utility and Cloud Computing, 83-90.
- Raj, R. J. R., and Sasipraba, T. (2010). *Web Service Selection Based on Qos Constraints*. Trendz in Information Sciences & Computing (TISC 2010), 156-162.
- Ran, S. (2003). A Model for Web Services Discovery with Qos. *SIGecom Exch.*, 4(1), 1-10.

- Ravn, A., Srba, J., and Vighio, S. (2010). A Formal Analysis of the Web Services Atomic Transaction Protocol with Uppaal. In *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification, and Validation* (Vol. 6415, pp. 579-593): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Rezgui, A., Ouzzani, M., Bouguettaya, A., and Medjahed, B. (2002). *Preserving Privacy in Web Services*. The 4th International Workshop on Web Information and Data Management, McLean, Virginia, USA, 56-62.
- Rodríguez, I., Díaz, G., Rabanal, P., and Mateo, J. A. (2012). A Centralized and a Decentralized Method to Automatically Derive Choreography-Conforming Web Service Systems. *The Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming*, 81(2), 127-159.
- Sadiq, U., Kumar, M., Passarella, A., and Conti, M. (2011). *Modeling and Simulation of Service Composition in Opportunistic Networks*. The 14th ACM International Conference on Modeling, Analysis and Simulation of Wireless and Mobile Systems, 159-168.
- Salunke, D., Upadhyay, A., Sarwade, A., Marde, V., and Kandekar, S. (2013). A Survey Paper on Role Based Access Control. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer and Communication Engineering*, 2(3), 1340-1342.
- Sasikaladevi, N., and Arockiam, L. (2010). Reliability Evaluation Model for Composite Web Services. *International Journal of Web & Semantic Technology (IJWEST)*, 1(2), 1-7.
- Sathya, M., Swarnamugi, M., Dhavachelvan, P., and Sureshkumar, G. (2010). Evaluation of Qos Based Web-Service Selection Techniques for Service Composition. *International Journal of Software Engineering*, 1(5), 73-90.
- Satoh, F., and Tokuda, T. (2011). Security Policy Composition for Composite Web Services. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 4(4), 314-327.
- Schonberger, A., and Wirtz, G. (2012). *The Chorch Approach: How to Model B2bi Choreographies for Orchestration Execution* (Vol. 12): University of Bamberg Press.
- Schuller, D., Lampe, U., Eckert, J., Steinmetz, R., and Schulte, S. (2013). Optimizing Complex Service-Based Workflows for Stochastic Qos Parameters. *International Journal of Web Services Research*, 10(4), 1-38.

- Shardt, Y. A. (2015). Design of Experiments. In *Statistics for Chemical and Process Engineers* (pp. 141-209): Springer.
- Sharifi, M., Manaf, A. A., Memariani, A., Movahednejad, H., and Dastjerdi, A. V. (2014). *Consensus-Based Service Selection Using Crowdsourcing under Fuzzy Preferences of Users*. IEEE International Conference on Services Computing (SCC 2014), 17-26.
- Sharifi, M., Movahednejad, H., Tabatabaei, S. G. H., and Suhaimi, I. (2009). *An Effective Access Control Approach to Support Web Service Security*. The 11th International Conference on Information Integration and Web-based Applications and Services, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 529-535.
- She, W., Yen, I. L., Thuraisingham, B., and Bertino, E. (2013). Security-Aware Service Composition with Fine-Grained Information Flow Control. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 6(3), 330-343.
- Shehu, U., Epiphaniou, G., and Safdar, G. A. (2014). A Survey of Qos-Aware Web Service Composition Techniques. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 89(12), 10-17.
- Shen, H., and Hong, F. (2005). *A Context-Aware Role-Based Access Control Model for Web Services*. The IEEE International Conference on e-Business Engineering (ICEBE 2005), 220-223.
- Sheng, Q. Z., Benatallah, B., Dumas, M., and Mak, E. O. Y. (2002). *Self-Serv: A Platform for Rapid Composition of Web Services in a Peer-to-Peer Environment*. The 28th international conference on Very Large Data Bases, Hong Kong, China, 1051-1054.
- Sheng, Q. Z., Benatallah, B., Maamar, Z., and Ngu, A. H. H. (2009). Configurable Composition and Adaptive Provisioning of Web Services. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 2(1), 34-49.
- Sheng, Q. Z., Maamar, Z., Yao, L., Szabo, C., and Bourne, S. (2014a). Behavior Modeling and Automated Verification of Web Services. *Information Sciences*, 258(0), 416-433.
- Sheng, Q. Z., Qiao, X. Q., Vasilakos, A. V., Szabo, C., Bourne, S., and Xu, X. F. (2014b). Web Services Composition: A Decade's Overview. *Information Sciences*, 280, 218-238.
- Sheng, Q. Z., Yu, J., and Dustdar, S. (2010). *Enabling Context-Aware Web Services: Methods, Architectures, and Technologies*: CRC Press.

- Sherchan, W., Nepal, S., and Paris, C. (2013). A Survey of Trust in Social Networks. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 45(4), 1-33.
- Sheth, A. P., Gomadam, K., and Lathem, J. (2007). Sa-Rest: Semantically Interoperable and Easier-to-Use Services and Mashups. *Internet Computing, IEEE*, 11(6), 91-94.
- Singhal, A., Winograd, T., and Scarfone, K. A. (2007). *Guide to Secure Web Services*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Sirin, E., Hendler, J., and Parsia, B. (2003). *Semi-Automatic Composition of Web Services Using Semantic Descriptions*. The 1st Workshop on Web Services: Modeling, Architecture and Infrastructure, 17-24.
- Squicciarini, A. C., Carminati, B., and Karumanchi, S. (2013). *Privacy Aware Service Selection of Composite Web Services*. The 9th International Conference Conference on Collaborative Computing: Networking, Applications and Worksharing (Collaboratecom) 260-268.
- Stoneburner, G. (2001). *Underlying Technical Models for Information Technology Security*. Technical Report. National Institute of Standards and Technology
- Strunk, A. (2010). *Qos-Aware Service Composition: A Survey*. IEEE 8th European Conference on Web Services (ECOWS), 67-74.
- Sun, Q. B., Wang, S. G., Zou, H., and Yang, F. C. (2011). Qssa: A Qos-Aware Service Selection Approach. *International Journal of Web and Grid Services*, 7(2), 147-169.
- Sun, Y., Huang, Z., and Ke, C. (2014). Obtaining P3p Privacy Policies for Composite Services. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2014, 10.
- Tabatabaei, S. G. H. (2010). *Discovery and Composition of Web Services Using Artificial Intelligence Planning and Web Service Modeling Ontology*. Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, Malaysia.
- Tabatabaei, S. G. H., Vahid Dastjerdi, A., Wan Kadir, W. M., Ibrahim, S., and Sarafian, E. (2010). Security Conscious Ai-Planning-Based Composition of Semantic Web Services. *International Journal of Web Information Systems*, 6(3), 203-229.
- Tbahriti, S.-E., Mrissa, M., Medjahed, B., Ghedira, C., Barhamgi, M., and Fayn, J. (2011). Privacy-Aware Daas Services Composition. In *Database and Expert Systems Applications* (Vol. 6860, pp. 202-216): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- Tbahriti, S. E., Ghedira, C., Medjahed, B., and Mrissa, M. (2014). Privacy-Enhanced Web Service Composition. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 7(2), 210-222.
- Tbahriti, S. E., Ghedira, C., Medjahed, B., Mrissa, M., and Benslimane, D. (2013). How to Enhance Privacy within Daas Service Composition. *IEEE Systems Journal*, 7(3), 442-454.
- Thomas, R. K., and Sandhu, R. S. (1998). *Task-Based Authorization Controls (Tbac): A Family of Models for Active and Enterprise-Oriented Autorization Management*. IFIP Eleventh International Conference on Database Security: Status and Prospects, 166-181.
- Triantaphyllou, E. (2013). *Multi-Criteria Decision Making Methods: A Comparative Study* (Vol. 44): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Triantaphyllou, E., Shu, B., Sanchez, S. N., and Ray, T. (1998). Multi-Criteria Decision Making: An Operations Research Approach. *Encyclopedia of electrical and electronics engineering*, 15, 175-186.
- Van Riemsdijk, M. B., and Wirsing, M. (2010). Comparing Goal-Oriented and Procedural Service Orchestration. *Multiagent and Grid Systems*, 6(2), 133-163.
- Veríssimo, P., and Rodrigues, L. (2001). Fundamental Security Concepts. In *Distributed Systems for System Architects* (Vol. 1, pp. 377-393): Springer US.
- Vining, G. G. (2008). Adapting Response Surface Methodology for Computer and Simulation Experiments. In *The Grammar of Technology Development* (pp. 127-134): Springer.
- Vu, L. H., Hauswirth, M., and Aberer, K. (2005). Qos-Based Service Selection and Ranking with Trust and Reputation Management. In *On the Move to Meaningful Internet Systems: Coopis, Doa, and Odbase* (Vol. 3760, pp. 466-483): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- W3C. (2001). Web Services Description Language (WsdL) 1.1. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/wsdl>
- W3C. (2003a). Qos for Web Services: Requirements and Possible Approaches. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3c.or.kr/kr-office/TR/2003/ws-qos/>
- W3C. (2003f). Web Services Choreography Requirements (W3c Working Draft). Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-chor-reqs/>

- W3C. (2004a). Owl Web Ontology Language Guide. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/owl-guide>
- W3C. (2004b). Web Services Architecture. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-arch/>
- W3C. (2004c). Web Services Architecture Requirements. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/wsa-reqs/>
- W3C. (2005). Web Service Modeling Language (WsmL). Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/Submission/WSML/>
- W3C. (2006). Web Services Choreography Description Language. Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/ws-cdl-10-primer/>
- W3C. (2007). Soap Version 1.2 Part 1: Messaging Framework (Second Edition). Retrieved November, 2015, from <http://www.w3.org/TR/2007/REC-soap12-part1-20070427/>
- Wancheng, N., Lingjuan, H., Lianchen, L., and Cheng, W. (2007). *Commodity-Market Based Services Selection in Dynamic Web Service Composition*. The 2nd IEEE Conference on Asia-Pacific Service Computing, 218-223.
- Wang, X., Vitvar, T., Kerrigan, M., and Toma, I. (2006). A Qos-Aware Selection Model for Semantic Web Services. In *Service-Oriented Computing – Icsoc 2006* (Vol. 4294, pp. 390-401): Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Wang, Z. (2007). *An Adaptive Approach for Qos-Aware Web Service Composition*. Master Thesis, University of Windsor, Canada.
- Weber, I., Paik, H.-Y., and Benatallah, B. (2013). Form-Based Web Service Composition for Domain Experts. *ACM Trans. Web*, 8(1), 1-40.
- Wei, X., Venkatakrishnan, V. N., Sekar, R., and Ramakrishnan, I. V. (2006). *A Framework for Building Privacy-Conscious Composite Web Services*. International Conference on Web Services (ICWS '06), 655-662.
- Whitman, M., and Mattord, H. (2013). *Management of Information Security*: Cengage Learning.
- Wu, Q., Zhu, Q., and Zhou, M. (2014). A Correlation-Driven Optimal Service Selection Approach for Virtual Enterprise Establishment. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 25(6), 1441-1453.
- Xitong, L., Yushun, F., Sheng, Q. Z., Maamar, Z., and Hongwei, Z. (2011). A Petri Net Approach to Analyzing Behavioral Compatibility and Similarity of Web

- Services. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics, Part A: Systems and Humans*, 41(3), 510-521.
- Xu, Z. (2015). *Uncertain Multi-Attribute Decision Making: Methods and Applications*: Springer.
- Yang, N., Chen, X., and Yu, H. (2012). A Reputation Evaluation Technique for Web Services. *International Journal of Security and Its Applications*, 6(2), 329-334.
- Yildiz, U., and Godart, C. (2007a). *Centralized Versus Decentralized Conversation-Based Orchestrations*. The 4th IEEE International Conference on Enterprise Computing, E-Commerce, and E-Services (CEC/EEE 2007), Tokyo, 289-296.
- Yildiz, U., and Godart, C. (2007b). *Information Flow Control with Decentralized Service Compositions*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2007), 9-17.
- Yildiz, U., and Godart, C. (2008). Designing Decentralized Service Compositions: Challenges and Solutions. In *Web Information Systems and Technologies* (pp. 60-71): Springer.
- Yu, E. S. (1997). *Towards Modelling and Reasoning Support for Early-Phase Requirements Engineering*. The Third IEEE International Symposium on Requirements Engineering, 226-235.
- Yu, P. L. (2013). *Multiple-Criteria Decision Making: Concepts, Techniques, and Extensions* (Vol. 30): Springer Science & Business Media.
- Yu, Q., and Bouguettaya, A. (2010). Towards a Wsms: The State of the Art. In *Foundations for Efficient Web Service Selection* (pp. 11-23): Springer US.
- Yu, Q., Liu, X., Bouguettaya, A., and Medjahed, B. (2008). Deploying and Managing Web Services: Issues, Solutions, and Directions. *The VLDB Journal*, 17(3), 537-572.
- Yu, T., and Lin, K.-J. (2005). Service Selection Algorithms for Web Services with End-to-End Qos Constraints. *Information Systems and e-Business Management*, 3(2), 103-126.
- Yu, T., Zhang, Y., and Lin, K.-J. (2007). Efficient Algorithms for Web Services Selection with End-to-End Qos Constraints. *ACM Transactions on the Web (TWEB)*, 1(1), 6.
- Yuan, E., and Tong, J. (2005). *Attributed Based Access Control (Abac) for Web Services*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2005), 569-578.

- Zeng, L. Z., Benatallah, B., Ngu, A. H. H., Dumas, M., Kalagnanam, J., and Chang, H. (2004). Qos-Aware Middleware for Web Services Composition. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 30(5), 311-327.
- Zhang, S. Q., Lin, W. M., Dou, W. C., and Chen, J. J. (2013). A Method for Optimizing Top-K Composite Services Towards Preference-Aware Service Dominance. *International Journal of Web Services Research*, 10(2), 63-86.
- Zhang, T., Ma, J., Xi, N., Liu, X., Liu, Z., and Xiong, J. (2014). *Trustworthy Service Composition in Service-Oriented Mobile Social Networks*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS), 684-687.
- Zhang, W., Chang, C. K., Feng, T., and Jiang, H.-y. (2010). *Qos-Based Dynamic Web Service Composition with Ant Colony Optimization*. IEEE 34th Annual Computer Software and Applications Conference (COMPSAC), 493-502.
- Zhao, L. (2008). *A Role-Based Access Control Security Model for Workflow Management System in an E-Healthcare Enterprise*. Florida University, USA.
- Zheng, H. Y., Zhao, W. L., Yang, J., and Bouguettaya, A. (2013). Qos Analysis for Web Service Compositions with Complex Structures. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 6(3), 373-386.
- Zheng, Z. (2011). *Qos Management of Web Services*. Springer.
- Zheng, Z., and Lyu, M. R. (2013). Personalized Reliability Prediction of Web Services. *ACM Trans. Softw. Eng. Methodol.*, 22(2), 1-25.
- Zheng, Z., Ma, H., Lyu, M. R., and King, I. (2011). Qos-Aware Web Service Recommendation by Collaborative Filtering. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 4(2), 140-152.
- Zhenyu, L., Ning, G., and Genxing, Y. (2007). *A Reliability Evaluation Framework on Service Oriented Architecture*. Pervasive Computing and Applications, 466-471.
- Ziqiang, X., Martin, P., Powley, W., and Zulkernine, F. (2007). *Reputation-Enhanced Qos-Based Web Services Discovery*. IEEE International Conference on Web Services (ICWS 2007), 249-256.
- Zou, G. B., Lu, Q., Chen, Y. X., Huang, R. Y., Xu, Y., and Xiang, Y. (2014). Qos-Aware Dynamic Composition of Web Services Using Numerical Temporal Planning. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 7(1), 2-15.