

**A FRAMEWORK FOR COTS SOFTWARE EVALUATION AND  
SELECTION FOR COTS MISMATCHES HANDLING AND NON-  
FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS**

**FERAS HAMED AL-TARAWNEH**

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA  
2014**

## **Permission to Use**

In presenting this thesis in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the Universiti Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for the copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences  
UUM College of Arts and Sciences  
Universiti Utara Malaysia  
06010 UUM Sintok

## Abstrak

Keputusan ketika membeli perisian *Commercial Off-The-Shelf* (COTS) memerlukan garis panduan yang sistematik supaya perisian COTS yang sesuai boleh dipilih bagi menghasilkan penyelesaian yang berdaya maju dan berkesan kepada organisasi. Walau bagaimanapun, rangka kerja penilaian dan pilihan perisian COTS yang sedia ada lebih menumpukan pada aspek kefungsiian dan tidak memberi perhatian yang mencukupi untuk mengendalikan ketidaksepadanan antara keperluan pengguna dan spesifikasi perisian COTS, serta tidak mengambil kira keperluan bukan kefungsiian. Oleh yang demikian, satu rangka kerja baharu bagi penilaian dan pemilihan perisian COTS dalam menyelesaikan ketidaksepadanan keperluan dan mengambil kira keperluan bukan kefungsiian sangat diperlukan. Justeru itu, kajian ini bertujuan untuk membangunkan rangka kerja baharu bagi penilaian dan pemilihan perisian COTS yang memberi penekanan terhadap pengendalian ketidaksepadanan keperluan dan mengambil kira keperluan bukan kefungsiian. Kajian ini telah dijalankan dengan menggunakan metodologi mod campuran yang melibatkan teknik kaji selidik dan temu bual. Kajian dilaksanakan dalam empat fasa: pelaksanaan kaji selidik dan temu bual di 63 buah organisasi untuk mengenal pasti kriteria penilaian COTS, pembangunan rangka kerja perisian COTS dengan menggunakan Teori Penilaian, pembangunan teknik membuat keputusan yang baharu dengan menerapkan Proses Analisis Hierarki dan Analisis Jurang bagi mengendalikan ketidaksepadanan perisian COTS, dan pengesahan kebolehlaksanaan dan kebolehpercayaan rangka kerja Penilaian dan Pemilihan perisian COTS (COTS-ESF) yang dicadangkan dengan merujuk kepada semakan pakar, kajian kes, dan pengesahan ukur takat. Kajian ini telah mengenal pasti lima kriteria penilaian bagi perisian COTS: Kualiti, Domain, Seni Bina, Persekitaran Operasi dan Reputasi Pembekal. Ia juga menyediakan teknik membuat keputusan dan proses lengkap untuk menjalankan penilaian dan pemilihan perisian COTS. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa aspek-aspek rangka kerja tersebut yang dinilai adalah sesuai dan berpotensi serta praktikal untuk digunakan dalam persekitaran sebenar. Sumbangan kajian ini merentangi kedua-dua perspektif penyelidikan dan praktikal dalam bidang penilaian perisian dengan memperbaiki proses membuat keputusan dan menyediakan garis panduan yang sistematik untuk menangani isu pembelian perisian COTS berdaya maju.

**Kata kunci:** Penilaian perisian *Commercial Off-The-Shelf*, Pemilihan perisian *Commercial Off-The-Shelf*, Keperluan bukan kefungsiian, Pengendalian ketidaksepadanan, Teori penilaian.

## Abstract

The decision to purchase Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software needs systematic guidelines so that the appropriate COTS software can be selected in order to provide a viable and effective solution to the organizations. However, the existing COTS software evaluation and selection frameworks focus more on functional aspects and do not give adequate attention to accommodate the mismatch between user requirements and COTS software specification, and also integration with non functional requirements of COTS software. Studies have identified that these two criteria are important in COTS software evaluation and selection. Therefore, this study aims to develop a new framework of COTS software evaluation and selection that focuses on handling COTS software mismatches and integrating the non-functional requirements. The study is conducted using mixed-mode methodology which involves survey and interview. The study is conducted in four main phases: a survey and interview of 63 organizations to identify COTS software evaluation criteria, development of COTS software evaluation and selection framework using Evaluation Theory, development of a new decision making technique by integrating Analytical Hierarchy Process and Gap Analysis to handle COTS software mismatches, and validation of the practicality and reliability of the proposed COTS software Evaluation and Selection Framework (COTS-ESF) using experts' review, case studies and yardstick validation. This study has developed the COTS-ESF which consists of five categories of evaluation criteria: Quality, Domain, Architecture, Operational Environment and Vendor Reputation. It also provides a decision making technique and a complete process for performing the evaluation and selection of COTS software. The result of this study shows that the evaluated aspects of the framework are feasible and demonstrate their potential and practicality to be applied in the real environment. The contribution of this study straddles both the research and practical perspectives of software evaluation by improving decision making and providing a systematic guidelines for handling issue in purchasing viable COTS software.

**Keywords:** Commercial Off-The-Shelf evaluation, Commercial Off-The-Shelf selection, Non-functional requirements, Mismatches handling, Evaluation theory.

## Acknowledgment



First and foremost all praise and thanks go to Allah for giving me the strength and patience, and providing me the knowledge to accomplish this research study.

In this occasion I would like to express my gratitude to a number of people whose admission, permission, and assistance contribute to finish my long story with PhD.

I would like to express my sincerest thanks and deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fauziah Baharom, for her excellent guidance, caring, patience, providing me with an excellent atmosphere for doing research, and sharing of all her research experiences throughout these challenging years. I would like also to thank my second supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Jamaiah Hj Yahaya for her continuous guidance, fruitful feedback, and moral support.

My highly appreciation to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Faudziah Ahmad and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Haslina Mohd for the useful comments and suggestions to improve my thesis. My sincere thanks must also go to the members of viva committee: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Huda Hj Ibrahim as chairman, Prof. Dr. Siti Salwah Salim from University of Malaya (UM) as external examiner, and Dr. Nor Laily Hashim as internal examiner.

On the personal level, I would also like to express my gratitude to my parents and my beloved family members for patience and support throughout my five years plus of difficult endeavor. I guess they are the most who suffered throughout this period. My gratitude also goes to all my colleagues in the PhD journey, specifically for the discussions and sometimes the heated arguments on the better ways to perform my research.

Thank You All Very Much

## Table of Contents

Permission to Use .....	i
Abstrak .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Acknowledgment .....	iv
Table of Contents .....	v
List of Tables .....	xi
List of Figures .....	xv
List of Appendices .....	xviii
List of Abbreviations .....	xix
<b>CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Background .....	1
1.3 Research Problem .....	4
1.3.1 COTS Software Mismatches .....	5
1.3.2 Non-Functional Requirements .....	7
1.4 Research Questions .....	9
1.5 Research Objectives .....	10
1.6 Research Scope .....	10
1.7 Significance of Research .....	12
1.8 Thesis Organization .....	13
<b>CHAPTER TWO LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	15
2.2 Overview of the COTS Software .....	15
2.3 COTS Software Evaluation and Selection .....	19
2.3.1 Existing Methods for COTS Software Evaluation and Selection .....	20
2.3.1.1 Off-The-Shelf-Option framework (OTSO) .....	21
2.3.1.2 Procurement-Oriented Requirements Engineering (PORE) .....	23
2.3.1.3 Social-Technical Approach to COTS Evaluation (STACE) .....	25
2.3.1.4 Other Existing Methods for COTS Evaluation and Selection .....	27

2.3.2 COTS Software Evaluation and Selection Theories .....	28
2.3.2.1 Evaluation Theory .....	28
2.3.2.2 Multi Criteria Decision Making (MCDM) .....	32
2.3.2.3 COTS Mismatches.....	39
2.3.2.4 The General COTS Selection (GCS) Process .....	48
2.3.3 The Missing Elements in the Existing Methods for COTS Evaluation and Selection.....	53
2.3.4 Related Studies.....	59
2.3.4.1 Existing Methods for Handling COTS Software Mismatches .....	60
2.3.4.2 Evaluation Criteria.....	67
2.3.4.3 Related Empirical Studies .....	81
2.3.5 Issues and Challenges in COTS Software Evaluation and Selection .....	84
2.4 Summary .....	86
<b>CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>88</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	88
3.2 Research Design.....	88
3.3 Phase One: Theoretical Study .....	89
3.4 Phase Two: Empirical Study.....	90
3.4.1 Study Approach and Data Collection Instrument .....	91
3.4.2 Sample Procedure .....	92
3.4.3 Instrument Development.....	92
3.4.4 Pilot Test .....	93
3.4.5 Survey Execution .....	94
3.4.6 Data Analysis Procedures .....	94
3.5 Phase Three: Framework Development.....	95
3.5.1 Identifying the Main Components of the Framework.....	96
3.5.2 Developing the COTS Evaluation Criteria .....	97
3.5.3 Developing the Decision Making Technique.....	98
3.5.4 Determining the Evaluation Processes.....	99
3.5.5 Determining the Data Collection Technique .....	99
3.5.6 Defining the Evaluation Target and Yardstick Components .....	99

3.6 Phase Four: Framework Evaluation .....	101
3.6.1 Verification Stage .....	101
3.6.2 Validation Stage .....	102
3.7 Summary .....	106
<b>CHAPTER FOUR EMPIRICAL STUDY .....</b>	<b>107</b>
4.1 Introduction .....	107
4.2 Questionnaire Layout .....	107
4.2.1 Demographic Data .....	108
4.2.2 CBS Practices .....	108
4.2.3 COTS Software Evaluation and Selection Practices .....	109
4.2.4 Evaluation Criteria .....	109
4.3 Questionnaire Testing .....	110
4.4 Data Collection and Response Rate .....	111
4.5 The Survey Findings .....	112
4.5.1 Demographic Data .....	112
4.5.1.1 Respondents Background .....	113
4.5.1.2 Organization Background .....	115
4.5.2 Findings Related to CBS Practice .....	116
4.5.2.1 Number of COTS Software in the Organization .....	117
4.5.2.2 Main Application of the COTS Software in the Organizations .....	118
4.5.2.3 The Current CBD Approaches .....	119
4.5.2.4 Benefits and Risks of CBS .....	120
4.5.3 COTS Software Evaluation and Selection .....	122
4.5.3.1 The Main Problems .....	123
4.5.3.2 Current Selection Methods .....	124
4.5.3.3 Supporting Tools .....	126
4.5.3.4 The Main Processes and Activities .....	126
4.5.3.5 The Most Frequent Used Techniques .....	127
4.5.4 Overview of the Evaluation Criteria .....	133
4.5.4.1 The Important of the Non-Functional Requirements .....	133
4.5.4.2 Quality Characteristics .....	135



4.5.4.3 Domain Characteristics .....	136
4.5.4.4 Architectural Characteristics .....	137
4.5.4.5 User Organization Characteristics .....	138
4.5.4.6 Vendor Organizations Characteristics .....	139
4.6 Discussion of the Findings .....	140
4.7 Summary .....	144
<b>CHAPTER FIVE COTS SOFTWARE EVALUATION AND SELECTION</b>	
<b>FRAMEWORK (COTS-ESF).....</b>	<b>146</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	146
5.2 The Main Features of the Proposed COTS-ESF .....	146
5.3 COTS-ESF .....	148
5.3.1 Evaluation Target .....	149
5.3.2 Evaluation Criteria .....	150
5.3.3 Yardstick .....	160
5.3.4 Data Gathering Techniques.....	163
5.3.5 Synthesis Technique .....	167
5.3.5.1 Assigning Weights for CEC .....	168
5.3.5.2 The COTS Alternatives Scoring.....	176
5.3.6 Evaluation Processes.....	195
5.3.6.1 Planning Process.....	196
5.3.6.2 Preparation Process .....	199
5.3.6.3 The Evaluation and Selection Process.....	203
5.4 Summary .....	209
<b>CHAPTER SIX FRAMEWORK EVALUATION.....</b>	
<b>211</b>	
6.1 Introduction .....	211
6.2 Verification by Expert Review.....	211
6.2.1 Results of Round One .....	214
6.2.2 Results of Round Two .....	222
6.2.3 Results of Round Three .....	225
6.3 Validation stage.....	226

6.3.1 Validation by Case Study.....	226
6.3.1.1 Decision Making-Prototyping Tool (DM-PT).....	226
6.3.1.2 Case Study One: Selecting the Appropriate Security System (Anti-Virus Software) .....	231
6.3.1.2.1 Profile of Organization A .....	231
6.3.1.2.2 Planning Process .....	233
6.3.1.2.3 Preparation Process.....	237
6.3.1.2.4 The Evaluation and Selection Process .....	243
6.3.1.3 Case Study Two: Selecting the Appropriate Student Management Information System (SMIS) .....	253
6.3.1.3.1 The Profile of Organization B .....	253
6.3.1.3.2 Planning Process .....	255
6.3.1.3.3 Preparation Process.....	259
6.3.1.3.4 Evaluation and Selection Process .....	263
6.3.1.4 Discussion of the Findings .....	271
6.3.2 Yardstick Validation .....	278
6.4 Summary .....	285
<b>CHAPTER SEVEN THE CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK.....</b>	<b>286</b>
7.1 Introduction.....	286
7.2 General Discussion.....	286
7.2.1 Theoretical Study .....	286
7.2.2 Empirical Study .....	287
7.2.3 COTS-ESF Development.....	289
7.2.4 COTS-ESF Evaluation.....	291
7.3 Research Contributions .....	293
7.3.1 COTS-ESF .....	293
7.3.2 CEC.....	294
7.3.3 The Decision Making Technique.....	295
7.3.4 Theoretical Findings .....	297
7.3.5 Empirical Survey Findings .....	297
7.3.6 Data Collection and Filtering Integration .....	298

7.3.7 DM-PT Software Tool .....	299
7.4 The Research Limitation and Future Work.....	299
7.4.1 Research Limitations .....	299
7.4.2 Future Work .....	301
7.5 Final Conclusion .....	302
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>304</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1 The COTS Software Advantages and Disadvantages.....	17
Table 2.2 The Existing COTS Software Evaluation and Selection Methods.....	27
Table 2.3 The MCDM Techniques .....	34
Table 2.4 The AHP Applications in Different Fields .....	37
Table 2.5 The Comparison of Existing Methods for COTS Selection.....	54
Table 2.6 The Comparison of Existing COTS Mismatches Approaches.....	66
Table 2.7 Evaluating the Existing Models of the COTS Software Evaluation .....	77
Table 2.8 Non-Functional Requirements Classifications.....	79
Table 2.9 The Related Previous Empirical Studies.....	83
Table 3.1 The Factors of Evaluating the Proposed Framework (Adapted from Kunda, 2002; Kitchenham & Pickard, 1998) .....	103
Table 4.1 Questionnaire Response Rate .....	112
Table 4.2 The Main Job Function in Organization .....	113
Table 4.3 Work Experience with CBD .....	114
Table 4.4 Current CBD Activities.....	114
Table 4.5 Primary Business of Participated Organizations.....	115
Table 4.6 Numbers of Employees in the Organization .....	116
Table 4.7 Number of COT Software in Organization.....	117
Table 4.8 Number of COTS versus Work Experience.....	118
Table 4.9 The Common COTS Applications in Organizations .....	119
Table 4.10 CBD Approaches .....	120
Table 4.11 Benefits of CBS .....	121
Table 4.12 Risks of CBS.....	122
Table 4.13 Problems of the COTS Software Evaluation and Selection.....	123
Table 4.14 The Relations between Lack of Formal and Other Problems .....	124
Table 4.15 Methods for Selecting the COTS Software.....	124
Table 4.16 Current Used Methods Cross the Main Problems.....	125
Table 4.17 Ad-hoc Manner to Select COTS Software.....	126
Table 4.18 Supporting Tools.....	126
Table 4.19 The COTS Software Evaluation and Selection Processes and Activities .....	127
Table 4.20 Techniques for Defining the Evaluation Criteria.....	128

Table 4.21	Techniques for Identifying COTS Software .....	129
Table 4.22	Data Collection Technique .....	130
Table 4.23	Analysis Techniques .....	131
Table 4.24	COTS Mismatches Considerations .....	131
Table 4.25	Considerations and Importance of the COTS Mismatches .....	132
Table 4.26	The COTS Mismatches Techniques .....	132
Table 4.27	Considerations of the Non-Functional Requirements .....	133
Table 4.28	The Importance of the Non-Functional Requirements .....	134
Table 4.29	Intervals Scale of the Consideration Level .....	135
Table 4.30	The COTS Quality Characteristics .....	136
Table 4.31	Domain Characteristics .....	136
Table 4.32	Architectural Characteristics .....	137
Table 4.33	User Organization Characteristics .....	138
Table 4.34	Vendor Characteristics .....	139
Table 5.1	The Types of Metrics to Measure the CEC Attributes .....	152
Table 5.2	The Quality Characteristics .....	153
Table 5.3	Quality Category Decomposed Criteria .....	154
Table 5.4	Domain Characteristics .....	155
Table 5.5	Decomposed Criteria of Domain Category .....	156
Table 5.6	Architectural Characteristics .....	156
Table 5.7	Decomposed Criteria of the Architectural Category .....	157
Table 5.8	Operational Environment Characteristics .....	158
Table 5.9	Decomposed Criteria of the Operational Environment Category .....	158
Table 5.10	Vendor Characteristics .....	159
Table 5.11	Decomposed Criteria of the Vendor Category .....	160
Table 5.12	Example of Defining and Using Yardstick .....	162
Table 5.13	Data Types of Attributes in the Yardstick .....	162
Table 5.14	Data Gathering Techniques Mapping With Data Resources .....	164
Table 5.15	The Pairwise Comparison Matrix for Level One in CEC .....	170
Table 5.16	The Pairwise Comparison Matrix of the Quality Category .....	171
Table 5.17	The Pairwise Comparison Matrixes in CEC .....	171
Table 5.18	Fundamental Scale for Pairwise Comparison (Saaty, 1980) .....	172
Table 5.19	Random Index .....	176
Table 5.20	Scenarios of Identifying the Types of the COTS Mismatches .....	179

Table 5.21 Potential Decisions for Each Type of COTS Mismatches.....	181
Table 5.22 The COTS Mismatches Information.....	184
Table 5.23 Conditions of the COTS Mismatches Handling Decisions.....	185
Table 5.24 An Example To Calculate ML.....	188
Table 5.25 Representation of the Resolution Action Constraints Values .....	190
Table 6.1 Round One Information Summarization.....	215
Table 6.2 The Part One Answers of Verification Questionnaire .....	216
Table 6.3 The Experts' Answers Related to the Second Part of the Questionnaire .....	218
Table 6.4 The Experts' Answers Related to the Part Three .....	220
Table 6.5 The Required Modifications to Improve the COTS-ESF .....	222
Table 6.6 Round Two: Information Summarization .....	223
Table 6.7 Summary of Round Three.....	226
Table 6.8 Defining the Project Target.....	234
Table 6.9 Different Roles in the Project .....	234
Table 6.10 Evaluation Team Members .....	235
Table 6.11 Forming the Evaluation Team .....	235
Table 6.12 Creating Project WBS.....	236
Table 6.13 Identified Functional Requirements.....	238
Table 6.14 Key Information Related to Defining Functional Requirements .....	239
Table 6.15 The COTS Software Searching Activity.....	240
Table 6.16 Defining the Yardstick Activity.....	242
Table 6.17 Data Collection and Filtering Activity.....	247
Table 6.18 Main Information Related to the CEC Weighting Task.....	249
Table 6.19 Decision Making Activity.....	252
Table 6.20 Defining the Evaluation Target.....	255
Table 6.21 Different Roles in the Project .....	256
Table 6.22 The Evaluation Team Members.....	257
Table 6.23 Forming the Evaluation Team .....	257
Table 6.24 WBS Creation .....	258
Table 6.25 Defining the Functional Requirements Activity .....	260
Table 6.26 The COTS Searching Activity .....	261
Table 6.27 Defining the Yardstick Thresholds Activity .....	262
Table 6.28 Data Collection and Filtering Activity.....	266
Table 6.29 Main Information Related to the CEC Weighting Task.....	268

Table 6.30 Decision Making Activity.....	271
Table 6.31 Comparing COTS-ESF with Other Baseline Models for COTS Software Evaluation and Selection.....	283

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1: The COTS-based Applications' Growth in USC E-Service Projects (Yang et al., 2005) .....	16
Figure 2.2: The OTSO Processes (Kontio, 1996) .....	22
Figure 2.3: The PORE's High-level Generic (Maiden & Ncube, 1998).....	24
Figure 2.4: The Processes Model of the STACE Method (Kunda & Brooks, 1999).....	26
Figure 2.5: Evaluation Theory Components (Scriven, 1991) .....	31
Figure 2.6: The AHP Hierarchical Structure (Pogarcic et al., 2008). .....	35
Figure 2.7: The Fulfilment Cost (Ncube & Dean, 2002) .....	43
Figure 2.8: General Idea of GA (Adapted from Bordley, 2001).....	45
Figure 2.9: Fitness Measurement Matrix .....	46
Figure 2.10: Matrix of Actual Information about Gap Fulfilment .....	47
Figure 2.11: The COTS Selection Process (adapted from Javed et al., 2012).....	49
Figure 2.12: The CAR/SA Process (Chung & Cooper, 2004) .....	62
Figure 2.13: The MiHOS Phases ( Mohamed et al., 2008).....	63
Figure 2.14: The Non-Functional Requirements for COTS Software (adapted from Beus-Dukic, 2000) .....	80
Figure 3.1: Research Methodology .....	89
Figure 3.2: Theoretical Study .....	90
Figure 3.3: Empirical Study .....	95
Figure 3.4: The Components of Combination .....	96
Figure 3.5: The Structure of Proposed Evaluation Criteria.....	97
Figure 3.6: The Structure of Proposed Decision Making Technique.....	98
Figure 3.7: Framework Development Phase.....	100
Figure 3.8: The Framework Evaluation Phase.....	105
Figure 5.1: The Proposed COTS-ESF.....	149
Figure 5.2: The CEC Categories .....	151
Figure 5.3: Yardstick Structure .....	161
Figure 5.4: Snapshot of the Evaluation Form .....	166
Figure 5.5: The Proposed Decision Making Technique.....	168
Figure 5.6: An Example of the CEC Hierarchy Structure .....	169
Figure 5.7: The Pairwise Matrix .....	170



Figure 5.8: Example of Performing the Judgments Pairwise Comparisons.....	173
Figure 5.9: Stages of Handling the COTS Mismatches .....	177
Figure 5.10: Mismatches Detection Matrix .....	178
Figure 5.11: The Decision of Handling COTS Mismatch .....	180
Figure 5.12: Resolving the COTS Mismatches Directions.....	182
Figure 5.13 The Example to Calculate FFS.....	193
Figure 5.14: The Evaluation Processes .....	196
Figure 5.15: Planning Activities. ....	197
Figure 5.16: The Activities of the Preparation Process.....	200
Figure 5.17: The COTS Searching.....	202
Figure 5.18: Data Collection and Filtering Activity .....	204
Figure 5.19: Evaluation Form for Level 2 .....	206
Figure 5.20: Decision Making Activity .....	208
Figure 6.1: Proposed COTS-ESF Verification Process Using Delphi Technique .....	212
Figure 6.2: The Main Components and Their Interactions of DM-PT .....	228
Figure 6.3: Snapshot of the Main Screen of DM-PT .....	229
Figure 6.4: Processes Alignment with DM-PT .....	231
Figure 6.5: The Snapshot of the WBS .....	236
Figure 6.6: The Functional Requirement Stored in the DM-PT .....	238
Figure 6.7: Snapshot Screen Displays: Entering the Anti-Virus Alternatives .....	240
Figure 6.8: Snapshot Screen Displays: Defining a Group of the Yardstick Thresholds.....	242
Figure 6.9: Snapshots from an Anti-Virus Website .....	244
Figure 6.10: The First Level of the Data Collection and Filtering.....	244
Figure 6.11: The Data Collection and Filtering Result of Level One.....	245
Figure 6.12: The Forth Level Filtering Result .....	246
Figure 6.13: Snapshot Screen: The First Level of the Pairwise Matrix .....	248
Figure 6.14: The Pairwise Matrix after Reviewing the Judgments.....	249
Figure 6.15: Product 1 Mismatches and Their Solutions.....	250
Figure 6.16: Snapshot Screen: the Fitness Anti-Virus Product.....	251
Figure 6.17: Snapshot Screen: the Sorted List of Products.....	251
Figure 6.18: Snapshot Screen from the Product 2 Report.....	252
Figure 6.19: Snapshot Screen of the WBS Information.....	258
Figure 6.20: Snapshot Screen for the Functional Requirements.....	259
Figure 6.21: The SMIS Alternatives .....	261

Figure 6.22: The Yardstick Thresholds Values .....	262
Figure 6.23: The Collected Data in the Level Two of Filtering Activity.....	264
Figure 6.24: The Level One Filtering Result .....	264
Figure 6.25: The Output of the Level Three .....	265
Figure 6.26: The Snapshot Screen of Product Failure .....	265
Figure 6.27: The Output of the Level Four .....	266
Figure 6.28: Criteria Weighting from the Second Level of the CEC.....	267
Figure 6.29: The Eduwave Software Mismatches and Their Solutions.....	269
Figure 6.30: The Snapshot Screen for the Fittest SMIS Product .....	269
Figure 6.31: Snapshot Screen from the Sorted List of Products Screen .....	270
Figure 6.32: Snapshot Screen from the Report Screen for Product 3 .....	270

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A Related Work For Questionnaire Development .....	325
Appendix B The Questionnaire.....	327
Appendix C Evaluation Criteria Resources .....	340
Appendix D CEC Description .....	343
Appendix E Yardstick Defining Template.....	348
Appendix F Evaluation Forms .....	355
Appendix G Data Collection and Filtering Levels.....	359
Appendix H The Findings of the First Case Study .....	366
Appendix I The Findings of the Second Case Study .....	374
Appendix J The Questionnaire of the Experts Review .....	383

## **List of Abbreviations**

<b>COTS</b>	Commercial-Off-The-Shelf
<b>CBS</b>	COTS-Based Systems
<b>CBD</b>	COTS-Based systems Development
<b>OTSO</b>	Off-The-Shelf Option
<b>PORE</b>	Procurement-Oriented Requirements Engineering
<b>CSSP</b>	COTS Software Selection Process
<b>CAP</b>	COTS software Acquisition Process
<b>PAREMO</b>	Balanced Reuse Model
<b>MiHOS</b>	Mismatch handling aware COTS Selection
<b>CRE</b>	COTS-based Requirements Engineering
<b>STACE</b>	Social-Technical Approach to COTS Evaluation
<b>DC</b>	Developing Country
<b>GUI</b>	Graphic User Interface
<b>IDC</b>	International Data Corporation
<b>CBA</b>	COTS-based Application
<b>USC</b>	University of Southern California
<b>TT&amp;C</b>	Telemetry, Tracking, and Control
<b>CERES</b>	Center for Research Support
<b>WSM</b>	Weighting Scoring Method
<b>AHP</b>	Analytical Hierarchy Process
<b>IusWare</b>	IUStitiasoftWAR
<b>CISD</b>	COTS-based Integrated System Development
<b>PRISM</b>	Portable, Reusable, Integrated Software Model
<b>CEP</b>	Comparative Evaluation Process
<b>CF</b>	Confidence Factor
<b>IESE</b>	Institute for Experimental Software Engineering
<b>RCPER</b>	Requirements-driven COTS Product Evaluation Process
<b>CARE</b>	COTS-Aware Requirements Engineering

<b>PECA</b>	Plan, Establish, Collect, and Analyze
<b>CSCC</b>	Combined Selection of COTS Components
<b>GCS</b>	General COTS Selection
<b>unHOS</b>	uncertainty Handling in COTS Selection
<b>GQM</b>	Goal Question Metrics
<b>ISO</b>	International Organization for Standardization
<b>QFD</b>	Quality Function Deployment
<b>BBN</b>	Bayesian Belief Network
<b>SPA</b>	Software Process Assessment
<b>MCDM</b>	Multi-Criteria Decision Making
<b>ERP</b>	Enterprise Resource Planning
<b>KM</b>	Knowledge Management
<b>API</b>	Application Programming Interface
<b>CAR/SA</b>	COTS-Aware Requirements and Software Architecture
<b>NFR</b>	Non-Functional Requirements
<b>IRC</b>	Identifying mismatches Resolution Constraints
<b>CRC</b>	Considered Resolution Constraint
<b>SDMP</b>	Systematic Decision Making Process
<b>C-QM</b>	COTS-Quality Model
<b>ISO/IEC</b>	International Organization for Standardization and international Electro technical Commission
<b>UK</b>	Unite Kingdom
<b>SME</b>	Small Medium Enterprise
<b>SE</b>	Software Engineering
<b>SPSS</b>	Software Package for Social Sciences
<b>JAD</b>	Joint Application design
<b>ASP.NET</b>	Active Server Pages.Net
<b>VB.Net</b>	Visual Basic.Net
<b>IT</b>	Information Technology
<b>SD</b>	Standard Deviation

<b>CEC</b>	COTS Evaluation Criteria
<b>ANC</b>	Average Normalized Column
<b>CR</b>	Consistency Ratio
<b>CI</b>	Consistency Index
<b>RI</b>	Random Index
<b>FMML</b>	Final Mismatching Level
<b>ML</b>	Matching Level
<b>MML</b>	Mismatching Level
<b>FFS</b>	Final Fitness Score
<b>WBS</b>	Work Breakdown Structure
<b>SLA</b>	Service Level Agreement
<b>DM-PT</b>	Decision Making- Prototyping Tool
<b>ID</b>	Identification number
<b>COB</b>	College Of Business
<b>CAS</b>	College of Art and Science
<b>CLGIS</b>	College of Law, Government, and International Studies
<b>PCs</b>	Personal Computers
<b>SMIS</b>	Student Management Information System
<b>OSS</b>	Open Source System
<b>OTS</b>	Off-The-Shelf

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides an introduction to the field of this research by describing the background of the study and discussing the research problem. The research questions are then presented and used to construct the research objectives. Finally, the chapter describes the scope of this research; as well as highlighting the significance of the research. The chapter concludes with an overview of the remaining chapters of this thesis.

### **1.2 Background**

The world of software development has significantly evolved from development-centric to a procurement-centric approach. In other words, this new approach has been introduced as an alternative software development approach which focused on building systems through pre-packaged solutions assembling, usually known as Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) software, and migrating existing systems towards COTS-Based Systems (CBS) (Gupta et al., 2012). Nowadays, most organizations have decided to change from in-house development towards COTS software integration in order to reduce the maintenance cost, development time, and operating, testing, and validating efforts (Couts & Gerdes, 2010). Thus, COTS software has become strategic and economic way for building large and complex systems.

The contents of  
the thesis is for  
internal user  
only



## REFERENCES

- Acuña, S. T., Antonio, A. D., Ferré, X., Lopez, M., & Mate, L. (2001). The software process: Modelling, evaluation and improvement. In S. K. Chang (Eds.), *Handbook of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering* (Vol. 1, pp. 193-237). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated.
- Akhavi, F., & Hayes, C. (2003). A comparison of two multi-criteria decision-making techniques. In *proceeding of the Systems, Man and Cybernetics 2003, IEEE International Conference held on 5-8 Oct. 2003 at the Washington DC* (Vol. 1, pp. 956-961). USA: IEEE.
- Alanbay, O. (2005). ERP selection using expert choice software. In *Proceeding of the ISAHP held on 8-10 July 2005 at the Honolulu, Hawaii* (47). USA: Elmhurst College.
- Albert, C., & Brownsword, L. (2002). *Evolutionary Process for Integrating COTS-Based Systems (EPIC): An Overview* (CMU/SEI-2002-TR-009). Software Engineering Institute, Carnegie Mellon University, Pennsylvania, United States.
- Alghamdi, A. (2007). An Empirical Process for Evaluating and Selecting AWEM Environments: "Evaluation Stage". *Comp. & Info. Sci.*, 19(1), 17-37. Retrieved from <http://ccisj.ksu.edu.sa/ccisj/CCIS/>
- Alvaro, A., Almeida, E. S., Vasconcelos, A. M. L., & Meira, S. R. L. (2005, Aug). *Towards a software component quality model*. Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Quality Software (QSIC), Work in Progress Session, Porto, Portugal.
- Alvaro, A., de Almeida, E. S., & Meira, S. L. (2006). A Software Component Quality Model: A Preliminary Evaluation. In *proceeding of the Software Engineering and Advanced Applications (SEAA '06) 32nd EUROMICRO Conference held on 29 Aug. – 1 Spt. 2006 at the Cavtat, Dubrovnik* (pp. 28-37). Croatia: IEEE.
- Alvaro, A., Santana de Almeida, E., & Romero de Lemos Meira, S. (2010). A software component quality framework. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 35(1), 1-18. doi: 10.1145/1668862.1668863
- Alves, C., & Castro, J. (2001, Oct). *CRE: A systematic method for COTS components selection*. Paper presented at the XV Brazilian Symposium on Software Engineering (SBES), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Alves, C., & Finkelstein, A. (2003). Investigating conflicts in COTS decision-making. *International Journal of Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering*, 13(5), 473-493. doi: 10.1142/S0218194003001408
- Alves, C., Castro, J., & Alencar, F. (2000, July). *Requirements Engineering for COTS Selection*. Paper presented at the 3<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Requirements Engineering, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Retrieved from <http://wer.inf.puc-rio.br/wer01/NFu-Req-1.pdf>
- Alves, C., Franch, X., Carvalho, J., & Finkelstein, A. (2005). Using Goals and Quality Models to Support the Matching Analysis during COTS Selection. In X. Franch & D. Port (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 3412, pp. 146-156). Bilbao, Spain: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

- Alves, C., Pinto Filho, J. B., & Castro, J. (2001, Nov). *Analysing the tradeoffs among requirements, architectures and COTS components*. Centro de Informática, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco Recife, Pernambuco. Retrieved on 26 Jul. 2009 from [http://www.inf.puc-rio.br/~wer/WERpapers/artigos/artigos\\_WER01/alves.pdf](http://www.inf.puc-rio.br/~wer/WERpapers/artigos/artigos_WER01/alves.pdf)
- Ariff, H., Salit, M. S., Ismail, N., & Nukman, Y. (2012). Use of Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) for selecting the best design concept. *Jurnal Teknologi*, 49, 1–18. doi: 10.11113/jt.v49.188
- Asghar, S., & Umar, M. (2010). Requirement Engineering Challenges in Development of Software Applications and Selection of Customer-off-the-Shelf (COTS) Components. *International Journal of Software Engineering (IJSE)*, 1(2), 32. Retrieved from <http://cscjournals.org/csc/manuscript/Journals/IJSE/volume1/Issue2/IJSE-7.pdf>
- Assadi, P., & Sowlati, T. (2009). Design and manufacturing software selection in the wood industry using analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Business Innovation and Research*, 3(2), 182-198. doi: 10.1504/IJBIR.2009.022754
- Avizienis, A., Laprie, J. C., Randell, B., & Landwehr, C. (2004). Basic concepts and taxonomy of dependable and secure computing. *Dependable and Secure Computing*, IEEE Transactions, 1(1), 11-33. doi: 10.1109/tdsc.2004.2
- Ayala, C. (2008). *Systematic Construction of Goal- Oriented COTS Taxonomies*. Unpublished Master Thesis, Departament of Llenguatges i Sistemes Informàtics, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.
- Ayala, C., Hauge, Ø., Conradi, R., Franch, X., & Li, J. (2011). Selection of third party software in Off-The-Shelf-based software development—An interview study with industrial practitioners. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 84(4), 620-637. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0164121210002864>
- Bachmeyer, K. (2004). *What Does COTS Really Mean?*. Retrieved on 13 May, 2009 from <http://www.gisdevelopment.net/proceedings/gita/2005/papers/58.pdf>
- Bailey, K. (2008). *Methods of Social Research* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Free Press.
- Basili, V., & Boehm, B. (2001). COTS-Based Systems Top 10 List. *IEEE Computer Society Press*, 34(5), 91 - 93. doi: 10.1109/2.920618
- Becker, C., & Rauber, A. (2009). Requirements modelling and evaluation for digital preservation: a COTS selection method based on controlled experimentation. *In Proceedings of the 2009 ACM symposium on Applied Computing at the Honolulu University* (pp. 401-402). Hawaii, USA: ACM.
- Behkamal, B., Kahani, M., & Akbari, M. K. (2009). Customizing ISO 9126 quality model for evaluation of B2B applications. *Information and software Technology*, 51(3), 599-609. doi: 10.1016/j.infsof.2008.08.001
- Beil, D. (2009). *Supplier Selection*. Wiley Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science, University of Michigan, Michigan, United States. Retrieved on 22 Jun 2010 from [http://www-personal.umich.edu/~dbeil/Supplier\\_Selection\\_Beil-EORMS.pdf](http://www-personal.umich.edu/~dbeil/Supplier_Selection_Beil-EORMS.pdf)
- Berch, D. B. (2003, July). *Gap Analysis: Bridging the space between what we know and what we want to know*. Paper presented at the National Research Council's Workshop on

Understanding and Promoting Knowledge Accumulation in Education: Tools and Strategies for Educational Research, Washington, USA.

- Bertoa, M., & Vallecillo, A. (2002, Jun). *Quality attributes for COTS components*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International Workshop on Quantitative Approaches in Object-Oriented Software Engineering (QAOOSE'2002), Malagas, Spain.
- Beus-Dukic, L. (2000). Non-functional requirements for COTS software components. *In Proceedings of the COTS workshop: Continuing Collaborations for Successful COTS Development (ICSE2000) held on 4-5 June 2000 at the University of Limerick* (pp. 4-5). Limerick, Ireland: ACM.
- Bharathi, V., Vaidya, O., & Parikh, S. (2012). Prioritizing and Ranking Critical Success Factors for ERP Adoption in SMEs. *AIMS International Journal of Management*, 6(1), 23-40. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2188829>
- Bhuta, J., & Boehm, B. (2005). A Method for Compatible COTS Component Selection. In X. Franch & D. Port (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 3412, pp. 132-143). Bilbao, Spain: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Bhuta, J., & Boehm, B. (2007). Attribute-based cots product interoperability assessment. *In Proceeding of the 6<sup>th</sup> International IEEE Conference in Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS)-Based Software Systems ICCBSS'07 held on 26 Feb. - 2 March 2007 at the Banff, Albt.* (pp. 163-171). Alberta, Canada: IEEE.
- Birisici, S., Metin, M., & Karakas, M. (2009). Prospective elementary teachers' attitudes toward computer and Internet use: A sample from Turkey. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 6(10), 1433-1440. Retrieved from [http://idosi.org/wasj/wasj6\(10\)/20.pdf](http://idosi.org/wasj/wasj6(10)/20.pdf)
- Boehm, B., & Abts, C. (1999). COTS integration: Plug and Pray?. *Computer*, 32(1), 135-138. doi: 10.1109/2.738311
- Boehm, B., Port, D., Yang, Y., & Bhuta, J. (2003). Not All CBS Are Created Equally: COTS-Intensive Project Types. In H. Erdogmus & T. Weng (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2580, pp. 36-50). Ottawa, Canada: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Botella, P., Burgués, X., Carvallo, J., Franch, X., Grau, G., Marco, J., et al. (2004, Jan). *ISO/IEC 9126 in practice: what do we need to know?*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 1st Software Measurement European Forum (SMEF), Roma.
- Bordley, R. F. (2001). Integrating gap analysis and utility theory in service research. *Journal of Service Research*, 3(4), 300-309. doi: 10.1177/109467050134003
- Brownsword, L., Oberndorf, T., & Sledge, C. (2000). Developing new processes for COTS-based systems. *IEEE software*, 17(4), 48-55. doi: 10.1109/52.854068
- Bruseberg, A. (2006). The design of complete systems: Providing human factors guidance for COTS acquisition. *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, 91(12), 1554-1565. doi:10.1016/j.res.2006.01.016
- Bryman, A., & Bell, E. (2007). *Business research methods*. USA: Oxford University Press.

- Buchanan, J., & Vanderpooten, D. (2007). Ranking projects for an electricity utility using ELECTRE III. *International Transactions in Operational Research*, 14(4), 309-323. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-3995.2007.00589.x.
- Burgués, X., Estay, C., Franch, X., Pastor, J., & Quer, C. (2002). Combined selection of COTS components. *COTS-Based Software Systems*, 2255(5), 54-64. doi: 10.1007/3-540-45588-4\_6.
- Cai, L., Xie, X., & Huang, S. (2011). Software Quality Model Development-An Introduction. *Energy Procedia*, 13, 8749-8758.
- Callagy, C. (2007). *Commercial Off-The-Shelf Software: Using Purchasing Portfolio Management to Gain Competitive Advantage*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Department of Management, Faculty of Commerce, National University of Ireland, Galway, Ireland.
- Cangussu, J., Cooper, K., & Wong, E. (2006). Multi Criteria Selection of Components Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process. In I. Gorton, G. Heineman, I. Crnković, H. Schmidt, J. Stafford, C. Szyperski & K. Wallnau (Eds.), *Component-Based Software Engineering* (Vol. 4063, pp. 67-81). Västerås, Sweden: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Carney, D. (1997, Jun). *Assembling large systems from COTS components: opportunities, cautions, and complexities*. Paper presented at the SEI Monographs on Use of Commercial Software in Government Systems. Pittsburgh, PA, US. Retrieved from <http://www.sei.cmu.edu/library/assets/assemblingsystems.pdf>
- Carney, D., Hissam, S., & Plakosh, D. (2000). Complex COTS-based software systems: practical steps for their maintenance. *Journal of Software Maintenance: Research and Practice*, 12(6), 357-376. doi: 10.1002/1096-908X(200011/12)12:6<357::AID-SMR219>3.0.CO;2-L
- Carson, J. S., II. (2002, Dec). Model verification and validation. *Paper presented in Proceeding of the 2002 Winter Simulation Conference, held on 8-11 Dec. 2002 at the Marietta, GA* (pp. 52-58 Vol.1). USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Carvalho, J. P., & Franch, X. (2006). Extending the ISO/IEC 9126-1 quality model with non-technical factors for COTS components selection. *Paper Proceedings in the 2006 international workshop of Software quality held on 20-28 May 2006 at the Shanghai International Convention Center* (pp.9-14). Shanghai, China: ACM.
- Carvalho, J. P., Franch, X., Grau, G., & Quer, C. (2004, September). COSTUME: a method for building quality models for composite COTS-based software systems. *In Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Quality Software, QSIC held on 8-9 Sept. 2004 at the Braunschweig* (pp. 214-221). Germany: IEEE Computer Society.
- Cechich, A., & Piattini, M. (2007). A Six Sigma-Based Process to Improve COTS Component Filtering. *Journal of Research and Practice in Information Technology*, 39(4), 245-272. Retrieved from [http://pdf.aminer.org/000/366/102/quantifying\\_cots\\_component\\_functional\\_adaptation.pdf](http://pdf.aminer.org/000/366/102/quantifying_cots_component_functional_adaptation.pdf)
- Cechich, A., & Taryano, K. (2003, Oct). *Selecting COTS components: a comparative study on E-Payment systems*. Paper presented in IX Congreso Argentino de Ciencias de la

Computación, CAECE University, Mar del Plata, Argentina. Retrieved from <http://sedici.unlp.edu.ar:8080/handle/10915/22582>

- Charpentier, R., & Salois, M. (2000). Detection of Malicious Code in COTS Software via Certifying Compilers. In *proceeding of the Commercial Off-The-Shelf Products in Defence Applications "The Ruthless Pursuit of COTS" held on 3-5 Apr 2000 at the Neuilly-sur-Seine Cedex, France* (pp.1-8). France: RTO.
- Chen McCain, S.-L., Jang, S., & Hu, C. (2005). Service quality gap analysis toward customer loyalty: practical guidelines for casino hotels. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 24(3), 465-472.  
doi://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2004.09.005
- Chung, L., & Cooper, K. (2004, Jun). *COTS-aware requirements engineering and software architecting*. Paper presented at the Proceeding of Software Engineering Research and Practice Conference (SERP), Las Vegas, NE, USA. Retrieved from [http://pdf.aminer.org/000/585/051/cots\\_aware\\_requirements\\_engineering\\_and\\_software\\_architecting.pdf](http://pdf.aminer.org/000/585/051/cots_aware_requirements_engineering_and_software_architecting.pdf)
- Chung, L., & Prado Leite, J. (2009). On Non-Functional Requirements in Software Engineering. In A. Borgida, V. Chaudhri, P. Giorgini & E. Yu (Eds.), *Conceptual Modeling: Foundations and Applications* (Vol. 5600, pp. 363-379). Canada: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Chung, L., Cooper, K., & Huynh, D. (2001, Oct). *COTS-aware requirements engineering Technique*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2001 Workshop on Embedded Software Technology (WEST01), Tahoe City, CA, USA. Retrieved on 22 Mar. 2009 from <http://cs.mvnu.edu/twiki/pub/Main/SoftwareEngineering2010/COCOTS-Aware.pdf>
- Clough, A. (2003). *Commercial Off-the-shelf (COTS) Hardware and Software for Train Control Applications: System Safety Considerations* (Report.No. DOT-VNTSC-FRA-02-01.). National Technical Information Service, USA.
- Comella-Dorda, S., Dean, J., Morris, E., & Oberndorf, P. (2002). A Process for COTS Software Product Evaluation. In J. Dean & A. Gravel (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2255, pp. 86-96).Orlando, Florida: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Comella-Dorda, S., Dean, J. C., Lewis, G., Morris, E. J., Oberndorf, P. A., & Harper, E. (2004). *A process for COTS software product evaluation* (Technical Report CMU/SEI-2003-TR-017). Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh: Carnegie Mellon University, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Cortellessa, V., Crnkovic, I., Marinelli, F., & Potena, P. (2007). Driving the selection of COTS components on the basis of system requirements. In *Proceedings of the 22<sup>th</sup> IEEE/ACM international conference on Automated software engineering held on 5-9 November 2007 at the Atlanta, Georgia* (pp. 413-416). Georgia, USA: ACM.
- Couts, C. T., & Gerdes, P. F. (2010). Integrating COTS Software: Lessons from a Large Healthcare Organization. *IT Professional*, 12(2), 50-58. doi: 10.1109/mitp.2010.59
- Crnkovic, I., Larsson, M., & Preiss, O. (2005). Concerning predictability in dependable component-based systems: Classification of quality attributes. *Architecting Dependable Systems III, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 3549, 257-278. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. Retrieved from

[http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F11556169\\_12?LI=true](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F11556169_12?LI=true)

- Dagdeviren, H., Juric, R., & Kassana, T. A. (2005). An exploratory study for effective COTS and OSS product marketing. In *Proceeding of the 27th International Conference on Information Technology Interfaces held on 20-23 June 2005 at the Cavtat* (pp. 644–649). Croatia: IEEE.
- Daim, T. U., Udbye, A., & Balasubramanian, A. (2013). Use of analytic hierarchy process (AHP) for selection of 3PL providers. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, 24(1), 28-51. doi: 10.1108/17410381311287472
- Dalkey, N., & Helmer, O. (1963). An experimental application of the Delphi method to the use of experts. *Management Science*, 9(3), 458-467. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.9.3.458
- Dean, J., & Gravel, A. (Eds.). (2002). COTS-Based Software Systems: *Proceedings of 1<sup>th</sup> International Conference on COTS-Based Software Systems (ICCBSS 2002)*, Orlando University, FL, Feb 2002, USA: Springer.
- Dolan, J. G. (2010). Multi-criteria clinical decision support: A primer on the use of multiple criteria decision making methods to promote evidence-based, patient-centered healthcare. *The patient*, 3(4), 229. doi: 10.2165/11539470-000000000-00000
- Dustin, E., Rashka, J., & McDiarmid, D. (2002). *Quality web systems: performance, security, and usability*. Boston, USA: Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing.
- Dzever, S., Merdji, M., & Saives, A.-L. (2001). Purchase decision making and buyer-seller relationship development in the French food processing industry. *Supply Chain Management: An International Journal*, 6(5), 216-229. doi: 10.1108/13598540110407769
- Egyed, A., & Balzer, R. (2006). Integrating cots software into systems through instrumentation and reasoning. *Automated Software Engineering*, 13(1), 41-64. doi: 10.1007/s10515-006-5466-4
- Elanchezian, C., Ramnath, B. V., & Kesavan, R. (2010). Vendor selection using analytical hierarchy process in supply chain management. *Journal of Engineering Research and Studies*, 1(1), 118-127. Retrieved from <http://www.technicaljournalsonline.com>
- Eldrandaly, K. (2007). An Intelligent MCDM Approach for Selecting the Suitable Expert System Building Tool. *the International Arab Journal of Information Technology (IAJIT)*, 4(4), 365-371. Retrieved from [http://history.kau.edu.sa/Files/195/Researches/58680\\_28927.pdf](http://history.kau.edu.sa/Files/195/Researches/58680_28927.pdf)
- Erol, I., & Ferrell Jr, W. G. (2003). A methodology for selection problems with multiple, conflicting objectives and both qualitative and quantitative criteria. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 86(3), 187-199. doi: 10.1016/S0925-5273(03)00049-5
- Fahmi, S. A., & Choi, H. J. (2009). A study on software component selection methods. In *proceeding of the 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference In Advanced Communication Technology (ICTACT 2009) held on 15-18 Feb. 2009 at the Phoenix Park* (Vol. 1, pp. 288-292). Dublin, Ireland: IEEE.

- Falessi, D., Cantone, G., Kazman, R., & Kruchten, P. (2011). Decision-making techniques for software architecture design: a comparative survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 43(4), 33. doi: 10.1145/1978802.1978812.
- Fan, C. K., & Cheng, S. W. (2009). Using analytic hierarchy process method and technique for order preference by similarity to ideal solution to evaluate curriculum in department of risk management and insurance. *Journal of Science in Society*, 19(1), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://www.krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSS/JSS-19-0-000-09-Web/JSS-19-1-000-09-Abst-PDF>
- Fang, G., Lin, J., Chin, K., & Lee, C. (2010). Software Integration for Applications with Audio/Video Stream. *International Journal of Innovative Computing, Information and Control*, 6(3), 1421–1433. Retrieved from <http://www.ijic.org/ihtmosp08-21-1.pdf>
- Felice, F., & Petrillo, A. (2012). Hierarchical Model to Optimize Performance in Logistics Policies: Multi Attribute Analysis. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58(0), 1555-1564. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.1142>
- Fisher, C. M. (2007). *Researching and writing a dissertation: a guidebook for business students*. England: Prentice Hall.
- Fox, R. J. 2010. *Non probability Sampling*. USA: Wiley International Encyclopedia of Marketing.
- Franch, X., & Carvallo, J. P. (2003). Using quality models in software package selection. *Software, IEEE*, 20(1), 34-41. doi: 10.1109/ms.2003.1159027
- Fröberg, J. (2000). *Software components and COTS in software system development*. Faculty of Information System and Technology, Mälardalen University, Västerås, Sweden.
- Galorath, D. (2005). *Software Reuse and Commercial Off-the-Shelf Software*. Galorath Incorporation, El Segundo, CA, USA. retrieved on 4 February 2009 from <http://www.compaid.com/caiinternet/ezine/galorath-reuse.pdf>
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application* (8<sup>th</sup> Edition). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Gayen, T., & Misra, R. (2009). Reliability Assessment of Elementary COTS Software Component. *International Journal of Recent Trends in Engineering*, 1(2), 196-200. Retrieved from <http://www.ijrte.academypublisher.com/vol01/no02/ijrte0102196200.pdf>
- George, B., Fleurquin, R., & Sadou, S. (2008). A Component Selection Framework for COTS Libraries. In M. V. Chaudron, C. Szyperski & R. Reussner (Eds.), *Component-Based Software Engineering* (Vol. 5282, pp. 286-301). Karlsruhe, Germany: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gerea, M. (2006). *Selection and Evaluation of Open Source Components*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Department of Computer and Information Science. Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU), Trondheim., Norway.
- Gill, N. S. (2006). Importance of software component characterization for better software reusability. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes*, 31(1), 1-3. doi: 10.1145/1108768.1108771

- Glinz, M. (2007). On non-functional requirements. *In proceeding of the 15<sup>th</sup> IEEE International in Requirements Engineering Conference (RE'07) held on 15-19 October 2007 at the Habitat World Convention Centre, Delhi* (pp. 21-26). India: IEEE.
- Gomes, C. F. S., Nunes, K. R. A., Helena Xavier, L., Cardoso, R., & Valle, R. (2008). Multi-criteria decision making applied to waste recycling in Brazil. *Omega*, 36(3), 395-404. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030504830600123X>
- Goswami, V., & Acharya, Y. (2009, Nov). *Method for Reliability Estimation of COTS Components based Software Systems*. Paper presented at the proceedings of 20<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Software Reliability Engineering, ISSRE, Bengaluru-Mysuru, India.
- Grau, G., Carvallo, J. P., Franch, X., & Quer, C. (2004). DesCOTS: a software system for selecting COTS components. *In Proceedings of the 30<sup>th</sup> Euromicro Conference held on 31 Aug.-3 Sept. 2004 at the Rennes, France* (pp. 118-126).France: IEEE.
- Gregor, S., Hutson, J., & Oresky, C. (2002). Storyboard Process to Assist in Requirements Verification and Adaptation to Capabilities Inherent in COTS. In J. Dean & A. Gravel (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2255, pp. 132-141). FL, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Guerra, PA de C., Rubira, C., Romanovsky, A., & de Lemos, R. (2004) A Dependable Architecture for COTS-based Software Systems using Protective Wrappers. In: de Lemos R, Gacek C, Romanovsky A (eds.), *Architecting Dependable Systems II, LNCS* (Vol. 3069, pp. 144–166). Portland, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Gulen, K. G. (2007). Supplier selection and outsourcing strategies in Supply Chain Management. *Journal of aeronautics and space technologies*, 3(2), 1-6. Retrieved from [http://www.bs2011.hho.edu.tr/web\\_eng/egitim\\_programlari/lisansustu\\_egitim/Huten%20Dergi/2007Temmuz/4\\_GULEN.pdf](http://www.bs2011.hho.edu.tr/web_eng/egitim_programlari/lisansustu_egitim/Huten%20Dergi/2007Temmuz/4_GULEN.pdf)
- Gupta, P., Mehlawat, M. K., & Verma, S. (2012). COTS selection using fuzzy interactive approach. *Optimization Letters*, 6(2), 273-289. doi: 10.1007/s11590-010-0243-5
- Gupta, P., Verma, S., & Mehlawat, M. (2012). Optimization Model of COTS Selection Based on Cohesion and Coupling for Modular Software Systems under Multiple Applications Environment. In B. Murgante, O. Gervasi, S. Misra, N. Nedjah, A. C. Rocha, D. Taniar & B. Apduhan (Eds.), *Computational Science and Its Applications – ICCSA 2012* (Vol. 7335, pp. 87-102). Bahia, Brazil: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Hallowell, M. R., & Gambatese, J. A. (2010). Qualitative research: application of the Delphi method to CEM research. *Journal of construction engineering and management*, 136(1), 99-107. doi: 10.1061/\_ASCE\_CO.1943-7862.0000137
- Hämäläinen, R., Kettunen, E., Marttunen, M., & Ehtamo, H. (2001). Evaluating a framework for multi-stakeholder decision support in water resources management. *Group decision and negotiation*, 10(4), 331-353. doi: 10.1023/A:1011207207809
- Herraiz, I., Shihab, E., Nguyen, T. H., & Hassan, A. E. (2011). Impact of installation counts on perceived quality: A case study on debian. *In Proceeding of the 18<sup>th</sup> Working Conference on Reverse Engineering (WCRE) held on 17-20 Oct 2011 at the Limerick, Ireland* (pp.219-228). Ireland: IEEE.



- Hill, R., Wang, J., & Nahrstedt, K. (2004). Quantifying non-functional requirements: a process oriented approach. In *Proceedings of the 12<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Conference of Requirements Engineering held on 6-11 Sept. 2004 at the Kyoto, Japan* (pp. 352-353). Japan: IEEE.
- Hopkins, J. (2000). Component primer. *Communications of the ACM*, 43(10), 27-30. doi: 10.1145/352183.352198
- Hsiao, S.-W. (2002). Concurrent design method for developing a new product. *International Journal of Industrial Ergonomics*, 29(1), 41-55. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8141\(01\)00048-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0169-8141(01)00048-8)
- Hsiao, W. H., Chang, T. S., Huang, M. S., & Chen, Y. C. (2011). Selection criteria of recruitment for information systems employees: Using the analytic hierarchy process (AHP) method. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(15), 6201-6209. doi: 10.5897/AJBM11.185
- Hsu, C.-C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus. Practical Assessment, *Research & Evaluation*, 12(10), 1-8. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/getvn.asp?v=12&n=10>
- Huang, J., Wu-chi, F., & Wu-chang, F. (2006). Cascades: scalable, flexible and composable middleware for multi-modal sensor networking applications. In *Proceeding of SPIE 6071, Multimedia Computing and Networking held on 15-18 January 2006 at the San Jose State University* (Vol. 6071). CA, USA: International Society for Optics and Photonics.
- Ibrahim, H., Elamy, A.-H. H., Far, B. H., & Eberlein, A. (2011). UnHOS: A Method for Uncertainty Handling in Commercial Off-The-Shelf (COTS) Selection. *International Journal of Energy, Information and Communications*, 2(3), 21-48. Retrieved from [http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJEIC/vol2\\_Is3/3.pdf](http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJEIC/vol2_Is3/3.pdf)
- Ibrahim, H., Far, B. H., Eberlein, A., & Daradkeh, Y. (2009). Uncertainty management in software engineering: Past, present, and future. In *Proceeding of the Canadian Conference on the Electrical and Computer Engineering (CCECE'09) held on 3-6 May 2009 at the St. John's, NL* (pp. 7-12). Canada: IEE.
- Ismail, W., Abedlazeed, N., & Hussin, Z. (2011). Epistemological Beliefs of Students at High Schools: A Survey Study in Malaysia. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(08), 39-46. Retrieved from <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1974094>
- ISO. (2011). *Systems and software engineering - Systems and software Quality Requirements and Evaluation (SQuaRE) - System and software quality models*, International Organization for Standardization, J.S. ISO/IEC 25010:2011.
- Jackson, M. J., Helms, M. M., & Ahmadi, M. (2011). Quality as a gap analysis of college students' expectations. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(4), 392-412. doi: 10.1108/09684881111170096
- Jadhav, A., & Sonar, R. (2008). A hybrid system for selection of the software packages. In *Proceeding of 1<sup>th</sup> International Conference Emerging Trends in Engineering and Technology (ICETET'08) held on 16-18 July 2008 at the University of Nagpur* (pp. 337-342). Nagpur, Maharashtra: IEEE.

- Jadhav, A., & Sonar, R. (2009). An Integrated Rule-Based and Case-Based Reasoning Approach for Selection of the Software Packages. *Springer Berlin Heidelberg*, 31(5), 280-291. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-00405-6\_30
- Jadhav, A. S., & Sonar, R. M. (2011). Framework for evaluation and selection of the software packages: A hybrid knowledge based system approach. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 84(8), 1394-1407. doi: 10.1016/j.jss.2011.03.034
- Javed, Z., Sattar, A. R., & Faridi, M. S. (2012). Unsolved Tricky Issues on COTS Selection and Evaluation. *Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 12(10-D). retrieved from <http://computerresearch.org/stpr/index.php/gjcs/article/viewArticle/1181>.
- Jha, P. C., & Bali, S. (2012). Optimal COTS selection for fault tolerant software system with mandatory redundancy in critical modules using consensus recovery block scheme under fuzzy environment. In *Proceeding of Recent Advances in Computing and Software Systems International Conference (RACSS) held on 25-27 April 2012 at the University of Madras, Chennai* (pp. 273-280). India: IEEE.
- Jingyue, L., Conradi, R., Bunse, C., Torchiano, M., Slyngstad, O., & Morisio, M. (2009). Development with Off-the-Shelf Components: 10 Facts. *Software, IEEE*, 26(2), 80-87. doi: 10.1109/ms.2009.33
- Johar, A. K., & Goel, S. (2011). COTS Components Usage Risks in Component Based Software Development. *International Journal of Information Technology*, 4(2), 573-575. Retrieved from [http://www.csjournals.com/IJITKM/PDF%204-2/Article\\_45.pdf](http://www.csjournals.com/IJITKM/PDF%204-2/Article_45.pdf)
- Kalaimagal, S., & Srinivasan, R. (2008). A retrospective on software component quality models. *SIGSOFT Software. Eng. Notes*, 33(6), 1-10. doi: 10.1145/1449603.1449611
- Kalaimagal, S., & Srinivasan, R. (2010/a). Q FACTO 10-A commercial off-the-shelf component quality model proposal. *J. Software Eng*, 4(1), 1-15. doi: 10.3923/jse.2010.1.15
- Kalaimagal, S., & Srinivasan, R. (2010/b). Q'Facto 12: an improved quality model for COTS components. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 35(2), 1-4. doi: 10.1145/1734103.1734116
- Kaur, A., & Mann, K. S. (2010). Component Selection for Component Based Software Engineering. *International Journal of Computer Applications IJCA*, 2(1), 109-114. retrieved from [www.psu.edu](http://www.psu.edu)
- Keil, M., & Tiwana, A. (2005). Beyond cost: the drivers of COTS application value. *IEEE software*, 22(3), 64-69. doi: 10.1109/MS.2005.58
- Kessler, E. (2008). Assessing COTS software in a certifiable safety-critical domain. *Information Systems Journal*, 18(3), 299-324. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2575.2007.00257.x
- Kim, S., & Park, J. (2003). C-QM: a practical quality model for evaluating cots components. In *Proceedings of the International Association of Science and Technology for Development (IASTED) International Conference on Software Engineering held on 10-13 February 2003 at the Innsbruck* (pp. 991-996). Austria: ACTA Press.

- Kirakowski, J. (2000). *Questionnaires in usability engineering: a list of frequently asked questions* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition.). Cork, Ireland: Human Factors Research Group.
- Kitchenham, B. A., & Pickard, L. M. (1998). Evaluating software engineering methods and tools: part 9: quantitative case study methodology. *SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes*, 23(1), 24-26. doi: 10.1145/272263.272268
- Kiv, S., Kolp, M., Filipe, J., Fred, A. L. N., & Sharp, B. (2010). A process for COTS-selection and mismatches handling-a goal-driven approach. *In proceeding of the 2<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence, ICAART2010 held on 22-24 Jan. 2010 at the Valencia* (pp.98-106). Spain: Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel (HUB).
- Kontio, H. (2008, April). *Current trends in software industry: COTS Integration*. Retrieved on 19 May 2009 from <http://www.cs.helsinki.fi/u/paakki/Kontio.pdf>
- Kontio, J. (1995). *OSTO: A Systematic Process for Reusable Software Component Selection*. (Technical Rep. No. CSTR-3478). University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland, USA. Retrieved from <http://dl.acm.org/>
- Kontio, J. (1996). A case study in applying a systematic method for COTS selection. *In Proceedings of the 18<sup>th</sup> International Conference in Software Engineering held on 25-29 Mar 1996 at the Berlin* (pp. 201-209). Berlin, Germany: IEEE.
- Kumar, R., & Singh, M. K. (2012). A Literature Survey on black box testing in component based software engineering. *International Journal*, 2(3), 420-423. Retrieved from [www.ijarcsse.com](http://www.ijarcsse.com)
- Kumar, S., & Suri, P. (2012). Effort Distribution in COTS Components Integration: A Simulation Based Approach. *Global Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, 12(3). Retrieved from <http://computerresearch.org/stpr/index.php/gjcst/article/view/1011/894>
- Kumari, U., & Upadhyaya, S. (2011). An Interface Complexity Measure for Component-based Software Systems. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 36(1), 46-52. Retrieved from <http://research.ijcaonline.org/volume36/number1/pxc3976247.pdf>
- Kunda, D. (2002). *A social-technical approach to selecting software supporting COTS-Based Systems*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of York, York, UK. .
- Kunda, D. (2003). STACE: social technical approach to COTS software evaluation. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 2693, 64-84. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-45064-1\_4
- Kunda, D., & Brooks, L. (1999). Applying social-technical approach for COTS selection. *In Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> UKAIS Conference held on 7-9 April 1999 at the University of York* (pp. 552-565). York, UK: McGraw-Hill.
- Kvale, A., Li, J., & Conradi, R. (2005). A case study on building COTS-based system using aspect-oriented programming. *In Proceedings of the 20<sup>th</sup> Annual ACM Symposium on Applied Computing held on 13-17 Mar. 2005 at the New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology, Socorro, NM, Santa Fe* (p. 1491-1498). New Mexico, USA: ACM.

- Land, R., & Blankers, L. (2007). *Classifying and Consolidating Software Component Selection Methods*. (Report-MRTC-218/2007-1-SE), Mälardalen Real-Time Research Centre, Mälardalen University, Sweden. Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:mdh:diva-7091>
- Land, R., Blankers, L., Chaudron, M., & Crnković, I. (2008). COTS Selection Best Practices in Literature and in Industry. In H. Mei (Ed.), *High Confidence Software Reuse in Large Systems* (Vol. 5030, pp. 100-111). Parma, Italy: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Land, R., Sundmark, D., Lüders, F., Krasteva, I., & Causevic, A. (2009). Reuse with Software Components - A Survey of Industrial State of Practice. In S. Edwards & G. Kulczycki (Eds.), *Formal Foundations of Reuse and Domain Engineering* (Vol. 5791, pp. 150-159). Falls Church, VA, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Lee, Y. W., Strong, D. M., Kahn, B. K., & Wang, R. Y. (2002). AIMQ: a methodology for information quality assessment. *Information & management*, 40(2), 133-146. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206\(02\)00043-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7206(02)00043-5)
- Leontie, E., Bloom, G., Narahari, B., Simha, R., & Zambreno, J. (2009). Hardware containers for software components: A trusted platform for COTS-based systems. In *Proceeding of 12<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Conference on Computational Science and Engineering, 2009 CSE'09 held on 29-31 Aug 2009 at the Vancouver, BC* (Vol. 2, pp. 830-836). Canada: IEEE.
- Lewis, G., & Morris, E. (2004). From System Requirements to COTS Evaluation Criteria. In R. Kazman & D. Port (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2959, pp. 159-168). CA, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Li, J. (2006). *Process improvement and risk management in Off-the-Shelf Component-based development*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Faculty of Information Technology, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Norwegian.
- Li, J., Bjørnson, F. O., Conradi, R., & Kampenes, V. B. (2006). An empirical study of variations in COTS-based software development processes in the Norwegian IT industry. *Empirical Software Engineering*, 11(3), 433-461. doi: 10.1007/s10664-006-9005-5
- Li, J., Conradi, R., Bunse, C., Torchiano, M., Slyngstad, O., & Morisio, M. (2009). Development with off-the-shelf components: 10 facts. *Software, IEEE*, 26(2), 80-87. doi: 10.1109/MS.2009.33
- Li, J., Conradi, R., Slyngstad, O., Bunse, C., Khan, U., Torchiano, M., et al. (2005). An Empirical Study on Off-the-Shelf Component Usage in Industrial Projects. In F. Bomarius & S. Komi-Sirviö (Eds.), *Product Focused Software Process Improvement* (Vol. 3547, pp. 54-68). Oulu, Finland: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Li, J., Kvale, A. A., & Conradi, R. (2006). A case study on improving changeability of COTS-based system using aspect-oriented programming. *Journal of Information Science and Engineering*, 22(2), 375-390. Retrieved from <http://www.idi.ntnu.no/grupper/su/publ/li/aop-sac12-journalversion.pdf>
- Lichota, R. W., Vesprini, R. L., & Swanson, B. (1997). PRISM Product Examination Process for component based development. In *Proceedings of 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium Assessment of Software Tools and Technologies held on 2-5 Jun 1997 at the Pittsburgh, PA* (pp. 61-69). USA: IEEE.

- Lin, H., Lai, A., Ullrich, R., Kuca, M., McClelland, K., Shaffer-Gant, J., et al. (2007). COTS Software Selection Process. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6<sup>th</sup> International IEEE Conference on Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS)-Based Software Systems held on 26 Feb -2 Mar. 2007 at the Banff, AB* (pp. 114-122). Canada: IEEE.
- Lin, H.-Y., Hsu, P.-Y., & Sheen, G.-J. (2007). A fuzzy-based decision-making procedure for data warehouse system selection. *Expert systems with applications*, 32(3), 939-953. doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2006.01.031
- Lincke, R., & Lowe, W. (2007, April). *Compendium of software quality standards and metrics—Version 1.0*. Retrieved on 9 August. 2010 from <http://www.arisa.se/compendium/quality-metrics-compendium.pdf>
- Liu, Y. N. (2010). A Case Study of Evaluating Supplier's Selection Criteria in a Steel Bars Manufacturer. *In Proceeding of IEEE International Conference in Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management, IEEM held on 7-10 Dec 2010 at the Venetian Macao-Resort-Hotel, Macao* (pp. 994-998). China: IEEE.
- Lloyd, W. J. (2005). A Common Criteria based approach for COTS component selection. *Journal of Object Technology*, 4(3), 27-34. Retrieved from [http://pdf.aminer.org/000/284/530/filtering\\_cots\\_components\\_through\\_an\\_improvement\\_based\\_process.pdf](http://pdf.aminer.org/000/284/530/filtering_cots_components_through_an_improvement_based_process.pdf)
- Lopez, M. (2000). *An evaluation theory perspective of the Architecture Tradeoff Analysis Method (ATAM)*. (Rep. No. CMU/SEI-2000-TR-012). Carnegie-Mellon University Pittsburgh Pa Software Engineering Inst., USA. Retrieved from DTIC. (ADA387265).
- Lopez, M. (2003). Application of an evaluation framework for analyzing the architecture tradeoff analysis method SM. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 68(3), 233-241. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212\(03\)00065-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0164-1212(03)00065-7)
- Lozano-Tello, A., & Gómez-Pérez, A. (2002). BAREMO: how to choose the appropriate software component using the analytic hierarchy process. *In Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> international conference on Software engineering and knowledge engineering held on July 2002 at the Ischia* (pp. 781-788). Italy: ACM.
- Maiden, N., & Ncube, C. (1998). Acquiring COTS software selection requirements. *IEEE software*, 15(2), 46-56. doi: 10.1109/52.663784
- Marianos, N. S., Lambrou, M. A., & Spyrou, D. (2011). Evaluating electronic port services for container terminals: the PPA case. *International Journal of Decision Sciences, Risk and Management*, 3(3), 347-368. doi: 10.1504/IJDSRM.2011.046152
- Martínez, C. (2008). *Systematic construction of goal-oriented COTS taxonomies*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Faculty of Information Technology, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Spain.
- Maxville, V., Armarego, J., & Lam, C. P. (2004). Intelligent component selection. *In Proceedings of the 28<sup>th</sup> Annual International in Proceeding of the Computer Software and Applications Conference 2004 (COMPSAC) held on 28-30 Sept. 2004 at the Hong Kong* (pp. 244-249). China: IEEE.
- Megas, K., Belli, G., Frakes, W. B., Urbano, J., & Anguswamy, R. (2013). A Study of COTS Integration Projects: Product Characteristics, Organization, and Life Cycle Models. *In*

*Proceeding of the 28<sup>th</sup> ACM SIGAPP Symposium on Applied Computing held on 18-22 Mar 2013 at the Institute of Engineering of the Polytechnic Institute of Coimbra (ISEC-IPC)* (pp. 1028-1033). Portugal: ACM.

- Mendoza, G. A., Anderson, A. B., & Gertner, G. Z. (2002). Integrating multi-criteria analysis and GIS for land condition assessment: Part 2—Allocation of military training areas. *Journal of Geographic Information and Decision Analysis*, 6(1), 17-30. Retrieved from [www.psu.edu](http://www.psu.edu)
- Merola, L. (2006). The COTS software obsolescence threat. In *Proceeding of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference in Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS)-Based Software Systems held on 13-16 Feb. 2006 at the San Diego, CA* (pp. 7-13). USA: IEEE.
- Mili, A., Chmiel, S. F., Gottumukkala, R., & Zhang, L. (2000). An integrated cost model for software reuse. In *Software Engineering, 2000. In Proceedings of the 2000 International Conference held on 4-11 June 2000 at the Limerick* (pp. 157-166). Limerick, Ireland: IEEE.
- Minkiewicz, A. (2005). Six steps to a successful cots implementation. *Crosstalk Journal of Defense Software Engineering*, 18, 17-22. Retrieved on 23 Jan. 2010 from [www.stsc.hill.af.mil](http://www.stsc.hill.af.mil)
- Mohamed, A. S. A. S. (2007). *Decision support for selecting COTS software products based on comprehensive mismatch handling*, Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of Calgary, Alberta.
- Mohamed, A., Ruhe, G., & Eberlein, A. (2007). COTS selection: Past, present, and future. In *Proceeding of the 14<sup>th</sup> Annual IEEE International Conference and Workshops on the Engineering of Computer-Based Systems (ECBS'07) held on 26 – 29 Mar 2007 at the Tucson, Arizona* (pp. 103-114).USA: IEEE Computer Society.
- Mohamed, A., Ruhe, G., & Eberlein, A. (2008). Optimized mismatch resolution for COTS selection. *Software Process Improvement and Practice*, 13(2), 157-169. doi: 10.1002/spip.374.
- Mohamed, A., Ruhe, G., & Eberlein, A. (2011). Mismatch handling for COTS selection: a case study. *Journal of Software Maintenance and Evolution: Research and Practice*, 23(3), 145-178. doi: 10.1002/smr.493
- Montecillo, M. (2009). *Website Vulnerability Assessment*, (Rep. No. Q4-2009). Enterprise Management Associates (EMA), USA. Retrieved from <http://www.enterprisemanagement.com/research/asset-free.php/1617/toc/EMA-Radar-on-Website-Vulnerability-Assessment-Q4-2009-toc>
- Moody, D. L. (2005). Theoretical and practical issues in evaluating the quality of conceptual models: current state and future directions. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 55(3), 243-276. doi: 10.1016/j.datak.2004.12.005
- Moody, D. L., Sindre, G., Brasethvik, T., & Sølvsberg, A. (2003). Evaluating the quality of information models: empirical testing of a conceptual model quality framework. In *Proceedings of the 25<sup>th</sup> International Conference of Software Engineering held on 3 – 10 May 2003 at the Oregon State University, Portland, Oregon* (pp. 295-305). USA: IEEE Computer Society.

- Morisio, M., & Torchiano, M. (2002). Definition and Classification of COTS: A Proposal. In J. Dean & A. Gravel (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2255, pp. 165-175). FL, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg
- Morisio, M., & Tsoukias, A. (1997). IusWare: a methodology for the evaluation and selection of software products. *IEE Proceedings in Software Engineering*. 144(3), 162-174. doi: 10.1049/ip-sen:19971350
- Morisio, M., Seaman, C., Basili, V., Parra, A., Kraft, S., & Condon, S. (2002). COTS-based software development: Processes and open issues. *Journal of Systems and Software*, 61(3), 189-199. doi: 10.1016/S0164-1212(01)00147-9
- Morris, A. T. (2000). COTS Score: an acceptance methodology for COTS software. In *Proceedings of the 19<sup>th</sup> Digital Avionics Systems Conference DASC hold on 7-13 Oct.2000 at the Philadelphia, PA* (Vol. 1, pp. 4B2/1-4B2/8). USA: IEEE.
- Morse, K. L. (2004). Data and metadata requirements for composable mission space environments. In *Proceedings of the 36<sup>th</sup> Conference on Winter Simulation (WSC '04) held on 5-8 December 2004 at the Washington, D.C* (pp. 271-278). USA: ACM.
- Mujeeb-u-Rehman, M., Yang, X., Dong, J., & Abdul Ghafoor, M. (2005). Prioritized selecting COTS vendor in cots-based software development process. In *Proceeding of the Canadian Conference in Electrical and Computer Engineering held on 1-4 May 2005 at the Saskatoon, Sask* (pp. 1939-1945). Canada: IEEE.
- Nachmias, F., & Nachmias, D. (1996). *Research methods in the social sciences* (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). London, UK: Aenold a member of the Hodder Headline Group.
- Navarrete, F., Botella, P., & Franch, X. (2007). Reconciling agility and discipline in COTS selection processes. In *Proceeding of the 6<sup>th</sup> International IEEE Conference in Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS)-Based Software Systems (ICCBSS'07) held on 26Febr – 2 Mar 2007 at the Banff, Alta.* (pp. 103-113). Alberta, Canada: IEEE.
- Ncube, C., & Dean, J. (2002). The Limitations of Current Decision-Making Techniques in the Procurement of COTS Software Components. In J. Dean & A. Gravel (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2255, pp. 176-187). Orlando, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Ncube, C., & Maiden, N. A. (1999). PORE: Procurement-oriented requirements engineering method for the component-based systems engineering development paradigm. In *Proceeding of the 2<sup>th</sup> International Workshop of Component-Based Software Engineering held on 17-18 May 1999 at the Los Angeles, CA* (pp. 130-140). USA: CiteSeerX.
- Neubauer, T., & Stummer, C. (2007). Interactive decision support for multi-objective COTS selection. In *Proceeding of the 40<sup>th</sup> Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences (HICSS 2007) held on 3-6 January 2007 at Waikoloa, HI* (pp. 283b-283b). Hawaii, US: IEEE.
- Ngai, E., & Chan, E. (2005). Evaluation of knowledge management tools using AHP. *Expert systems with applications*, 29(4), 889-899. doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2005.06.025
- Nguyen, D. K., van den Heuvel, W. J., Papazoglou, M. P., de Castro, V., & Marcos, E. (2009). Gap analysis methodology for business service engineering. In *Proceeding of*

*the IEEE Conference in Commerce and Enterprise Computing (CEC'09) held on 20-23 July 2009 at the Vienna* (pp. 215-220). Austria: IEEE.

- Obeidat, M. A. (2011). Evaluation of Information Technology Vendor Services: An Empirical Study. *International Management Review*, 7(1), 82-88. Retrieved from <http://www.usimr.org/IMR-1-2011/v7n111-art10.pdf>
- Ochs, M., Pfahl, D., Chrobok-Diening, G., & Nothhelfer-Kolb, B. (2001). A method for efficient measurement-based COTS assessment and selection method description and evaluation results. In *Proceedings of the 7<sup>th</sup> International Software Metrics Symposium (METRICS) held on 04-06 Apr 2001 at the London* (pp. 285-296). UK: IEEE.
- Ortega, M., Pérez, M., & Rojas, T. (2003). Construction of a Systemic Quality Model for Evaluating a Software Product. *Software Quality Journal*, 11(3), 219-242. doi: 10.1023/a:1025166710988.
- Pallant, J. (2007). *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows Version 15* (3<sup>th</sup> Edition). UK: Open University Press.
- Pande, J. (2012). On Some Critical Issues in Component Selection in Component based Software Development. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 46(4), 44-50. doi: 10.5120/6899-9255.
- Pande, J., Garcia, C. J., & Pant, D. (2013). Optimal component selection for component based software development using pliability metric. *ACM SIGSOFT Software Engineering Notes*, 38(1), 1-6. doi: 10.1145/2413038.2413044
- Patricia, K., Kathryn, E., & Deborah, A. (2001). A Formal Process for Evaluating COTS Software Products. *IEEE Computer Society*, 34(5), 55-60. Retrieved from <http://www.it.iitb.ac>.
- Pavlovski, C. J., & Zou, J. (2008). Non-functional requirements in business process modeling. In *Proceedings of the 5<sup>th</sup> Asia-Pacific Conference on Conceptual Modelling (APCCM 2008) held on 22-25 January 2008 at the Wollongong, New South Wales*. (Vol. 79, pp. 103-112). Australia: ACM.
- Philips, B. C., & Polen, S. M. (2002). Add Decision Analysis to Your COTS Selection Process. *The Journal of Defense Software Engineering, Software Technology Support Center Crosstalk*, 21-25. Retrieved on 4 April 2011 from <http://www.crosstalkonline.org/storage/issue-archives/2002/200204/200204-Phillips.pdf>
- Pogarcic, I., Francic, M., & Davidovic, V. (2008, October). *Application of AHP Method in Traffic Planning*. Paper presented at the 16th International Symposium on Electronics in Traffic (ISEP 2008) - A Condition for Sustainable Development and Prosperity of A Modern and Safe Transport, Ljubljana Exhibition and Convention Centre, Ljubljana, Slovenia.
- Postina, M., Sechyn, I., & Steffens, U. (2009). Gap analysis of application landscapes. In *Proceeding of the 13<sup>th</sup> Conference in Enterprise Distributed Object Computing Conference Workshops (EDOCW 2009) held on 1-4 Sept. 2009 at the Auckland* (pp. 274-281). Auckland: IEEE.



- Rauscher, H. M., Lloyd, F. T., Loftis, D. L., & Twery, M. J. (2000). A practical decision-analysis process for forest ecosystem management. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 27(1), 195-226. doi: 10.1016/S0168-1699(00)00108-3
- Rawashdeh, A., & Matakah, B. (2006). A new software quality model for evaluating COTS components. *Journal of Computer Science*, 2(4), 373-381. retrieved from <http://docsdrive.com/pdfs/sciencepublications/jcssp/2006/373-381.pdf>
- Rogers, M. R., & Lopez, E. C. (2002). Identifying Critical Cross-Cultural School Psychology Competencies. *Journal of school psychology*, 40(2), 115-141. doi:10.1016/S0022-4405(02)00093-6
- Roscoe, J. T. (1975). *Fundamental research statistics for the behavioral sciences*, New York, USA: Holt.
- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15(4), 353-375. doi:10.1016/S0169-2070(99)00018-7
- Roy, B. (1991). The outranking approach and the foundations of ELECTRE methods. *Theory and Decision*, 31(1), 49-73. doi: 10.1007/BF00134132
- Ruhe, G. (2003). Software Engineering Decision Support – A New Paradigm for Learning Software Organizations. In S. Henninger & F. Maurer (Eds.), *Advances in Learning Software Organizations* (Vol. 2640, pp. 104-113). Chicago, IL, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Ruth, N. (2008). *A Multi criteria decision making support to software selection*. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
- Saaty, T. L. (1980). *The Analytic Hierarchy Process*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.
- Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. *International Journal of Services Sciences*, 1(1), 83-98. doi: 10.1504/IJSSci.2008.01759
- Sankaran, K., Kannabiran, G., & Dominic, P. (2011). Determinants of software quality in COTS products: an exploratory study. *International Journal of Business Information Systems*, 8(1), 4-22. doi: 10.1504/IJBIS.2011.041084
- Sargent, R. G. (2012). Verification and validation of simulation models. *Journal of Simulation*, 7(1), 12-24. doi: 10.1057/jos.2012.20
- Sarkar, S. (2012). Architecture Centric Tradeoff-A Decision Support Method for COTS Selection and Life Cycle Management. In *Proceeding of the Seventh International Conference on Software Engineering Advances (ICSEA 2012) held on 18-23 November 2012 at the Lisbon* (pp. 122-128), Lisbon, Portugal: ThinkMind.
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. and Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research methods for business students* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). London, UK: Prentice Hall.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sedigh-Ali, S., Ghafoor, A., & Paul, R. A. (2002). Metrics-based framework for decision making in COTS-based software systems. In *Proceeding of the 7<sup>th</sup> IEEE International*

*Symposium in High Assurance Systems Engineering (HASE 2002) held on 23-25 Oct 2002 at the Tokyo* (pp. 243-244). Japan: IEEE.

- Seffah, A., Donyaee, M., Kline, R., & Padda, H. (2006). Usability measurement and metrics: A consolidated model. *Software Quality Journal*, 14(2), 159-178. doi: 10.1007/s11219-006-7600-8
- Sekaran, U. & Bougie, R. (2010). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach* (5<sup>th</sup> edition). Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research methods for business* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sen, C. G., & Baraclı, H. (2006, May). *A brief literature review of enterprise software evaluation and selection methodologies: A comparison in the context of decision-making methods*. Paper presented at the 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Intelligent Manufacturing, Department of Industrial Engineering, Sakarya University, Sakarya, Turkey.
- Sharifi, M., Van Den Toorn, W., Rico, A., & Emmanuel, M. (2003). Application of GIS and multi-criteria evaluation in locating sustainable boundary between the Tunari National Park and Cochabamba City (Bolivia). *Journal of Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis*, 11(3), 151-164. doi: 10.1002/mcda.323
- Sharma, A., Kumar, R., & Grover, P. (2007). Managing Component-Based Systems with Reusable Components. *International Journal of Computer Science and Security*, 1(2), 60. Retrieved from <http://www.cscjournals.org/csc/manuscript/Journals/IJCSS/Volume1/Issue2/IJCSS-16.pdf>
- Sharma, A., Kumar, R., & Grover, P. S. (2008). Estimation of quality for software components: an empirical approach. *SIGSOFT Software. Eng. Notes*, 33(6), 1-10. doi: 10.1145/1449603.1449613
- Sheng, J., & Wang, B. (2008). Evaluating COTS Components Using Gap Analysis. In *Proceeding of the 9<sup>th</sup> International Conference for Young Computer Scientists (ICYCS 2008) held on 18-21 Nov. 2008 at the Hunan* (pp. 1248-1253). Hunan, China: IEEE.
- Simão, R. S., & Belchior, A. (2003). Quality Characteristics for Software Components: Hierarchy and Quality Guides. In A. Cechich, M. Piattini & A. Vallecillo (Eds.), *Component-Based Software Quality* (Vol. 2693, pp. 184-206). Brazil: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Singh, M., Khan, I., & Grover, S. (2011). Application of AHP in Measuring and Comparing Quality of Manufacturing Industries. *International Journal Of Multidisciplinary Sciences And Engineering*, 2(3), 6-13. Retrieved from <http://www.ijmse.org/Volume2/Issue3/paper2.pdf>
- Skramstad, T. (2005, Sept). *Assessment of safety critical systems with COTS software and software of uncertain pedigree (SOUP)*. Paper presented at the ERCIM Workshop on Dependable Systems, ERCIM Conference on Dependable Software intensive embedded Systems, Italy.

- Solberg H. and Dahl K. M.,( 2001). *COTS Software Evaluation and Integration Issues*. (Rep. No.SIF8094), Norwegian University of Technology and Science, Software Engineering Project, Trondheim, Norway. Retrieved from [www.idi.ntnu.no](http://www.idi.ntnu.no)
- Sommerville, I. (2001). *Software Engineering* (6<sup>th</sup> edition). UK: Addison- Wesley.
- Sommerville, I. (2004). *Software Engineering* (7<sup>th</sup> Edition). UK: Pearson Education.
- Sommerville, I. (2011). *Software Engineering* (9<sup>th</sup> Edition). UK: Addison-Wesley.
- Soni, G., & Kodali, R. (2010). A multi-criteria decision model for the selection of supply chain management software. *International Journal of Services and Operations Management*, 7(4), 501-533. doi: 10.1504/IJSOM.2010.03571
- Sun, C.-C. (2010). A performance evaluation model by integrating fuzzy AHP and fuzzy TOPSIS methods. *Expert systems with applications*, 37(12), 7745-7754. doi: 10.1016/j.eswa.2010.04.066.
- Tam, F. (2012). *Definitions, Concepts, and Principles*. Service Availability, 1-21. Retrieved on 17 August 2009 from [http://content.schweitzer-online.de/static/content/catalog/newbooks/978/111/995/9781119954088/9781119954088\\_Excerpt\\_001.pdf](http://content.schweitzer-online.de/static/content/catalog/newbooks/978/111/995/9781119954088/9781119954088_Excerpt_001.pdf)
- Tektas, A., & Aytakin, A. (2011). Supplier selection in the international environment: a comparative case of a Turkish and an Australian company. *IBIMA Business Review*, 2011(1), 1-14. doi: 10.5171/2011.598845
- Thacker, B. H., Anderson, M. C., Senseny, P. E., & Rodriguez, E. A. (2006). The role of nondeterminism in model verification and validation. *International Journal of Materials and Product Technology*, 25(1), 144-163. Retrieved from <http://inderscience.metapress.com/content/eex43vkgr5ylu0j5/>
- Thapar, S., Singh, P., & Rani, S. (2012). Challenges to the Development of Standard Software Quality Model. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, 49(10), 1-7. doi: 10.5120/7660-0765
- Torchiano, M. (2001). *Selected Literature on COTS products*. USA: NASA Electronic Parts and Packaging (NEPP). Retrieved on 25 March 2009 from <http://nepp.nasa.gov/DocUploads/6ABAC4DFB96C430185E6C00ECD6399B2/Selected%20Literature%20on%20COTS%20products.pdf>
- Torchiano, M., & Morisio, M. (2004). Overlooked aspects of COTS-based development. *IEEE software*, 21(2), 88-93. doi: 10.1109/MS.2004.1270770
- Torchiano, M., Jaccheri, L., Sørensen, C. F., & Wang, A. I. (2002). COTS products characterization. In *Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Software Engineering and Knowledge Engineering (SEKE 2002) held on 15-19 July 2002 at the Ischia* (pp. 335-338). Italy: ACM.
- Tran, V., Liu, D. B., & Hummel, B. (1997). Component-based systems development: challenges and lessons learned. In *Proceedings of 8<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Workshop of Software Technology and Engineering Practice held on 14-18 Jul 1997 at the incorporating Computer Aided Software Engineering* (pp. 452-462). London, UK: IEEE.

- Trochim, W. M. (2006). *Qualitative measures. Research Measures Knowledge Base*, (pp.361-9433). Retrieved on 13 May 2010 from <http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/qualval.php>.
- Tsai, W.-H., Chou, W.-C., & Lai, C.-W. (2010). An effective evaluation model and improvement analysis for national park websites: A case study of Taiwan. *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 936-952. doi: 10.1016/j.tourman.2010.01.016
- Turksoy, H., Uysal, M., Cetinkaya, O., Malas, A., Akcaoglu, I., & Okur, Y. (2012). Building a layered enterprise architecture using COTS products for NATO air command & control information services. *In Proceeding of the Communications and Information Systems Conference (MCC) held on 8-9 Oct. 2012 at the Gdansk* (pp. 1-6). Gdansk, Poland: IEEE.
- Ünal, C., & Güner, M. G. (2009). Selection of ERP suppliers using AHP tools in the clothing industry. *International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology*, 21(4), 239-251. doi: 10.1108/09556220910959990
- Ulkuniemi, P., & Seppanen, V. (2004). COTS component acquisition in an emerging market. *IEEE software*, 21(6), 76-82. doi: 10.1109/MS.2004.38.
- Vaidya, O. S., & Kumar, S. (2006). Analytic hierarchy process: An overview of applications. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 169(1), 1-29. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2004.04.028>
- Vega, J. P. C. (2006, February). Supporting organizational induction and goals alignment for COTS components selection by means of i\*. *In Proceeding of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference in Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS)-Based Software Systems held on 13-16 Feb. 2006 at the Orlando* (pp. 8-pp).Florida, USA: IEEE.
- Vijayalakshmi, K., Ramaraj, N., & Amuthakkannan, R. (2008). Improvement of component selection process using genetic algorithm for component-based software development. *International Journal of Information Systems and Change Management*, 3(1), 63-80. doi: 10.1504/IJISCM.2008.019289
- Vitharana, P., Zahedi, F., & Jain, H. (2003). Knowledge-based repository scheme for storing and retrieving business components: a theoretical design and an empirical analysis. *IEEE transactions on Software Engineering*, 29(5), 649-664. doi: 10.1109/TSE.2003.1214328
- Wallnau, K. C., Hissam, S., & Seacord, R. C. (2002). *Building systems from commercial components*. USA: Addison-Wesley.
- Wallnau, K., Carney, D., & Pollak, B. (1998). How COTS software affects the design of COTS-intensive systems. *SEI interactive*, 6, 98. Retrieved from <http://interactive.sei.cmu.edu/Features/1998/june/cotssoftware/CotsSoftware.htm>
- Wanyama, T., & Far, B. (2005). A Multi-Agent Framework for Conflict Analysis and Negotiation: Case of COTS Selection. *IEICE transactions on information and systems*, 88(9), 2047-2058. Retrieved from [http://search.ieice.org/bin/summary.php?id=e88-d\\_9\\_2047](http://search.ieice.org/bin/summary.php?id=e88-d_9_2047)
- Wanyama, T., & Far, B. (2008). An Empirical Study to Compare Three Methods for Selecting Cots Software Components. *International Journal of Computing and ICT Research*, 2, 34-46. Retrieved 25 July 2009 from

[www.siaa.net/software/pubs/growth\\_software03.pdf](http://www.siaa.net/software/pubs/growth_software03.pdf)

- Wanyama, T., & Lumala, A. F. N. (2007). Decision Support for the Selection of COTS. *International Journal of Computing and ICT Research*, 1(2), 33-43. Retrieved from <http://www.ijcir.org/volume1-number/article4.pdf>.
- Wei, C.-C., Chien, C.-F., & Wang, M.-J. J. (2005). An AHP-based approach to ERP system selection. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 96(1), 47-62. doi: 10.1016/j.ijpe.2004.03.004
- Wile, D., Balzer, R., Goldman, N., Tallis, M., Egyed, A., & Hollebeek, T. (2010). Adapting COTS products. In *Proceeding of the Software Maintenance (ICSM) in IEEE International Conference held on 12-18 Sept. 2010 at the Timisoara* (pp. 1-9). Romania: IEEE.
- Yahaya, J. (2006). *The development of software certification model based on product quality approach*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Faculty of Information Science and Technology, University of Kebangsaan Malaysia. Malaysia.
- Yanes, N., Sassi, S. B., & Ghezala, H. H. B. (2012, Apr). *A Theoretical and Empirical Evaluation of Software Component Search Engines, Semantic Search Engines and Google Search Engine in the Context of COTS-Based Development*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.2079, Cornell University Library, NY,USA. Retrieved on 7 Oct. 2012 from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.2079>
- Yang, L., Dang, Z., & Fischer, T. R. (2011). Information gain of black-box testing. *Formal aspects of computing*, 23(4), 513-539. doi: 10.1007/s00165-011-0175-6
- Yang, Y., Bhuta, J., Boehm, B., & Port, D. (2005). Value-based processes for COTS-based applications. *IEEE software*, 22(4), 54-62. doi: 10.1109/MS.2005.112
- Ye, F., & Kelly, T. (2004). COTS Product Selection for Safety-Critical Systems. In R. Kazman & D. Port (Eds.), *COTS-Based Software Systems* (Vol. 2959, pp. 53-62). CA, USA: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Yin, R. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). London, UK: Sage.
- Yu, E. (1997). Towards modeling and reasoning support for early-phase requirements engineering. RE '97: Proceedings of the 3<sup>th</sup> IEEE International Symposium on Requirements Engineering, page 226.
- Zarour, M. (2009). *Methods to evaluate lightweight software process assessment methods based on evaluation theory and engineering design principles*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Computer Science Department, Du Quebec University, Canada.