



ICEIS 2008

***TENTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
ENTERPRISE INFORMATION SYSTEMS***

Proceedings

Information Systems Analysis and Specification - VOL 2

BARCELONA, SPAIN – June 12-16, 2008

ORGANIZED BY



CO-SPONSORED BY



IN COOPERATION WITH



ICEIS 2008

Proceedings of the
Tenth International Conference on
Enterprise Information Systems

Volume ISAS-2

Barcelona, Spain

June 12 – 16, 2008

Organized by
**INSTICC – Institute for Systems and Technologies of Information, Control
and Communication**

Co-sponsored by
WfMC – Workflow Management Coalition

In Cooperation with
AAAI – Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence

Copyright © 2008 INSTICC – Institute for Systems and Technologies of
Information, Control and Communication
All rights reserved

Edited by José Cordeiro and Joaquim Filipe

Printed in Portugal

ISBN: 978-989-8111-38-8

Depósito Legal: 275673/08

<http://www.iceis.org>

secretariat@iceis.org

BRIEF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|------|
| INVITED SPEAKERS..... | IV |
| SPECIAL SESSION CHAIRS | V |
| ORGANIZING AND STEERING COMMITTEES | VI |
| SENIOR PROGRAM COMMITTEE..... | VII |
| PROGRAM COMMITTEE | VIII |
| AUXILIARY REVIEWERS | XIII |
| SELECTED PAPERS BOOK | XV |
| FOREWORD..... | XVII |
| CONTENTS..... | XIX |

INVITED SPEAKERS

Moira C. Norrie

ETH Zurich

Switzerland

Ricardo Baeza-Yates

VP of Yahoo! Research for Europe and LatAm

Spain and Chile

Jorge Cardoso

SAP AG

Germany

Jean-Marie Favre

University of Grenoble, LIG

France

SPECIAL SESSION CHAIRS

SPECIAL SESSION ON COMPUTATIONAL INTELLIGENCE USING AFFINITY SET

Yuh-Wen Chen, Dept. of Industrial Engineering and Management of Technology, Da-Yeh University, Taiwan

SPECIAL SESSION ON COMPUTER SUPPORTED ACTIVITY COORDINATION

José Cordeiro, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal / INSTICC, Portugal

Joaquim Filipe, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal / INSTICC, Portugal

ORGANIZING AND STEERING COMMITTEES

CONFERENCE CHAIR

Joaquim Filipe, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal / INSTICC, Portugal

PROGRAM CHAIR

José Cordeiro, Polytechnic Institute of Setúbal / INSTICC, Portugal

PROCEEDINGS PRODUCTION

Paulo Brito, INSTICC, Portugal

Marina Carvalho, INSTICC, Portugal

Helder Coelhas, INSTICC, Portugal

Vera Coelho, INSTICC, Portugal

Andreia Costa, INSTICC, Portugal

Bruno Encarnação, INSTICC, Portugal

Bárbara Lima, INSTICC, Portugal

Vitor Pedrosa, INSTICC, Portugal

Vera Rosário, INSTICC, Portugal

Mónica Saramago, INSTICC, Portugal

CD-ROM PRODUCTION

Paulo Brito, INSTICC, Portugal

WEBDESIGNER

Marina Carvalho, INSTICC, Portugal

GRAPHICS PRODUCTION

Helder Coelhas, INSTICC, Portugal

SECRETARIAT AND WEBMASTER

Vitor Pedrosa, INSTICC, Portugal

SENIOR PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Luís Amaral, University of Minho, Portugal

Senén Barro, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Jean Bézin, ATLAS Group (INRIA & IRIN), University of Nantes, France

Enrique Bonsón, University of Huelva, Spain

João Alvaro Carvalho, University of Minho, Portugal

Albert Cheng, University of Houston, U.S.A.

Bernard Coulette, University of Toulouse 2, France

Jan Dietz, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Virginia Dignum, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Schahram Dustdar, Technical University of Vienna, Austria

António Figueiredo, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Ulrich Frank, ICB - University of Essen, Germany

Nuno Guimarães, University of Lisbon, Portugal

Jatinder Gupta, University of Alabama in Huntsville, U.S.A.

Dimitris Karagiannis, University of Vienna, Austria

Michel Leonard, University of Geneva, Switzerland

Kecheng Liu, University of Reading, U.K.

Pericles Loucopoulos, University of Manchester, U.K.

Andrea De Lucia, Università di Salerno, Italy

Kalle Lyytinen, Case Western Reserve University, U.S.A.

Yannis Manolopoulos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

José Legatheaux Martins, Faculty of Sciences and Technology, New University of Lisbon, Portugal

Masao Johannes Matsumoto, Kyushu Sangyo University, Japan

Luís Moniz Pereira, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

Marcin Paprzycki, Systems Research Institute Polish Academy of Science, Poland

Alain Pirotte, University of Louvain, Belgium

Klaus Pohl, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Matthias Rauterberg, Technical University Eindhoven, The Netherlands

Colette Rolland, University of PARIS-1, France

Narcyz Roztocki, State University of New York (SUNY) at New Paltz, U.S.A.

Abdel-Badeeh Salem, Ain Shams University, Faculty of Computer & Information Sciences, Egypt

Bernardette Sharp, Staffordshire University, U.K.

Timothy K. Shih, Tamkang University, Taiwan

Alexander Smirnov, St. Petersburg Institute for Informatics and Automation of Russian Academy of Sciences - SPIIRAS, Russian Federation

Ronald Stamper, Measur Ltd, U.K.

David Taniar, Monash University, Australia

Miguel Toro, University of Seville, Spain

Antonio Vallecillo, Universidad de Málaga, Spain

Michalis Vazirgiannis, Athens University of Economics & Business, Greece

François Vernadat, European Commission, Luxembourg

Ioannis Vlahavas, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Frank Wang, Cambridge-Cranfield High Performance Computing Facilities, U.K.

Merrill Warkentin, Mississippi State University, U.S.A.

Hans Weigand, Tilburg University, The Netherlands

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Mohd Syazwan Abdullah, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

Rama Akkiraju, IBM Research, U.S.A.

Patrick Albers, ESEO, France

Vasco Amaral, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

Yacine Amirat, University of Paris 12, France

Andreas Andreou, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Plamen Angelov, Lancaster University, U.K.

Pedro Antunes, DI/FCUL, Portugal

Nasreddine Aoumeur, University of Magdeburg, Germany

Gustavo Arroyo-Figueroa, Electrical Research Institute, Mexico

Wudhichai Assawinchaichote, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Thailand

Juan Carlos Augusto, University of Ulster at Jordanstown, U.K.

Ramazan Aygun, University of Alabama in Huntsville, U.S.A.

Bart Baesens, University of Southampton, U.K.

Cecilia Baranauskas, UNICAMP - Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Brazil

Steve Barker, King's College London University, U.K.

Balbir Barn, Thames Valley University, U.K.

Daniela Barreiro Claro, UFBA-LASID-DCC, Brazil

Nick Bassiliades, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Remi Bastide, LIIHS-IRIT, France

Nadia Bellalem, University NANCY 2, France

Orlando Belo, University of Minho, Portugal

Hatem Ben Sta, Tunisia University, Tunisia

Sadok Ben Yahia, Faculty of Sciences of Tunis, Tunisia

Manuel F. Bertoa, University of Malaga, Spain

Peter Bertok, RMIT University, Australia

Robert Biddle, Carleton University, Canada

Oliver Bittel, HTWG Konstanz - University of Applied Sciences, Germany

Luis Borges Gouveia, University Fernando Pessoa, Portugal

Djamel Bouchaffra, Oakland University, Michigan, U.S.A.

Danielle Boulanger, University of Lyon, France

Jean-louis Boulanger, University of Technologie of Compiègne, labo HEUDIASYC UMR 6599, France

José Ângelo Braga de Vasconcelos, Universidade Fernando Pessoa, Portugal

Sjaak Brinkkemper, Utrecht University, The Netherlands

Miguel Calejo, Declarativa, Portugal

Coral Calero, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Luis M. Camarinha-Matos, New University of Lisbon / Uninova, Portugal

Olivier Camp, Ecole Supérieure d'Electronique de l'Ouest, France

Roy Campbell, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.

Gerardo Canfora, University of Sannio, Italy

Fernando Carvalho, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Brazil

Nunzio Casalino, LUISS Guido Carli University, Italy

Jose Jesus Castro-Schez, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Luca Cernuzzi, Universidad Católica, Paraguay

Maria Filomena Cerqueira de Castro Lopes, Universidade Portucalense Infante D. Henrique, Portugal

Laurent Chapelier, Fortis Banque Luxembourg, France

Cindy Chen, University of Massachusetts Lowell, U.S.A.

Jinjun Chen, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia

Abdelghani Chibani, CityPassenger, France

Henning Christiansen, Roskilde University, Denmark

Chrisment Claude, IRIT/SIG, France

Francesco Colace, Università degli Studi di Salerno, Italy

PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CONT.)

Cesar Collazos, Universidad del Cauca - FIET -
Depto Sistemas, Colombia

Jose Eduardo Corcoles, LoUISE Research Group
Castilla-La Mancha University, Spain

Antonio Corral, University of Almeria, Spain

Ulises Cortes, Technical University of Catalonia,
Spain

Sharon Cox, University of Central England, U.K.

Alfredo Cuzzocrea, University of Calabria, Italy

Mohamed Dahchour, National Institute of Posts and
Telecommunications, Morocco

Sergio de Cesare, Brunel University, U.K.

Nuno de Magalhães Ribeiro, Centro de Estudos e
Recursos Multimidiáticos (CEREM), UFP, Portugal

José-Neuman de Souza, Federal University of Ceará,
Brazil

Suash Deb, National Institute of Science &
Technology, India

Vincenzo Deufemia, Università di Salerno, Italy

Rajiv Dharaskar, Nagpur University, MIET, CSI,
India

Kamil Dimililer, Near East University, Cyprus

Gillian Dobbie, University of Auckland, New Zealand

José Javier Dolado, University of the Basque
Country, Spain

Anonio Dourado, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Juan C. Dueñas, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid,
Spain

Alan Eardley, Staffordshire University, U.K.

Hans-Dieter Ehrich, TU Braunschweig, Germany

Jean-Max Estay, Université Catholique de l'Ouest,
France

Yaniv Eytani, University of Illinois at
Urbana-Champaign, U.S.A.

Antonio Fariña, University of A Coruña, Spain

Antonio Fernández-Caballero, Universidad de
Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Edilson Ferneda, Universidade Católica de Brasília,
Brazil

Paulo Ferreira, INESC-ID/IST - Technical University
of Lisbon, Portugal

Filomena Ferrucci, Dipartimento di Matematica e
Informatica, University of Salerno, Italy

Juan J. Flores, Universidad Michoacana, Mexico

Donal Flynn, University of Manchester, U.K.

Ana Fred, IT- IST - Technical University of Lisbon,
Portugal

Lixin Fu, University of Carolina, Greensboro, U.S.A.

Mariagrazia Fugini, Politecnico di Milano, Italy

Jose A. Gallud, University of Castilla-La Mancha,
Spain

Juan Garbajosa, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid -
Technical University of Madrid, Spain

Leonardo Garrido, Monterrey Institute of
Technology, Mexico

Peter Geczy, AIST, Japan

Marcela Genero, University of Castilla-La Mancha,
Spain

Joseph Giampapa, Carnegie Mellon University,
U.S.A.

Paolo Giorgini, University of Trento, Italy

Raúl Giráldez, School of Engineering, Pablo de
Olavide University of Seville, Spain

Pascual González, Universidad de Castilla-La
Mancha, Spain

Gustavo Gonzalez-Sanchez, University of Girona,
Spain

Robert Goodwin, Flinders University of South
Australia, Australia

Jaap Gordijn, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam,
The Netherlands

Silvia Gordillo, LIFIA-UNLP, Argentina

Feliz Gouveia, University Fernando Pessoa / CEREM,
Portugal

Virginie Govaere, INRS, France

Maki Habib, Saga University, Japan

Sven Groppe, University of Lübeck, Institute of
Information Systems, Germany

Sissel Guttormsen Schär, University of Bern,
Switzerland

Sung Ho Ha, Kyungpook National University, Korea

Lamia Hadrich Belguith, MIRACL Laboratory,
FSEGS, University of Sfax, Tunisia

PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CONT.)

Beda Christoph Hammerschmidt, Oracle USA Corporation, U.S.A.

Abdelwahab Hamou-Lhadj, Concordia University, Canada

Thorsten Hampel, University of Paderborn, Germany

Sven Hartmann, Massey University, New Zealand

Christian Heinlein, University of Ulm, Germany

Ajantha Herath, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, U.S.A.

Suvineetha Herath, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, U.S.A.

Francisco Herrera, University of Granada, Spain

Colin Higgins, University of Nottingham, U.K.

Peter Higgins, Swinburne University of Technology, Australia

Wladyslaw Homenda, Warsaw University of Technology, Poland

Jun Hong, Queen's University Belfast, U.K.

Wei-Chiang Hong, Oriental Institute of Technology, Taiwan

Nguyen Hong Quang, IFI, Viet Nam

Jiankun Hu, RMIT University, Australia

Kaiyin Huang, South China Normal University, China

Joshua Ignatius, Intelligent Insights International, Malaysia

François Jacquenet, University of Saint-Etienne, France

Hamid Jahankhani, University of East London, U.K.

Arturo Jaime, Universidad del Pais Vasco, Spain

Ivan Jelinek, Czech Technical University in Prague, Czech Republic

Luis Jiménez Linares, UCLM, Spain

Paul Johannesson, Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

Shuigeng Zhou, Fudan University, China

Michail Kalogiannakis, University Paris 5 - René Descartes, France

Nikos Karacapilidis, University of Patras, Greece

Nikitas Karanikolas, Technological Educational Institute of Athens (TEI-A), Greece

Stamatis Karnouskos, SAP Research, Germany

Hiroyuki Kawano, Nanzan University, Japan

Nicolas Kemper Valverde, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico

Seungjoo Kim, Sungkyunkwan University, Korea

Alexander Knapp, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany

John Krogstie, IDI, NTNU and SINTEF, Norway

Stan Kurkovsky, Central Connecticut State University, U.S.A.

Rob Kusters, Eindhoven University of Technology / Open University, The Netherlands

Joaquín Lasheras, University of Murcia, Spain

James P. Lawler, Pace University, U.S.A.

Chul-Hwan Lee, University of Pittsburgh, U.S.A.

Jintae Lee, Leeds School of Business at University of Colorado, Boulder, U.S.A.

Alain Leger, France Telecom R&D - Orange Labs, France

Kauko Leiviskä, University of Oulu, Finland

Carlos León de Mora, University of Sevilla, Spain

Joerg Leukel, University of Hohenheim, Germany

Hareton Leung, Hong Kong Polytechnic University, China

Xue Li, The University of Queensland, Australia

Therese Libourel, LIRMM, France

John Lim, National University of Singapore, Singapore

ZongKai Lin, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China

Matti Linna, University of Vaasa, Finland

Rune Gustavsson, Blekinge Institute of Technology, Sweden

Panos Iinos, Butler University, U.S.A.

Honghai Liu, University of Portsmouth, U.K.

Jan Ljungberg, Gothenburg University, Sweden
Stephane Loiseau, LERIA, France

João Correia Lopes, University of Porto, Portugal

Víctor López-Jaquero, LoUISE Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

María Dolores Lozano, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CONT.)

Miguel R. Luaces, Universidade da Coruña, Spain

Christopher Lueg, University of Tasmania, Australia

Mark Lycett, Brunel University, U.K.

Edmundo Madeira, UNICAMP - University of Campinas, Brazil

Laurent Magnin, University of Montreal, Canada

S. Kami Makki, University of Toledo, U.S.A.

Mirko Malekovic, FOI - Zagreb University, Croatia

Nuno Mamede, IST / L2F of INESC-ID Lisboa, Portugal

João Bosco Mangueira Sobral, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina - UFSC, Brazil

Pierre Maret, LIRIS INSA-LYON, France

Farhi Marir, London Metropolitan University, U.K.

Maria João Marques Martins, IST - Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal

Herve Martin, Grenoble University - LIG, France

Miguel Angel Martinez, Univerdad de Murcia, Spain

David Martins de Matos, L2F / INESC ID Lisboa / Instituto Superior Técnico / Tech. University of Lisbon, Portugal

Katsuhisa Maruyama, Ritsumeikan University, Japan

Hamid Mcheick, University of Quebec at Chicoutimi, Canada

Andreas Meier, University of Fribourg, Switzerland

Engelbert Mephu Nguifo, Université d'Artois - IUT de Lens, CRIL-CNRS, France

John Miller, University of Georgia, U.S.A.

Subhas Misra, State University of New York, Buffalo, U.S.A.

Sudip Misra, Yale University, U.S.A.

Michele Missikoff, IASI-CNR, Italy

Ghodrat Moghadampour, Vaasa Polytechnic, Finland

Pascal Molli, Nancy-Université, France

Francisco Montero, LoUISE Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Paula Morais, Universidade Portucalense, Portugal

Fernando Moreira, Universidade Portucalense, Portugal

Nathalie Moreno Vergara, Universidad de Málaga, Spain

Gianluca Moro, DEIS, University of Bologna, Italy

Haralambos Mouratidis, University of East London, U.K.

Pietro Murano, University of Salford, U.K.

Tomoharu Nakashima, Osaka Prefecture University, Japan

Paolo Napoletano, University of Salerno, DIIIIE, Italy

Ana Neves, knowman - Consultadoria em Gestão, Lda, Portugal

Jose Angel Olivas, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Luis Olsina Santos, Universidad Nacional de La Pampa, Argentina

Peter Oriogun, London Metropolitan University, U.K.

Tansel Ozyer, TOBB ETU, Turkey

Claus Pahl, Dublin City University, Ireland

José R. Paramá, University of A Coruña, Spain

João Pascoal Faria, FEUP - Faculty of Engineering of University of Porto, Portugal

Vicente Pelechano, Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Spain

Maria Carmen Penadés Gramaje, Technical University of Valencia, Spain

Gabriel Pereira Lopes, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal

Laurent Péridy, IMA-UCO, France

Dana Petcu, Western University of Timisoara, Romania

Robert Tolksdorf, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

Paolo Petta, Austrian Research Institute for Artificial Intelligence, Austria

José Pires, Escola Superior de Tecnologia e Gestão / IPB, Portugal

Geert Poels, Faculty of Economics and Business Economics, Ghent University, Belgium

José Ragot, INPL/CNRS, France

PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CONT.)

Abdul Razak Rahmat, University Utara Malaysia, Malaysia

Jolita Ralyte, University of Geneva, Switzerland

Srini Ramaswamy, University of Arkansas at Little Rock, U.S.A.

Pedro Ramos, ISCTE, Portugal

Marek Reformat, University of Alberta, Canada

Hajo A. Reijers, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, The Netherlands

Ulrich Reimer, University of Applied Sciences St. Gallen, Switzerland

Marinette Revenu, ENSICAEN, France

Yacine Rezgui, University of Salford, U.K.

Simon Richir, Presence & Innovation Lab. ENSAM Laval, France

Roland Ritsch, University of Applied Sciences St. Gallen, Switzerland

David Rivreau, Université Catholique de l'Ouest, France

Daniel Rodriguez, University of Alcalá, Spain

Pilar Rodriguez, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Spain

Jimena Rodriguez Arrieta, University of the Basque Country, Spain

Oscar M. Rodriguez-Elias, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California (UABC), Mexico

Jose Raul Romero, University of Cordoba, Spain

Agostinho Rosa, IST - Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal

Gustavo Rossi, LIFIA-UNLP, Argentina

Angel L. Rubio, Universidad de La Rioja, Spain

Francisco Ruiz, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

Sotirios Terzis, University of Strathclyde, U.K.

Claudine Toffolon, Université du Maine - LIUM, France

Leif Peterson, The Methodist Hospital Research Institute (Houston), U.S.A.

Steeff Peters, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Roberto Ruiz, Pablo de Olavide University, Spain

Ángeles S. Places, University of A Coruña, Spain

Manuel Santos, Universidade do Minho, Portugal

Jurek Sasiadek, Carleton University, Canada

Daniel Schang, ESEO, France

Mareike Schoop, University of Hohenheim, Germany

Remzi Seker, UALR, U.S.A.

Isabel Seruca, Universidade Portucalense, Portugal

Jianhua Shao, Cardiff University, U.K.

Alberto Silva, INESC/IST - Technical University of Lisbon, Portugal

Maria João Silva Costa Ferreira, Universidade Portucalense - Departamento de Inovação Ciência e Tecnologia, Portugal

Spiros Sirmakessis, Technological Educational Institution of Messolongi, Greece

Hala Skaf-Molli, ECOO Team, France

Pedro Soto-Acosta, University of Murcia, Spain

Chantal Soule-Dupuy, University of Toulouse 1 - IRIT, France

Priti Srinivas Sajja, Sardar Patel University, India

Chris Stary, University of Linz, Austria

Janis Stirna, Jönköping University, Sweden

Markus Stumptner, University of South Australia, Australia

Chun-Yi Su, Concordia University, Canada

Vijayan Sugumaran, Oakland University, U.S.A.

Lily Sun, The University of Reading, U.K.

Gion K. Svedberg, Örebro University, AASS, Sweden

Ramayah T., Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia

Grigorios Tsoumakas, Department of Informatics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Ryszard Tadeusiewicz, AGH University of Science and Technology, Poland

Theodoros Tzouramanis, University of the Aegean, Greece

Gulden Uchyigit, Imperial College, U.K.

Athina Vakali, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Michael Vassilakopoulos, Alexander Technological Educational Institute of Thessaloniki, Greece

PROGRAM COMMITTEE (CONT.)

Belén Vela Sánchez, Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

Christine Verdier, LIG - University Joseph Fourier Grenoble, France

Maria-Amparo Vila, University of Granada, Spain

HO Tuong Vinh, Institut de la Francophonie pour l'Informatique (IFI), Viet Nam

Aurora Vizcaino, Escuela Superior de Informática, Spain

Bing Wang, University of Hull, U.K.

Gerhard Weiss, SCCH, Austria

Graham Winstanley, University of Brighton, U.K.

Claus Witfelt, ITU, Denmark

Wita Wojtkowski, Boise State University, U.S.A.

Robert Wrembel, Poznan University of Technology, Poland

Baowen Xu, Southeast University, China

Haiping Xu, University of Massachusetts Dartmouth, U.S.A.

Hongji Yang, De Montfort University, U.K.

Lili Yang, Loughborough University, U.K.

Jasmine Yeap, Intelligent Insights International, Malaysia

Kokou Yetongnon, University of Bourgogne, France

Jun Zhang, SUN Yat-sen University, China

Liping Zhao, The University of Manchester, U.K.

Hans Weghorn, University of Cooperative Education, Stuttgart, Germany

AUXILIARY REVIEWERS

Antonia Albani, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands

Francisco Martínez Alvarez, Pablo de Olavide University, Seville, Spain

Simona Barresi, Salford University, U.K.

Bruno Barroca, UNL, Portugal

Christos Berberidis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

Beatriz Pontes Balanza, University of Seville, Spain

Félix Biscarri, University of Seville, Spain

Valeria de Castro, Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

José María Cavero, Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

Max Chevalier, University of Toulouse 3, IRIT, France

Evandro de Barros Costa, Universidade Federal de Alagoas, Brazil

Stergiou Costas, University of the Aegean, Greece

Guillermo Covella, UNLPam, Argentina

Andrea Delgado, Universidad de la República, Uruguay

Manuel Fernández Delgado, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Yuhui Deng, EMC Research, China

Remco Dijkman, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands

Vincent Dubois, CRIL - CNRS, IUT de Lens, France

Beatrice Duval, LERIA, University Angers, France

Fausto Fasano, Università di Salerno, Italy

Paulo Félix, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Oscar Pedreira Fernández, University of A Coruña, Spain

David Ferreira, INESC, Portugal

Rita Francese, Università di Salerno, Italy

Vittorio Fuccella, University of Salerno, Italy

David Heise, University Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Na Helian, Hertfordshire University, U.K.

AUXILIARY REVIEWERS (CONT.)

Andi Iskandar, Kyushuu Sangyo University, Japan

Nitin Kanaskar, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

R. B. Lenin, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

Oriana Licchelli, ESEO, France

Fernanda Lima, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil

Marcos López, Rey Juan Carlos University, Spain

Luiz Mauricio Martins, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Shamila Makki, Florida International University, U.S.A.

Philip Mayer, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Germany

Bernado Mello, Embrapa, Brazil

Germana Menezes da Nóbrega, Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil

Iñigo Monedero, University of Seville, Spain

Gabriele Monti, DEIS University of Bologna, Cesena, Italy

Diego Seco Naveiras, University of A Coruña, Spain

Rocco Oliveto, Università di Salerno, Italy

Efi Papatheocharous, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Ignazio Passero, Università di Salerno, Italy

Manuel Lama Penín, Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain

Hércules Antonio do Prado, Embrapa & Universidade Católica de Brasília, Brazil

Franck Ravat, University of Toulouse 1, IRIT, France

Michele Risi, University of Salerno, Italy

K. Sauvagnat, IRIT/SIG, France

João Saraiva, INESC, Portugal

Carlos Senna, University of Campinas, Brazil

Ivo dos Santos, University of Campinas, Brazil

Ernst Sikora, SSE, University Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Renate Strazdina, Riga Technical University, Latvia

Xosé Antón Vila Sobrino, Universidade de Vigo, Spain

Anastasis Sofokleous, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Sithu D. Sudarsan, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

Jonas Sprenger, University Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Mehdi Snene, University of Geneva, Switzerland

Giuseppe Scanniello, Università della Basilicata, Italy

Constantinos Stylianou, University of Cyprus, Cyprus

Guilaine Talens, University of Lyon, France

Christer Thörn, Jönköping University, Sweden

Athanasios Tsadiras, Alexander Technological Educational Institute of Thessaloniki, Greece

S. Vimalathithan, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

Zhiming Wang, University of Georgia, U.S.A.

Sining Wu, Cranfield University, U.K.

Kenji Yoshigoe, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

Johannes Zaha, University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Chuanlei Zhang, UALR, Little Rock, U.S.A.

Johannes Zaha, SSE, University Duisburg-Essen, Germany

SELECTED PAPERS BOOK

A number of selected papers presented at ICEIS 2008 will be published by Springer-Verlag in a LNBIP Series book. This selection will be done by the Conference Chair and Program Chair, among the papers actually presented at the conference, based on a rigorous review by the ICEIS 2008 program committee members.

FOREWORD

This volume contains the proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems (ICEIS 2008), organized by the Institute for Systems and Technologies of Information Control and Communication (INSTICC) in cooperation with the Association for Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI) and co-sponsored by the Workflow Management Coalition (WfMC).

ICEIS 2008, held in Barcelona, Spain, culminates a series of ten successful ICEIS editions, clearly showing that this is a world class event which has become a major point of contact between research scientists, engineers and practitioners in the area of business applications of information systems. This year, five simultaneous tracks were held, covering different aspects related to enterprise computing, including: “Databases and Information Systems Integration”, “Artificial Intelligence and Decision Support Systems”, “Information Systems Analysis and Specification”, “Software Agents and Internet Computing” and “Human-Computer Interaction”. All tracks describe research work that is often oriented towards real world applications and highlight the benefits of Information Systems and Technology for industry and services, thus making a bridge between the Academia and the Enterprise worlds.

Following the trend of previous editions, ICEIS 2008 also had a number of satellite workshops, related to the field of the conference. This year we collaborated in the organization of the following ten international workshops: 8th International Workshop on Pattern Recognition in Information Systems; 6th International Workshop on Modelling, Simulation, Verification and Validation of Enterprise Information Systems; 6th International Workshop on Security In Information Systems; 5th International Workshop on Natural Language Processing and Cognitive Science; 2nd International Workshop on RFID Technology - Concepts, Applications, Challenges; 2nd International Workshop on Human Resource Information Systems; and .the joint workshops: 5th International Workshop on Ubiquitous Computing; 4th International Workshop on Model-Driven Enterprise Information Systems; and 3rd International Workshop on Technologies for Context-Aware Business Process Management.

ICEIS 2008 received 665 paper submissions from more than 40 countries in all continents. 62 papers were published and presented as full papers, i.e. completed work (8 pages/30’ oral presentation), 183 papers reflecting work-in-progress or position papers were accepted for short presentation, and another 161 contributions were scheduled for poster presentation.

These numbers, leading to a “full-paper” acceptance ratio below 10%, and a total acceptance ratio below 61%, show the intention of preserving a high quality forum for the next editions of this conference. Additionally, as usual in the ICEIS conference series, a number of invited talks, presented by internationally recognized specialists in different areas, have positively contributed to reinforce the overall quality of the Conference and to provide a deeper understanding of the Enterprise Information Systems field.

A book of Selected Papers will be published, following the conference, by Springer-Verlag in the newly created series "Lecture Notes in Business Information Processing" (LNBIP). This series brings the successful LNCS approach to areas such as business information systems, e-business, B2B integration, Enterprise applications and industrial software development.

The program for this conference required the dedicated effort of many people. Firstly, we must thank the authors, whose research and development efforts are recorded here. Secondly, we thank the members of the program committee and the additional reviewers for their diligence and expert reviewing. Thirdly, we thank the invited speakers for their invaluable contribution and for taking the time to synthesise and prepare their talks. Fourthly, we thank the workshop chairs and the special session chairs whose collaboration with ICEIS was much appreciated. Finally, special thanks to all the members of the local organising committee, especially Jorge Cardoso, whose collaboration was fundamental for the success of this conference.

This year, the organization will distribute two awards to papers presented at the conference: the best paper award and the best student paper award, mainly based on the classifications provided by the Program Committee members.

We wish you all an exciting conference and an unforgettable stay in Barcelona. We hope to meet you again next year for the 11th ICEIS, to be held in Milan - Italy, details of which are available at <http://www.iceis.org>.

Joaquim Filipe

I.P.Setúbal/ INSTICC, Portugal

José Cordeiro

I.P.Setúbal/INSTICC, Portugal

CONTENTS

INVITED SPEAKERS

KEYNOTE LECTURES

| | |
|---|-------|
| THE LINK BETWEEN PAPER AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS <i>Moirá C. Norrie</i> | IS-5 |
| TOWARDS A DISTRIBUTED SEARCH ENGINE <i>Ricardo Baeza-Yates</i> | IS-13 |
| SERVICE ENGINEERING FOR FUTURE BUSINESS VALUE NETWORKS <i>Jorge Cardoso</i> | IS-15 |
| FROM STONE AGE TO INFORMATION AGE: (SOFTWARE) LANGUAGES THROUGH THE AGES <i>Jean-Marie Favre</i> | IS-21 |

INFORMATION SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND SPECIFICATION (PART II)

SHORT PAPERS

| | |
|--|----|
| PRODUCTION CONFIGURATION OF PRODUCT FAMILIES - An Approach based on Petri Nets <i>Lianfeng Zhang, Brian Rodrigues, Jannes Slomp and Gerard J. C. Gaalman</i> | 5 |
| AN EXTREME PROGRAMMING RELEASE PLAN THAT MAXIMIZES BUSINESS PERFORMANCE <i>Marcelo C. Fernandes, Antonio Juárez Alencar and Eber Assis Schmitz</i> | 12 |
| DEFINING THE IMPLEMENTATION ORDER OF SOFTWARE PROJECTS IN UNCERTAIN ENVIRONMENTS <i>Eber Assis Schmitz, Antonio Juárez Alencar, Marcelo C. Fernandes and Carlos Mendes de Azevedo</i> | 23 |
| WORKFLOW TREES FOR REPRESENTATION AND MINING OF IMPLICITLY CONCURRENT BUSINESS PROCESSES <i>Daniel Nikovski</i> | 30 |
| ON CONCEPTUALIZATION AS A SYSTEMATIC PROCESS <i>A. J. J. van Breemen and Janos J. Sarbo</i> | 37 |
| GENERALIZATION AND BLENDING IN THE GENERATION OF ENTITY-RELATIONSHIP SCHEMAS BY ANALOGY <i>Marco A. Casanova, Simone D. J. Barbosa, Karin K. Breitman and Antonio L. Furtado</i> | 43 |
| VARIABILITY MANAGEMENT IN SOFTWARE PRODUCT LINES FOR DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS CONSTRUCTION <i>María Eugenia Cabello and Isidro Ramos</i> | 49 |
| COMBINING DIFFERENT CHANGE PREDICTION TECHNIQUES <i>Daniel Cabrero, Javier Garzías and Mario Piattini</i> | 57 |
| A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DOCUMENT CORRELATION TECHNIQUES FOR TRACEABILITY ANALYSIS <i>Anju G. Parvathy, Bintu G. Vasudevan and Rajesh Balakrishnan</i> | 64 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| SELF-ADAPTIVE CUSTOMIZING WITH DATA MINING METHODS - A Concept for the Automatic Customizing of an ERP System with Data Mining Methods <i>Rene Schult and Gamal Kassem</i> | 70 |
| DIAPASON: A FORMAL APPROACH FOR SUPPORTING AGILE AND EVOLVABLE INFORMATION SYSTEM SERVICE-BASED ARCHITECTURES <i>Hervé Verjus and Frédéric Pourraz</i> | 76 |
| A PROCESS-DRIVEN METHODOLOGY FOR CONTINUOUS INFORMATION SYSTEMS MODELING <i>Alfredo Cusuzzocrea, Andrea Gualtieri and Domenico Sacca</i> | 82 |
| IS THERE A ROLE FOR PHILOSOPHY IN GROUP WORK SUPPORT? <i>Roger Tagg</i> | 89 |
| ON-THE-FLY AUTOMATIC GENERATION OF SECURITY PROTOCOLS <i>Shinsaku Kiyomoto, Haruki Ota and Toshiaki Tanaka</i> | 97 |
| KNOWLEDGE ELICITATION TECHNIQUES FOR DERIVING COMPETENCY QUESTIONS FOR ONTOLOGIES <i>Lila Rao, Han Reichgelt and Kweku-Muata Osei-Bryson</i> | 105 |
| MODELING INCREASINGLY COMPLEX SOCIO-TECHNICAL ENVIRONMENTS <i>I. T. Hawryszkiewicz</i> | 111 |
| A REQUIREMENTS ENGINEERING PROCESS MODEL FOR DISTRIBUTED SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT - Lessons Learned <i>Leandro Teixeira Lopes and Jorge Luis Nicolas Audy</i> | 117 |
| CHALLENGES IN SOFTWARE DESIGN IN LARGE CORPORATIONS - A Case Study at Siemens AG <i>Peter Killisperger, Markus Stumpfner, Georg Peters and Thomas Stückel</i> | 123 |
| A METADATA-DRIVEN APPROACH FOR ASPECT-ORIENTED REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS <i>Sérgio Agostinho, Ana Moreira, André Marques, João Araújo, Isabel Brito, Ricardo Ferreira, Ricardo Raminhos, Jasna Kovačević, Rita Ribeiro and Philippe Chevalley</i> | 129 |
| CAMEL FRAMEWORK - A Framework for Realizing Complete Separation of Developer's and Designer's Work in Rich Internet Application <i>Hiroaki Fukuda and Yoshikazu Yamamoto</i> | 137 |
| SECURITY ANALYSIS OF THE HEALTH CARE TELEMATICS INFRASTRUCTURE IN GERMANY <i>Michael Huber, Ali Sunyaev and Helmut Krcmar</i> | 144 |
| MANAGING PROCESS VARIANTS IN THE PROCESS LIFE CYCLE <i>Alena Hallerbach, Thomas Bauer and Manfred Reichert</i> | 154 |
| MAXIMIZING THE BUSINESS VALUE OF SOFTWARE PROJECTS - A Branch & Bound Approach <i>Antonio Juarez Alencar, Eber Assis Schmitz, Énio Pires de Abreu, Marcelo Carvalho Fernandes and Armando Leite Ferreira</i> | 162 |
| ITO-TRACKER - A Tool for Evaluating ITO Projects based on Critical Success Factors <i>Edumilis Méndez, María Pérez, Luis E. Mendoza and Maryoly Ortega</i> | 170 |
| CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS TO EVALUATE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY OUTSOURCING PROJECTS <i>Edumilis Méndez, María Pérez, Luis E. Mendoza and Maryoly Ortega</i> | 176 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| A GROUP AUTHENTICATION MODEL FOR WIRELESS NETWORK SERVICES BASED ON GROUP KEY MANAGEMENT <i>Huy Hoang Ngo, Xianping Wu and Phu Dung Le</i> | 182 |
| INTRODUCING SERVICE-ORIENTATION INTO SYSTEM ANALYSIS AND DESIGN <i>Prima Gustiene and Remigijus Gustas</i> | 189 |
| RANKING REFACTORING PATTERNS USING THE ANALYTICAL HIERARCHY PROCESS <i>Eduardo Piveta, Ana Moreira, Marcelo Pimenta, João Araújo, Pedro Guerreiro and R. Tom Price</i> | 195 |
| A FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING AND RUNTIME RECOVERY OF WEB SERVICE-BASED APPLICATIONS <i>René Pegoraro, Riadh Ben Halima, Khalil Drira, Karim Guennoun and João Mauricio Rosário</i> | 201 |
| REPRESENTATION AND REASONING MODELS FOR C3 ARCHITECTURE DESCRIPTION LANGUAGE <i>Abdelkrim Amirat and Mourad Oussalah</i> | 207 |
| CONTEXT-ORIENTED WEB METHODOLOGY WITH A QUALITY APPROACH <i>Anna Grimán, María Pérez, Maryoly Ortega and Luis E. Mendoza</i> | 213 |
| MODELS FOR PARALLEL WORKFLOW PROCESSING ON MULTI-CORE ARCHITECTURES <i>Thomas Rauber and Gudula Rünger</i> | 220 |
| ROUND-TRIP ENGINEERING OF WEB APPLICATIONS FOCUSING ON DYNAMIC MODELS <i>Yuto Imazeki, Shingo Takada and Norihisa Doi</i> | 228 |
| SIMILARITY MATCHING OF BUSINESS PROCESS VARIANTS <i>Noor Mazlina Mahmood, Shazia Sadiq and Ruopeng Lu</i> | 234 |
| BRIDGING UNCERTAINTIES GAPS IN SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS <i>Deniss Kumlander</i> | 240 |
| FORMAL VERIFICATION OF THE SECURE SOCKETS LAYER PROTOCOL <i>Llanos Tobarra, Diego Cazorla, J. José Pardo and Fernando Cuartero</i> | 246 |
| ONTOLOGICAL ERRORS - Inconsistency, Incompleteness and Redundancy <i>Muhammad Fahad, Muhammad Abdul Qadir and Muhammad Wajabat Noshairwan</i> | 253 |
| REALIZING WEB APPLICATION VULNERABILITY ANALYSIS VIA AVDL <i>Ha-Thanh Le and Peter Kok Keong Lob</i> | 259 |
| PHYSICAL-VIRTUAL CONNECTION IN UBIQUITOUS BUSINESS PROCESSES <i>Pau Giner, Manoli Albert and Vicente Pelechano</i> | 266 |
| A METHOD FOR ENGINEERING A TRUE SERVICE-ORIENTED ARCHITECTURE <i>G. Engels, A. Hess, B. Humm, O. Juwig, M. Lobmann, J.-P. Richter, M. Vofß and J. Willkomm</i> | 272 |
| EVALUATING CONSISTENCY BETWEEN UML ACTIVITY AND SEQUENCE MODELS <i>Yoshiyuki Shinkawa</i> | 282 |
| MODELLING AND DISTRIBUTING INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE ACTIVITIES IN A WORKFLOW SYSTEM <i>Sáida Boukbedouma and Zaia Alimazighi</i> | 290 |
| FROM PROCESS TO SOFTWARE SYSTEMS' SERVICE - Using a Layered Model to Connect Technical and Process-related Views <i>Christian Prpitsch</i> | 298 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| A MODEL DRIVEN ARCHITECTURE TOOL BASED ON SEMANTIC ANALYSIS METHOD <i>Thiago Medeiros dos Santos, Rodrigo Bonacin, M. Cecilia C. Baranauskas and Marcos Antônio Rodrigues</i> | 305 |
| AN ANALYSIS PATTERN FOR MOBILE GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS TOWARD MUNICIPAL URBAN ADMINISTRATION <i>Bruno Rabello Monteiro, Jugurta Lisboa Filho, José Luís Braga and Waister Silva Martins</i> | 311 |
| STRUCTURAL MODEL OF REAL-TIME DATABASES <i>Nizar Idoudi, Claude Duvallet, Bruno Sadeg, Rafik Bouaziz and Faiez Gargouri</i> | 319 |
| B2B AUTOMATIC TAXONOMY CONSTRUCTION <i>Ivan Bedini, Benjamin Nguyen and Georges Gardarin</i> | 325 |
| IT GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORKS AS METHODS <i>Matthias Goeken and Stefanie Alter</i> | 331 |
| USING VARIANTS IN KAOS GOAL MODELLING <i>Joël Brunet, Farida Semmak, Régine Laleau and Christophe Gnabo</i> | 339 |
| ECM SYSTEMS ANALYSIS AND SPECIFICATION - Towards a Framework for Business Process Re-Engineering <i>Jan vom Brocke, Alexander Simons and Anne Cleven</i> | 345 |
| QUALITY IMPROVEMENT OF WORKFLOW DIAGRAMS BASED ON PASSBACK FLOW CONSISTENCY <i>Osamu Takaki, Takahiro Seino, Izumi Takeuti, Noriaki Izumi and Koichi Takahashi</i> | 351 |
| A QVT-BASED APPROACH FOR MODEL COMPOSITION - Application to the VUML Profile <i>Adil Anwar, Sophie Ebersold, Mahmoud Nassar, Bernard Coulette and Abdelaziz Krionile</i> | 360 |
| BP-FAMA: BUSINESS PROCESS FRAMEWORK FOR AGILITY OF MODELLING AND ANALYSIS <i>Mohamed Boukebebouze, Youssef Amghar and Aïcha-Nabila Benharkat</i> | 368 |
| RICAD: TOWARDS AN ARCHITECTURE FOR RECOGNIZING AUTHOR'S TARGETS <i>Kanso Hassan, Elhore Ali, Soulé-Dupuy Chantal and Tazji Said</i> | 374 |
| TOWARDS A VALUE-ORIENTED APPROACH TO BUSINESS PROCESS MODELLING <i>Jan vom Brocke, Jan Mendling and Jan Recker</i> | 380 |
| TESTING-BASED COMPONENT ASSESSMENT FOR SUBSTITUTABILITY <i>Andres Flores and Macario Polo Usaola</i> | 386 |
| TOWARDS CREATION OF LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR EVENT-DRIVEN INFORMATION SYSTEMS <i>Darko Anicic and Nenead Stojanovic</i> | 394 |
| A SUPPLY CHAIN ONTOLOGY CONCEPTUALIZATION WITH FOCUS ON PERFORMANCE EVALUATION <i>Alicia C. Böhm, Horacio P. Leone and Gabriela P. Henning</i> | 402 |
| METHODOLOGICAL EXTENSIONS FOR SEMANTIC BUSINESS PROCESS MODELING <i>David de Francisco, Ivan Markovic, Javier Martínez, Henar Muñoz and Noelia Pérez</i> | 410 |
| TOWARDS A SEMI-AUTOMATIC TRANSFORMATION PROCESS IN MDA - Architecture and Methodology <i>Slimane Hammoudi, Wajib Alouini and Denivaldo Lopes</i> | 416 |
| MEASURING THE e-PARTICIPATION IN DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES THROUGH ONLINE SURVEYS <i>Cristiano Maciel, Licinio Roque and Ana Cristina Garcia</i> | 426 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| WHY HEIDEGGER? - Critical Insights for IS Design from Pragmatism and from Social Semiotics <i>Ángela Lacerda Nobre</i> | 435 |
| TOWARD A HYBRID ALGORITHM FOR WORKFLOW GRAPH STRUCTURAL VERIFICATION <i>Karim Baïna and Fodé Touré</i> | 442 |
| INFORMATION SYSTEM ENGINEERING FOR AN ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION COMPANY <i>Diane Asensio, Abdelaziz Khadraoui and Michel Léonard</i> | 448 |
| APPLYING MDA TO GAME SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT <i>Takashi Inoue and Yoshiyuki Shinkawa</i> | 454 |
| EXTRACTING CLASS STRUCTURE BASED ON FISHBONE DIAGRAMS <i>Makoto Shigemitsu and Yoshiyuki Shinkawa</i> | 460 |
| IMPROVING REQUIREMENTS ANALYSIS - Rigorous Problem Analysis and Formulation with Coloured Cognitive Maps <i>John R. Venable</i> | 466 |
| AUTHOR INDEX | 471 |

**INVITED
SPEAKERS**

**KEYNOTE
LECTURES**

COMBINING DIFFERENT CHANGE PREDICTION TECHNIQUES

Daniel Cabrero

*Spanish Ministry of Internal Affairs, Traffic Division, C/ Josefa Valcárcel 44, Madrid, Spain
dani_mas_d@yahoo.fr*

Javier Garzás

*Kybele Consulting S. L. Madrid, Spain
javier.garzas@kybeleconsulting.com*

Mario Piattini

*Alarcos Research Group, University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real, Spain
mpiattini@inf-cr.uclm.es*

Keywords: Change prediction, object-oriented design, selectors of change.

Abstract: This work contributes to software change prediction research and practice in three ways. Firstly, it reviews and classifies the different types of techniques used to predict change. Secondly, it provides a framework for testing those techniques in different contexts and for doing so automatically. This framework is used to find the best combination of techniques for a specific project (or group of projects) scenario. In third place, it provides a new prediction technique based on what the expectation of change is, from the user's point of view. This new proposal is based on a gap found in the relevant research, during the course of a review of the relevant literature.

1 INTRODUCTION

The maintenance cost of a software system is directly related to how often is it expected to change in the future (Wiederhold, 2006), and thus to how expensive it is to modify that system. In this sense, in order to optimize maintenance costs, it is possible to find improvement possibilities for a given design, but only “*improvements related to artifacts having a bigger change expectancy will really save costs in later phases*” (Cabrero et al., 2007).

This is an example of what can be found right across the pertinent literature. Change prediction techniques can be used for a wide range of purposes, such as testing prioritization, reengineering planning, or artifact tracing.

Given the importance of change prediction, many proposals to do with this have been presented in the last decades. Thus, in order to summarize all the available information, this paper reviews the related research work regarding change prediction and provides a **classification of change prediction**

techniques, consisting of three categories. This classification depends on the source of information used to carry out the estimation.

During the literature review, we realised that there is a need for more research that addresses the accuracy of the different proposals. In other words, the literature did not give us an insight into which techniques are supposed to be the most efficient for each specific context of development.

This paper proposes a new technique that gathers together all the preceding research work on predicting change in object-oriented systems. This new proposal is called **Automatic Heterogeneous change prediction (AHCP)**. This name comes from the fact that we propose to evaluate, automatically, the behaviour of each change prediction approach on the precedent releases. The aim is also to use this information to apply the best combination of techniques to the next releases.

The literature review also highlighted a new gap in the research. We did not actually find any change prediction technique based on the user input. So in this paper we also propose a fresh approach that

identifies which design artifacts will change, using the estimated requirement changeability that is extracted from the different stakeholders.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the related research work on change prediction, including our new proposal based on user input. Section 3 points out what is lacking in the existing approaches. Section 4 describes in more detail the AHCP technique proposed in this paper. Finally, section 5 draws some conclusions and identifies future research work.

2 CHANGE PREDICTION APPROACHES

In the context of this work, we performed a review of the literature on change prediction techniques. As a result of the review, we identified several interesting contributions focusing on the probability of change. We classified those proposals into three different approaches:

- Review of historical information
- Analysis of static structure and properties
- Extraction of user information

As regards the last one of the above approaches, a new method called CORT (Change Oriented Requirement Tracing) is proposed in this paper.

2.1 Historical Information Review

Predicting the future is a hard task indeed. We can, however, study in detail what happened in the past, and expect a similar behaviour in the near future. In terms of change prediction, (Girba et al., 2004) concludes that there is an “*empirical observation that classes which changed the most in the recent past also suffer important changes in the near future*”.

This technique reviews which artifacts have changed throughout the system’s history. A good option in the application of this technique is to divide the whole life of the project into releases. Table 1 shows an example of data extraction with three releases: R1, R2, and R3. The idea is to count the registered changes for each release in order to estimate the next release changes.

Table 1: Extraction per release of historical information data.

| Artifact | Number of Changes per Release | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|----|----|
| | R1 | R2 | R3 |
| Art. 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| Art. 2 | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| Art. 3 | 0 | 4 | 2 |

Table 1 presents information that can be used in several ways to predict changes. Release change ($Changes_{n+1}$) is calculated, then, as the average of the previous changes in the releases, that is, the sum of the changes of the previous releases ($\sum_n Changes_n$) divided by the number of releases (n), as set out in Equation 1.

$$Changes_{n+1} = (\sum_{i=(1..n)} Changes_i) / n \quad (1)$$

Table 2 shows the application of Equation 1 in the data presented in Table 1.

Table 2: Change prediction for the next release, using historical information.

| Artifact | Estimated number of changes |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| Art. 1 | $4/3 = 1,25$ |
| Art. 2 | $9/3 = 3$ |
| Art. 3 | $6/3 = 2$ |

To complete this approach, we can also take into account that recent changes may have more relative importance than old changes. (Girba et al., 2004) used a technique called “*Yesterday's Weather*”, which uses different metrics that assign a different importance to changes, depending on when they occur. For further information we would refer you to their work.

(Sharafat & Tahvildari, 2007) noted that this estimation would depend on the Time Between Releases (TBR). “*When the time between consecutive releases is very short, an overestimation can be observed; the opposite is true when this period is longer than average*”. To achieve the prediction of change per unit of time, they proposed the use of a polinomial technique.

2.1.1 Advantages and Drawbacks

The main advantage of this technique is that it can be easily automated, but there are two pre-requisites for its use. First of all, we need to have all this information available in a Configuration Management Tool. Secondly, this tool must have already been used for a long enough period of time to receive a representative amount of change requests.

2.2 Static Structure/Properties Analysis

Some researchers have realized that structures and properties of an object-oriented design can identify change-prone objects. An example of change prediction based on static structure could be a typical “god object” scenario where an object sends

messages to many other objects. This object is likely to have a high probability of change, because when a referenced object changes its interface, the change may be propagated to the first object.

Properties or code structures could also point to a change-prone object. The size and number of methods of an object can also be an indicator of its probability of change. The existence of code structures, such as big case statements or any other Bad Smells (Fowler, 1999) can also highlight a bigger probability of change.

Those techniques have proved to be useful in predicting change in each design artifact and component. (Tsantalis et al., 2005) proposed a new method based on “*Axes of Change*”, which assigned probability of change, taking into account the structure and dependencies of the static structure. Their work compared their proposal to many other change prediction methods based on static structure and properties. Among this set of techniques we can highlight Coupling Measures and Size Measures.

Coupling Measures have already been referenced throughout Impact Analysis literature for some time now. (Briand et al., 2002) provide a list of techniques that aim to identify dependencies among classes. Initially, this information was used to analyse the impact of different alternatives, but later on, a new utility of change prediction was discovered. Recent research suggests that if a class can be impacted by changes in other classes, this will raise its probability of change. Among Impact Analysis techniques, we can highlight (Chidamber et al., 1998), who proposed a suite of OO metrics, called C&K metrics: DIT (depth of inheritance tree), NOC (number of children), CBO (coupling between objects), and RFC (response for a class), and two intra-class metrics, WMC (weighted methods per class), and LCOM (lack of cohesion in methods).

(Chen & Rajlich, 2001) also proposed a technique in the context of Impact Analysis, based on the construction of an “*Abstract System Dependence Graph*” (ASDG) representing dependencies between software components and domain concepts. They also proposed a tool called RIPPLES.

On the other hand, **Size Measures** are based on the fact that the bigger a class is, the less modularised its design is. This is the reason why some design heuristics recommend keeping classes simple and small. The Number of Methods per Class-NOO used in (Arisholm et al., 2004) to identify change prone classes, or the Class Size-CS, used in (Wilkie & Kitchenham, 2000) to investigate its relationship to the effort to implement changes, figure in this group of techniques.

In addition, (Sharafat & Tahvildari, 2007) proposed a combination of the “*Axes of Change*” technique with the historical information, using both probabilities together.

The above work is an interesting starting point for our change prediction proposal. A new approach that aims to gather together the previous research work on change prediction must take into account the analysis of structures and properties of design artifacts.

2.2.1 Advantages and Drawbacks

We can point out that one great advantage of those methods is that static structures and properties can be analysed automatically. Some tools already use metrics presented here to improve code and design. Unfortunately, those tools do not focus on the probability of change, and do not assign a different value to the improvement opportunities.

(Tsantalis et al., 2005) made tests on two “open source” Java projects, and identified the accuracy of all those different techniques. It is difficult to ensure the applicability of those accuracy rates to any software system, however. Different software, such as Real-Time system or Business Management Systems, may have different cycles of change. Thus, different methods should be used to predict their changes.

2.3 Extracting Change Tendencies from Stakeholders

In the preceding sections, we have presented a review of the different techniques used to predict changes in an object-oriented system. Those techniques are based on concepts such as historical information or static properties; that is, they are based on technical data. We could easily imagine a situation, however, where two projects with a similar history and static properties could have a different probability of change for non-technical reasons.

Sometimes, only final users and other stakeholders know about the possibility of some changes occurring. We did not find any technique focusing on the change expectancy provided by users. In response to that lack, we propose a new technique called **CORT (Change Oriented Requirement Tracing)** which uses user input to estimate which design artifact requirement will change. Our technique is inspired by a case study presented by (Srikanth & Williams, 2005), which used a method called VBRT (Value Based Requirement Tracing). This sets a requirement prioritization based on the risk and relative Value of each requirement.

In our case, we use a similar approach, but focused on changeability. We propose a technique that aims to ask the user about future possibility of change in the case of each approved requirement. We will later use tracing techniques to translate this Value from requirements to design artifacts.

2.3.1 CORT: Requirement Extraction

First of all, we need to identify all the different stakeholders of the project. Then these individuals are asked to assign “changeability” variables to each requirement and use case. They are asked explicitly about the possibility of several possible future scenarios. The identification of those variables will be based on work done on Software Product Lines.

“*Software Product Lines (SPL) engineering gathers the analysis, design and implementation of a family of systems in order to improve the reuse of the commonality among them*” (Clements & Northrop, 2001). A Product Line is thus a group of “similar” systems. In the SPL field, there is significant experience in models of variability. The experience in this field grouped differences, called “discriminants” of a family of products, into “mutually exclusive”, “optional” and “multiple” differences (Keepence & Mannion, 1999). If we want to express this in change prediction terms, those types of changes would be **extension** (*multiple discriminant*), **change** (*option discriminant*) and **suppression** (*mutually exclusive discriminant*).

As far as our case is concerned, stakeholders are asked to estimate the “**probability of change**”, the “**probability of extension**” and the “**probability of suppression**”. This will generate three matrices of requirement/stakeholders with an “estimated variability” of each requirement from the point of view of each stakeholder. Table 3 shows an example of one of those matrices, focusing on “probability of extension”.

Table 3: Estimated Extension matrix.

| | User 1 | User 2 | User 3 |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Req. 1 | 28% | 71% | 0% |
| Req. 2 | 28% | 100% | 14% |
| Req. 3 | 0% | 14% | 0% |

The next step is to calculate the average probability (or adjusted average, which assigns weights to different users if each stakeholder is not equally important). For the sake of simplicity, in our case we will consider all users to have the same relative importance and we will not use weights. Each column of Table 4 represents a

type of change extracted from a matrix such as the one presented in Table 3.

Table 4: Estimated Probability of change for each requirement.

| | Change | Extension | Suppression |
|--------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| Req. 1 | 33% | 12% | 15% |
| Req. 2 | 47% | 6% | 80% |
| Req. 3 | 5% | 5% | 1% |

As denoted by (Keepence & Mannion, 1999), different types of change can be solved using different types of design patterns. This is the main reason why it could be a good idea to specify what sort of change is to be expected (change, extension and suppression). This facility is not available from other change prediction techniques.

2.3.2 CORT: Requirement Tracing

“*Requirements tracing is the ability to follow the life of a requirement in a forward and backward direction*” (Gotel & Finkelstein, 1994). For our proposal, we are only interested in requirement tracing techniques that establish relationships between requirements and design artifacts in a forward direction. This relationship will allow us to analyse which objects will change if a given requirement changes, and to translate that “probability of change” from requirements to objects. For example, if a requirement 1 has a 33% of probability of change and this change will affect both the A and B objects, we could conclude that objects A and B have a 33% of probability of change.

Several techniques have been proposed over the last years. An interesting summary of tracing techniques is provided by (Cleland-Huang et al., 2004). A further detailed analysis of each tracing technique is beyond the scope of this document. A simple approach is recommended in this case, however, because at this stage of the process we already know the relative importance of each requirement, and we can trace only requirements that have a higher probability of change.

2.3.3 Advantages and Drawbacks

One of the main advantages of this approach is that many software requirement tools, which already have variables associated with requirements such as importance or frequency, can use it with ease. In addition, as we extract information on change directly from stakeholders, our technique is the only one that allows an identification of the specific kind

of change that may be expected (Change, Extension or Suppression). On the other hand, we need access to the software requirement specification and it is essential to have direct contact with stakeholders, which is not always available. Another important drawback is that processes involving stakeholders are expensive in terms of both time and resources.

3 LACKS IN EXISTING TECHNIQUES

A number of tests for change prediction accuracy have been done in specific contexts. However, we found a gap in the research as regards when to apply each of those techniques. In other words, some techniques are more valuable than others, depending on the specific kind of project.

For example, reviewing historical data and user input techniques can be very useful in some Business Management Systems, where final users could constantly add functionality incrementally, or redesign some parts of the application user interface. On the other hand, structure analysis techniques can achieve a better accuracy in other contexts, such as a real-time system. This raises the following issues:

- When should we use each technique? Which one adds more value?
- Can we use several techniques at the same time?
- If so, how much accuracy does each technique provide?

(Chaumon et al., 1999) claims that *"In summary, most results on the influence of design on changeability come out of small systems, and the change impact models we found in the literature are incomplete or not systematic"*.

We believe that this lack of knowledge, concerning when and how is it efficient to use all those different approaches, makes it difficult for the software industry to use change prediction techniques. We also believe that further research in this field would help to reduce maintenance costs, and facilitate the daily work of the industry.

4 AHCP (AUTOMATIC HETEROGENEOUS CHANGE PREDICTION)

In the sections above, we have given an overview of the available research work that is related to change

prediction. There exist a lot of metrics and techniques that could help when trying to accomplish this task. In fact, a given technique could successfully predict changes in a given scenario and yet it might not achieve this accuracy in other context. The problem then, as stated before, is that it is difficult to know what the accuracy of each approach will be.

This new approach sets out to identify which techniques of change prediction predict the future better than others, for a given scenario. In addition, it uses this information to select the most appropriate techniques for making new predictions. To achieve this, we will use the concept of *"change selector"* to identify (or *"select"*) change prone classes.

4.1 Change-Prone Selectors

When talking about change prediction, each metric or technique that aims to identify a change-prone class can be modelled as a selector. For example, the Class Size metric can be modelled as *"Classes larger than 5Kb of source code (without comments)"*. We call this a *"selector"*, because it *"selects"* classes complying with this size, and marks them as change-prone classes.

Table 5 summarizes an initial example of a catalogue of selectors, where some previous research work has been modelled. Each selector can be configured through variables. For example, CS selector can be configured using the *"Size in KB"* variable. When this variable is configured to a very high value, only really big classes will be selected.

Table 5: Example of Selector Catalogue.

| Prev. Work | Change Selector | Variables |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------|
| Historical | Number of changes per release > M | M = Num of Changes |
| CORT | The probability obtained < N | N = Thrshld. |
| Axes of Change | The probability obtained < N | N = Thrshld. |
| CS (Class Size) | Classes larger than 5Kb of source code (without comments) | N = Size in KB |
| CBO(Coupling Measure) | A class must be coupled with at least N other classes | N = Num. of classes |
| NOO (Num of Methods) | Every class must contain at least N methods | N = Num. of methods |
| Refactorings | Switch or if sentence with more than N statements | N = Num. of statem. |

This example of a list is only an initial step. Selectors will be added or deleted through experimentation, as described in the next section.

4.2 Assigning Value to Selectors

Even if software architects know about techniques that help to estimate the probability of change, they must deal with the problem of selecting the appropriate technique or set of techniques for its specific situation. In fact, right up to the present time, no work addressing this issue has been published.

The advantage of change prediction techniques is that we can estimate the accuracy of each type of technique using historical information, and use selector's variables and weights to find out the best combination of techniques for each kind of project.

Let us imagine an Enterprise Management project. We can use our technique to perform simulations of estimation of change at the end of the third release, in order to estimate changes in the fourth release. Our approach proposes to compare the results of each technique with the changes that actually happened. Depending on the *Overall Accuracy-OA* and *Sensitivity-S (Percentage of correct change classifications)*, we will set up the **weight** variable for each technique. The bigger the OA and S are, the higher the weight will be.

False Positive Ratio-FPR (Percentage of incorrect classifications of changes that did not occur) will help to set the Threshold and other variables, such as **number of changes**, number of methods and so on. In this case, the bigger the FPR is, the higher the Threshold and number of changes must be. OA, S and FPR ratios were extracted from (Tsantalis et al., 2005) accuracy tests.

We can thus make the comparison using several possibilities, to find the best combination of techniques for this specific project. Table 6 shows an example of this data.

Table 6: Weighting and configuring Selectors.

| Selector | Threshold | Weight |
|----------------|-----------------|--------|
| Historical | Changes = 3 | 0,5 |
| CORT | Threshold = 0,6 | 0,3 |
| Axes of Change | Threshold = 0,3 | 0,2 |

Another interesting aspect is the automation of this technique. This would allow us to repeat this process for a set of projects in order to segment them into different groups, depending on which techniques predict the Probability of Change with

greater accuracy. This will provide new results that should help to guide future research.

In the example described in Table 6, accuracy values have automatically discarded the rest of the techniques. Note that each technique is selected or discarded automatically. In this way, whether or not to apply a technique will be based on empirical data instead of on personal opinions.

4.3 Why is this Information Useful?

This information obtained by comparing expected results with historical data can be useful in order to:

- Estimate costs in future releases of a project.
- Choose between the different kinds of estimation techniques depending on the characteristics of our specific project.
- Invest more effort in the testing and tracing of where the Probability of Change is higher.
- Design applications to make them easier to maintain, introducing patterns where the application is expected to change.

Change prediction techniques can also be useful in focusing efforts on change-prone artifacts. This is possible in several ways. For example, (Girba et al., 2004) used it to guide the reverse engineering process of large systems. (Kung et al., 1995) were also interested in change prediction for regression-testing purposes.

5 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

The problem of software change prediction is not new. In the last few years many research papers on this issue have been presented. However, our experiences in several software factories reveal that industrial practice doesn't reflect this research effort.

We believe that the misuse of change prediction techniques is due to the fact that developers don't know which techniques are available. Apart from that, they don't know which techniques are supposed to be the most efficient ones for their specific context of development.

This work has presented a review and classification of the different types of change prediction techniques. It also provides a framework for testing those techniques automatically, in different contexts.

The result of this work is directly applicable to different lines of research. For example, the relative

importance of a test or a design decision will be bigger if it focuses on a change-prone component. In other words, the Return of Investment will be more profitable if we focus our efforts correctly, using change prediction techniques.

In future work, we plan to build an agent that both automates and assists in the different steps proposed in this paper. More specifically, in the context of the Traffic Division of the Spanish Ministry of Internal Affairs, we plan to apply those techniques to guide software improvements. In this way, we plan choose which part of applications should be refactored (change-prone classes) in order to improve their maintainability.

We expect that increasing the maintainability of change-prone component, the cost of maintenance will decrease, and a higher Return of Investment will be provided face to changes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research is partially supported by the ESFINGE project of the General Research Council (Dirección General de Investigación) of the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science and FEDER (TIC 2003-02737-C02-02)

REFERENCES

- Arisholm, E., Briand, L. C. & Føyen, A. (2004) Dynamic Coupling Measurement for Object-Oriented Software. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 30, 491-506.
- Briand, L. C., Wüst, J. & Lounis, H. (2002) Using Coupling Measurement for Impact Analysis in Object-Oriented Systems. *Science of Computer Programming*, 45, 155-174.
- Cabrero, D., Garzás, J. & Piattini, M. (2007) Maintenance Cost of a Software Design. A Value-Based Approach. In *9th International Conference on Enterprise Information Systems (ICEIS)*, Funchal, Madeira, Portugal.
- Cleland-Huang, J., Zemont, G. & Lukasik, W. (2004) A Heterogeneous Solution for Improving the Return on Investment of Requirements Traceability. In *Requirements Engineering Conference, 12th IEEE International (RE'04)*, IEEE Computer Society
- Clements, P. & Northrop, L. (2001) *Software Product Lines: Practices and Patterns*, Addison-Wesley.
- Chaumun, M. A., Kabaili, H., Keller, R. K. & Lustman, F. (1999) A Change Impact Model for Changeability Assessment in Object-Oriented Software Systems In *European Conference on Software Maintenance and Reengineering*, Washington, DC, USA IEEE Computer Society.
- Chen, K. & Rajlich, V. (2001) RIPPLES: tool for change in legacy software. In *International Conference on Software Maintenance*, Florence, Italy, IEEE Computer Society.
- Chidamber, S. R., Darcy, D. P. & Kemerer, C. F. (1998) Managerial Use of Metrics for Object-Oriented Software. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 24, 629-639.
- Fowler, M. (1999) *Refactoring: Improving the Design of Existing Code*, Menlo Park, California, Addison Wesley.
- Girba, T., Ducasse, S. & Lanza, M. (2004) Yesterday's Weather: Guiding Early Reverse Engineering Efforts by Summarizing the Evolution of Changes. In *20th IEEE International Conference on Software Maintenance* Washington, DC, USA IEEE Computer Society.
- Gotel, O. C. Z. & Finkelstein, A. C. W. (1994) An analysis of the requirements traceability problem. In *1st International Conference on Requirements Engineering*, Colorado Springs, CO, USA, IEEE Computer Society.
- Keepence, B. & Mannion, M. (1999) Using patterns to model variability in product families. *IEEE Software*, 16, 102-108.
- Kung, D., Gao, J., Hsia, P., Wen, F. & Toyoshima, Y. (1995) Class firewall, test order, and regression testing of object-oriented programs. *Object Oriented Programming*, 8, 51-65.
- Sharafat, A. R. & Tahvildari, L. (2007) A Probabilistic Approach to Predict Changes in Object-Oriented Software Systems. In *International Conference in Software Maintenance and Reengineering*, Amsterdam, IEEE Computer Society.
- Srikanth, H. & Williams, L. (2005) On the economics of requirements-based test case prioritization. In *7th international workshop on Economics-driven software engineering research* St. Louis, Missouri ACM Press
- Tsantalis, N., Chantzigeorgiou, A. & Stephanides, G. (2005) Predicting the Probability of Change in Object-Oriented Systems. *IEEE Transactions on Software Engineering*, 31, 601-614.
- Wiederhold, G. (2006) What is your Software Worth? *Communications of the ACM*, 49, 65-75.
- Wilkie, F. G. & Kitchenham, B. A. (2000) Coupling Measures and Change Ripples in C++ Application Software. *Systems and Software*, 52, 157-164.