

A Coordination Protocol for User-customisable Cloud Policy Monitoring

Ming-Xue Wang¹, Lei Xu¹ and Claus Pahl¹

¹*School of Computing, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland*

{mwang,lxu,cpahl}@computing.dcu.ie

Keywords: Cloud Computing; Cloud Architecture; Customisation; Cloud Governance; Policy

Abstract: Cloud computing will see a increasing demand for end-user customisation and personalisation of multi-tenant cloud service offerings. Combined with an identified need to address QoS and governance aspects in cloud computing, a need to provide user-customised QoS and governance policy management and monitoring as part of an SLA management infrastructure for clouds arises. We propose a user-customisable policy definition solution that can be enforced in multi-tenant cloud offerings through an automated instrumentation and monitoring technique. We in particular allow service processes that are run by cloud and SaaS providers to be made policy-aware in a transparent way.

1 INTRODUCTION

Cloud computing is service-based provisioning of software, infrastructure and platform technology (SaaS, IaaS, PaaS) (Buyya et al., 2011). SaaS providers are the primary target of our policy definition, instrumentation and monitoring solution, but also SaaS users such as end users and mashup providers are important in the context of service processes. Programmatic management interfaces and multi-tenancy are often named as open cloud issues. A customer needs to be allowed to better control and customise cloud offerings through specific management interfaces. For the provider, this is a multi-tenancy environment where users have varying requirements. Governance and QoS issues are concerns for users. QoS responsibilities are usually split between provider and user. This requires a coordination solution to deal with monitoring and enforcement where QoS-related and other policies can be configured by the user and enforced and monitored by the provider. Policies are specifications that formulate user QoS and governance requirements.

Two key objectives of our coordination model and protocol for policy definition, instrumentation and monitoring can be singled out. Firstly, the benefit of user-configured policy management for multi-tenancy is to allow end-user customisable cloud computing, i.e. creating a multitenant environment where user-specific end-to-end SLAs can be formulated and specific needs specified and controlled by the user. Major cloud providers often use a one-size-fits-all SLA

approach for their cloud platforms. Governance of clouds needs to be more open for the actual user to specify and enforce requirements better, which of course also requires infrastructure support on the provider side in multi-tenancy environments to manage the execution within SLAs. Secondly, our solution to process-level policy management will work not only for service offerings, but also for process-level architectures, where the provider implements an offered service as a process. This is particularly important for a growing market of cloud prosumers that provide mashups of existing services.

2 FRAMEWORK OVERVIEW

A framework for user-controlled management of policy (governance and QoS) aspects can facilitate intelligent (self-)management of cloud resources. Our solution allows to optimise usage (the provider perspective) based on monitoring compliancy SLA compliance (the user perspective) based on monitoring policies (Leusse et al., 2009). Our assumption is that services processes (rather than individual services) are enacted by Cloud/SaaS providers or users. These are

- either provider processes which are customer policy-enhanced using the proposed techniques. An example is Amazon's EC2 offering, which provides an interface (API) described in WSDL and accessible via SOAP, that is internally enacted as a process (for instance WS-BPEL-based).

- or customer processes which are customer policy-enhanced. This refers to the combination and integration of cloud services by intermediaries (i.e. prosumers or brokers that provide mashups).

Technical challenges are multi-tenancy, user-controlled end-to-end SLAs, and process-centricity. Multi-tenancy applications, i.e. cloud applications provided to many users, are manageable as long as a one-size-fits-all approach works, but a management scalability problem arises if different users have different requirements (Mietzner et al., 2009). A configurable policy monitoring technique is the proposed solution (Wang et al., 2009). Customisation of policy management requires a fine-granular multi-tenancy model, where end users can configure and enact (remotely) their specific requirements. Two types of interfaces in cloud applications exist that are internally enacted through service processes. Firstly, the upload and management of resources, executed by a provider BPEL process. Secondly, functionality that the application uses as a process (the cloud acts as a middle-ware). Here, policy monitoring is a customer service. Both are, however, subject to SLAs/policy specifications. Our solution consist of:

- A policy model captures a range of cloud computing context aspects in order to allow users to specify their dynamic quality and governance requirements. User-specific requirements and settings will be validated and converted into an executable, commonly used (standardised) format that can be enacted by providers.
- A policy coordination and instrumentation tool instruments services at process level with the user policies. For the process view, mashups (composition) need to address composition of functionality as well as composition of quality aspects and their respective policy specifications.

We have implemented components for policies [A], policy validation [B], policy instrumentation [C], validation monitoring [D], and policy customisation at the end user side [E] (Wang et al., 2009) to support the policy definition and monitoring approach.

1. Policy definitions are collections of XML rules. Customised policies are stored at customer-end or in a common repository.
2. A target process based on customer requirements.
3. Policy instrumentation for dynamic coordination using pre/post conditions attached to constituent Web services of the selected process.
4. A policy validation engine is needed.
5. Policy validation results are monitored. Monitoring provides feedback for policy customisation -

implemented as a listener service for the process.

3 POLICY MODEL

The policy model needs to allow end-users to formulate policies supported by policy validation techniques and mechanisms for SLA-policy language integration and translation (Weigand et al., 2008). This section introduces a policy model for process consumers to formalize business policies as a customization of business processes of process providers. A range of sample policies, covering business aspects (receipts, billing) and technical aspects (response time), are the following:

- Buyer receipts need be issued for every checkout.
- Shipping is calculated for before payment.
- Retry the service for card processing if it fails, but no more 5 times in the last minute, and no more 30 times in the last 5 minutes.
- Credit card processing should be completed in less than 700 ms without faults. for each order should less than 5 seconds.

The business policies are defined after the business processes they are meant to be applied to are implemented and provided for process consumers. This makes policy-first process development for processes, as in the conventional business rules approach, not applicable. A new policy language for consumers to formalize the business policies for pre-developed processes is then a customization language of prepared business processes. The defined policies are enforced on business processes by providers for the consumers. This is a process-level contract between process consumers and providers (Pahl, 2005). The mechanism for process providers to carry out the contract is a process coordination and governability technique - see next section. Hence the development of the policy model is based on a coordination protocol for runtime governance between process consumers and providers to achieve on-the-fly customization.

The core of the policy model is a language model for process consumers to express business policies for existing provided processes as process customization metadata. The language model is inspired by the XACML access control modelling language. The policy language model is based on standard syntax for grouping rules into policies and policy sets. It is used by business analysts and developers of process consumers to express different rule categories of policies. *Flexibility rules* are business-oriented rules (like the first two above) that would not result in any suspension or termination of the process. *Constraint rules*,

like the last two above, must be satisfied; otherwise the process will not proceed. *Fault rules* refer to technical/infrastructure problems. A range of standard reactions such as suspend, alert or log for the consumer and validate, ignore or replace for the provider are defined. The policy language model also provides features such as matching and combination algorithms for policy developers to resolve conflicts of multiple policies. This allows policy developers to express and reason about complex business policies, such as policy hierarchies. As we focus on the coordination, a detailed description of the policy model is omitted here, but can be found in (Wang, 2012).

4 COORDINATION AND INSTRUMENTATION

A coordination framework with protocols as real contracts makes process consumers and providers contribute together to governance to ensure that defined policies are enforced. For a business transaction requested by a process consumer, there are a number of activities including those from subprocesses within a process that will participate in the transaction. The WS-Coordination specifications are designed for transactions of distributed Web services (Barrett et al., 2006) rather than transactions of business processes. Adaptive processes for handling processes transactions lack coordination mechanisms for our case to guarantee all participants working together in a unified manner. The coordination framework we designed is a response to these limitations. It includes defined protocols as contracts for all participants for any business transactions of business processes.

We develop a coordination model which focuses on message exchange or coordination contexts between participants and coordinators. A coordination protocol for policy enforcement in business transactions is also defined. Then, we design an approach which offers BPEL templates to implement the protocols with BPEL processes for providers, but also with the multi-tenancy capability.

4.1 The Coordination Model

The coordination model is inspired by the WS-Coordination and XACML policy framework, re-defined for the needs of our coordination protocol and mechanism for policy enforcement. The coordination model defines two types of subcoordinators for process consumers and providers. Thus, each participant only interacts with its own type of coordinator. The coordination model is defined as

$\langle COOR, COOR_{context} \rangle$, where $COOR = COOR^c \cup COOR^p$ and $coor^c \in COOR^c$ is a coordinator associated with the consumer and $coor^p \in COOR^p$ is a coordinator associated with the provider. $coor_{context} \in COOR_{context}$ captures coordination context information. $coor^c$ and $coor^p$ interact in a coordination conversation. Protocol X and services X_c and X_p are instances in this coordination protocol.

1. The process consumer sends a create coordination context request to the activation service of $coor^c$, getting back an initialized $coor_{context}$ (Cc) that contains the identification, a service reference of the $coor^c$'s protocol service and other information for starting a coordination conversation.
2. The process consumer then sends a process request to the provider or business process containing the $coor_{context}$.
3. The $coor_{context}$ is extracted from the SOAP message and passed to the protocol service X_p at $coor^p$. At this point, the protocol service X_c service reference is known to the protocol service X_p and the communication between the protocol services can be established.
4. The coordination conversation ends with the completion of the process execution.

4.2 Process Activity Protocol

The process activity protocol defines a coordination type for coordination conversations. It relies on the coordination model. A coordination conversation of a business process is established upon coordination of all activities which are within the overall process and subprocesses for the consumer. The conceptual modelling of the coordination protocol is activity-centric, so it can be applied to any process regardless of flow logic, without losing the aspects related to business processes. This coordination protocol applies to all activities of business processes to be governed during execution. A coordination protocol comprises three definitions in its identification ($ct \in coor_{context}$).

1. a protocol message schema defines the message data structure needed for protocol services communication between $COOR^c$ and $COOR^p$ for the extension element of the $COOR_{context}$.
2. a Finite State Machine (FSM) of $COOR^c$ and $COOR^p$, described in more detail below.

The process activity protocol defines runtime governability available for business processes and the responsibilities of process providers and consumers as a contract. This should satisfy the requirements of all rule categories in the policy model. It is formalized

as an FSM of the coordination protocol. It defines a completed FSM for every activity in the business processes, and describes the system behaviours of $COOR^c$ and $COOR^p$ on coordination conversations. The idea behind the FSM design is to instrument the governance states into the process flow as these governance states are core to offer process governability.

The full FSM is divided into two parts for a protocol, which are responsible for $COOR^c$ and $COOR^p$ respectively. The FSM of $COOR^c$ is a submachine state of FSM of $COOR^p$. The process providers only follow the part of the protocol which is defined for $COOR^p$. The consumers follow the FSM of $COOR^c$. Since the implementation of the FSM will be executed at the consumer and provider separately, the $COOR^c$ must have sufficient information about the process execution for its part of the state machine execution, as the process executes on the provider side. In our design of the entire FSM, the FSM of $COOR^c$ defined for the submachine state in FSM of $COOR^p$ is isolated from the business process. As a result, the protocol message schema only covers the complete information about the activity rather than the process state information. The execution of the FSM of $COOR^c$ does not require information other than the weaving request, which is defined in the protocol message schema. The execution of the FSM of $COOR^p$ does not require information other than the weaving response. The rationale behind this is that, firstly, the same protocol message schema can be used for different coordination protocols. A process consumer can customize the FSM of $COOR^c$ for itself without affecting the FSM of $COOR^p$ and other process consumers. Secondly, it avoids possible complexity in state machine implementation for both sides. One side does not need to know the implementation details of other side for its own implementation.

The two part design reduces the number of governance states in the FSM of $COOR^p$, hence reducing the message exchange times required between $COOR^c$ and $COOR^p$ on coordination conversations. The advantage is that it can reduce the performance overhead caused by communication between the protocol services. Depending on the network situations between a process consumer and providers, the message exchange between them could be expensive in some cases. Reducing required message exchange times improves the overall coordination efficiency.

The FSM of $COOR^p$ specifies the protocol which is responsible for $COOR^p$ - the FSM of $COOR^c$ is specified in full detail in (Wang, 2012). FSM of $COOR^p$ is defined as a 5-tuple $(S, S_{start}, F, TA, \delta)$, where

- $S = S_g \cup S_{-g}$ is a set of states. S_g is a set of gov-

ernance states $\{s_{man_val_pre}, s_{man_val_post}, s_{handling_pre}, s_{handling_post}, s_{cancelling}\}$ directly involved with process consumers or policies. The S_{-g} is a set of non-governance states $\{s_{start}, s_{violated_pre}, s_{executing}, s_{replacing}, s_{waiting}, s_{skipping}, s_{violated_post}, s_{compensating}, s_{com+rep}, s_{com+ign}, s_{completed}, s_{end}\}$ not directly involved with consumers.

- $s_{start} \in S_{-g}$ is an initial state. The activity coordination can only be started by the process provider, and is not directly involved with consumers.
- $F \subseteq S_{-g}$ is a set of final states $\{s_{end}\}$.
- $TA = TA_g \cup TA_{-g}$ is a set of input symbols of transaction actions. TA_g is a set of transaction actions $\{ta_{violate}, ta_{validated}, ta_{ignore}, ta_{replace}, ta_{skip}, ta_{cancel}, ta_{compensate}, ta_{retry}, ta_{com+ign}, ta_{com+rep}\}$ expected from process consumers. TA_{-g} is a set of transaction actions which are not expected from process consumers $\{0, 1\}$. The input stream of the FSM regarding TA_{-g} is decided by the process providers based on the process state information which is not covered by the FSM (the FSM is only activity-scoped).
- δ is a transition system $\delta : S \times TA \rightarrow S$, see transition graph in Figure 2.

4.3 Coordination Implementation and BPEL Instrumentation

The coordination protocol needs to be implemented to enable coordination. The difficulty is on the provider side, since all activities within a business process need to comply with the protocol during the process or BPEL execution.

We designed a set of templates for BPEL to avoid platform dependency. In this case, the protocol would be implemented with a BPEL process as a $coord^p$ for activities. The process contains the flow logic to be executed and can be driven by protocol messages. A process instance, not the BPEL process, is associated with a coordination conversation belonging to a consumer to enable multi-tenancy.

We divide the FSM of $COOR_p$ into two parts. The first is process-independent, i.e., does not require awareness of the process states. The implementation of this part is wrapped up in the main BPEL process. The second part continues the FSM to the end state of activities of the main process. The first part can be implemented in BPEL processes, but separated from the main process. Through this hybrid design, we offer a platform-independent approach that keeps the main BPEL simple. However, the BPEL processes are protocol-specific.




Figure 1: Message flow diagram

The BPEL transaction scope concept is applied for implementing the protocol with BPEL for supporting long-running transactions (LRTs). LRTs in BPEL are centred on scopes and scopes can be nested. Nested scopes can be standalone BPEL subprocesses which are business activities of the parent process. When a fault occurs, all previously committed activities can either be compensated within the fault process, or compensated as an activity in its parent process. This is defined in the provided BPEL process and exposed to process consumers.

Two templates for BPEL process development minimise the development effort for protocol implementation. A template defines the program skeleton of an algorithm from the template method pattern. One or more of the algorithm steps can be overridden by subclasses to allow differing behaviours while ensuring that the overarching algorithm or the protocol is still followed.

We extract the first part of FSM as the non-transactional requirement FSM for business activities of a process. The second part is an extension for business activities to support process transaction requirement. The FSM is separated into two implementation parts with two templates: the wrapper service template and the main process template. We discuss the latter in detail. The process template is an implementation of the second part of the FSM containing activity states from $s_{completed}$ to the s_{end} state. When the process is in cancelling status, previous successfully executed activities should be compensated if necessary. The template is designed with an activity scope and a process scope.

A BPEL template for the activity scope associated with activity states can be defined. The BPEL template for each activity is a separate scope. There are two services inside the template indicated by grey

boxes. The first service is the wrapper service for the first part of the FSM implementation. The necessary variables are passed into the BPEL process by a BPEL `<assign>` activity. With the following BPEL `<if>` control structure, a `<throw>` activity throws a defined fault if the `comp` variable is set to false. An attached BPEL `<catchAll>` handler catches the fault and marks this scope as faulty. The BPEL `<compensationHandler>` attachment would only be triggered by a successful scope if the process in cancelling status. In that case, e.g. if the $s_{executing}$ is skipped in the first FSM part, the compensation handler attached to the activity scope will not be triggered as the scope is marked as faulty. The last `<if>` control structure will mark the process in cancelling status, it throws a defined fault and will be caught in a `<catchAll>` handler defined in the process scope template. Hence, the `<compensationHandler>` handler at activity scope would be triggered. The activities of the process would be executed from the $s_{completed}$ to the $s_{cancelling}$ state if required. A utility service inside the `<compensationHandler>` transfers from the $s_{cancelling}$ to the s_{end} state of the activity.

Figure 3 illustrates the BPEL template for the process scope. All activities of the process are inside a process scope, which is associated with a `<catchAll>` handler. If a defined fault for the process cancelling is caught by the handler with the process scope, all `<compensationHandler>`s of activity templates of fault-free activity scopes are executed in reverse order, which is specified in the process design. Activities in $s_{completed}$ will transition to the $s_{cancelling}$ state. If this process is a subprocess and subprocess cancelling is completed, the activity that represents this subprocess would transition to $s_{violated_{post}}$ in its parent process depending on constraint policies of the activity. The consequent violation handling depends on the




Figure 2: Transition graph for FSM for $Coor^P$

fault policy defined in the parent process.

5 EVALUATION

In this section we are going to discuss our coordination framework. We focus on evaluating the effectiveness of the coordination framework and the performance overhead in the coordination framework.

We defined 21 test cases (along the lines of the 4 examples given earlier) for a consumer that cover all four types of rules to address effectiveness. A purchase order checkout BPEL process was developed for the experimental setup. All of the service context information required for constraint validation and service selection were manually and randomly assigned. A test case in our case comprises of four parts: 1) a target process of this test case (some test cases are targeted on a sub process level), 2) as input a section of SOAP message of the business process input that contains the business object information, policies defined for the business process, 3) an expected process activity log in a process instance and 4) expected output in the form of a SOAP message referring to

the expected output from the process instance. We compared the real process execution and coordination log with the expected process activity log to verify whether the validations have correctly occurred.

With these test cases, we can demonstrate that our approach provides an effective coordination solution for governance in a distributed and multi-tenant environment. The activity centric process coordination protocol design can be applied to any business process. The process runtime governance is both process instance and consumer based. In addition, there was no interference between different consumers sharing a single BPEL process at the same time, which highlights its multi-tenancy capability.

We need to implement coordination frameworks on both the process provider and consumer side in our approach. However, once developed, the policy weavers and $COOR_c$ can be used for any business process. The only question that needs to be raised regarding is the difficulty of BPEL development with $COOR_p$. As described, the process activity protocol is implemented with BPEL processes following the templates. That means additional efforts are required in BPEL development compared to conven-




Figure 3: Process scope BPEL template

tional BPEL development. However, from our own experience with development for this case study, the effort required is small. The wrapper service development only requires a few lines of code for a business activity, once the first template is developed.

Regarding performance, we have generated 1000 test cases. Using a standard PC configuration, the coordination overhead is less than 2 ms for a new related policy. The overall overhead can increase when we apply it in networks with consideration of the network latency. However, we still consider the performance overhead is quite small, as long running business activities take a few hours or even a few days for execution in a process with LRT. In some cases with utility services (e.g. email notification), the business activity is expected with instant activities response. For example, the average execution time including a real-world email notification service only takes 854 ms. In this case, our coordination overhead would be greater than 29.7% and 14.9% with an additional cache enabled (see (Wang, 2012) for details). Since business processes usually are mixed with long running activities for LRTs, the performance overhead for the overall process again is very small and acceptable.

In a violation situation, the coordination overhead mean value for adaptation is 598ms (cache disabled). If we deduct the time cost in a violation-free situation (245ms), the overhead on adaptation would be $598 - 245 = 254$ ms for each process. Yet, it is possible to set

a permanent adaptation to avoid remedy overhead on each process instance. However, the instance adaptation would avoid to store activity service information on the provider side anyway. Still, we consider the overhead to be acceptable compared with inherent time delays of long running activities.

6 RELATED WORK

Current open research concerns for cloud computing include end-user definition of governance and quality policies and the non-intrusive instrumentation of processes with policies. Today, one-size-fits-all service monitoring techniques are in place. However, their inherent inflexibility makes multi-tenancy difficult to manage and adapt to individual needs. We discuss related work in the field of policy enforcement and adaptive BPEL process. These solutions are generally not tailored for the multi-tenancy problem.

The first category is located at the BPEL layer. BPEL processes are usually designed or generated to serve their purpose, but also to realize a platform-independent approach. (Wu and Doshi, 2008) provides a similar approach, where the BPEL specification itself is extended with a fault policy specification. Exception handling policies are bound into process schemas as a BPEL extension. The SRRF framework (Kareliotis et al., 2007) generates SRRF-aware BPEL processes according to the defined policies. However, with these approaches, binding policies into business processes or static policies are certainly not an option for our objective, as it impossible to support multi-tenancy adequately.

The second category is located at the BPEL engine layer. The BPEL process is maintained to be simplified, but the solution is platform-dependent. The disadvantage of the Dynamo project (Baresi and Guinea, 2011) in this regards is that BPEL event handlers must be statically embedded into the process prior to deployment, meaning that the recovery logic is defined once and for all, and that it can only be personalized through the parametrization of the event handler itself (Baresi and Guinea, 2011). This approach does not support dynamic policies and does not support a multi-tenancy environment. The TWSO framework (Hrastnik and Winiwarter, 2005) addresses process transactions. The PAWS framework (Ardagna et al., 2007) extends the ActiveBPEL engine to provide a flexible process that can change its behaviour dynamically, according to variable execution contexts. Similar frameworks (Mosincat and Binder, 2008), (Erradi et al., 2006) also extend the BPEL engine for process adaptation, but without an awareness of multi-

tenancy.

Furthermore, process-centricity is a major aim. Recently, business-processes-as-a-service is being discussed. While not addressed here, this perspective needs to be further complemented by an architectural style for its implementation (Wang, 2012).

7 CONCLUSIONS

Governance technology is crucial for the current trend towards Software as a Service (SaaS). According to technology reports the 451 Group, "nearly 90% of organisations expect to maintain or grow their SaaS usage, with more than one third transitioning from on-premises to SaaS" indicating that IT consumers need more trustworthy infrastructures.

We presented a coordinator framework with protocols that ensures that consumer-defined and controlled policies are enforced during business transactions for business processes between consumers and providers. We defined a coordination model and a protocol for the policy-based governance of business processes on business transactions. The BPEL templates are offered in order to provide best-practice solution templates for the implementation with BPEL business processes. Our overall approach supports transaction management, adaptation for flexible processes, and multi-tenancy capability.

We have indicated some limitations in the evaluation. BPEL process implementations are protocol-specific. The BPEL activities of a business activity must be placed in a BPEL scope. Better consumer support for policy definition, e.g. through repositories of common rules and adequate interfaces and methods for semantic policy specification and customisation, needs to be investigated (Pahl et al., 2009; Pahl et al., 2007).

REFERENCES

- Ardagna, D., Comuzzi, M., Mussi, E., Pernici, B. and Plebani, P. (2007). Paws: A framework for executing adaptive web-service processes. *IEEE Software*, 24(6):39–46.
- Baresi, L. and Guinea, S. (2011). Self-supervising bpm processes. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 37(2):247 – 263,
- R. Barrett, L. M. Patcas, J. Murphy, and C. Pahl. (2006). Model Driven Distribution Pattern Design for Dynamic Web Service Compositions. *International Conference on Web Engineering ICWE06*. Palo Alto, US. ACM Press.
- Buyya, R., Broberg, J., and Goscinski, A. (2011). *Cloud Computing - Principles and Paradigms*. Wiley. 2011.
- Erradi, A., Maheshwari, P. and Tosic, V. (2006). Policy-driven middleware for self-adaptation of web services compositions. *ACM/IFIP/USENIX International Middleware Conference*.
- Hrastnik, P. and Winiwarter, W. (2005). Twso - transactional web service orchestrations. *International Conference on Next Generation Web Services Practices*.
- Kareliotis, C., Vassilakis, C., and Panayiotis, G. (2007). Enhancing bpm scenarios with dynamic relevance-based exception handling. *IEEE International Conference on Web Services*.
- Leusse, P.D., Dimitrakos, T., and Brossard, D. (2009). A governance model for SOA. *IEEE International Conference on Web Services*.
- Mietzner, R., Unger, T., Titze, R., and Leymann, F. "Combining different multi-tenancy patterns in service-oriented applications," in *IEEE Intl Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conf*, 2009.
- Mosincat, A. and Binder, W. (2008). Transparent runtime adaptability for bpm processes. *Intl Conf on Service-Oriented Computing*.
- Pahl, C. (2005). Layered Ontological Modelling for Web Service-oriented Model-Driven Architecture. *European Conference on Model-Driven Architecture - Foundations and Applications ECMDA05*. Springer.
- Pahl, C., Giesecke, S. and Hasselbring, W. (2009). Ontology-based Modelling of Architectural Styles. *Information and Software Technology*. 1(12): 1739-1749
- Pahl, C., Giesecke, S. and Hasselbring, W. (2007). An Ontology-based Approach for Modelling Architectural Styles. *European Conference on Software Architecture ECSA2007*. Springer.
- Subramanian, S., Thiran, P., Narendra, N.C., Mostefaoui, C.K., and Maamar, Z. (2008). On the enhancement of BPEL engines for self-healing composite web services. *Intl Symp on Applications and the Internet*. pp. 33-39.
- Wang, M.X., Bandara, K.Y. and Pahl, C. (2009). Integrated constraint violation handling for dynamic service composition. *IEEE Intl Conf on Services Computing*. pp. 168-175.
- Wang, M.X. (2012). *A Policy-based Governance Framework for Cloud Service Process Architectures*. Ph.D. Thesis. Dublin City University.
- Weigand, H., Heuvel, W.-J. v. d. and Hiel, M. (2008). Rule-based service composition and service-oriented business rule management. *Interdisciplinary Workshop Regulations Modelling and Deployment*.
- Wu, Y. and Doshi, P. (2008). Making bpm flexible and adapting in the context of coordination constraints using ws-bpm. *Intl Conf on Services Computing*.