

# An Analytical Approach for Predicting QoS of Web Services Choreographies\*

Alfredo Goldman, Yanik Ngoko  
Institute of Mathematic and Statistic  
University of São Paulo  
São Paulo, Brasil  
{gold, yanik}@ime.usp.br

Dejan Milojicic  
Hewlett Packard Laboratories  
Palo Alto, CA USA  
dejan.milojicic@hp.com

## ABSTRACT

Given a Web Services Composition, we deal with the prediction of the mean service response time that can be expected from a user request that is serviced. This challenge is a key issue in the design of middleware, managing Web Services Composition. We focus on complex services composition that can be described as BPMN choreographies of services. Our main contribution is a mathematical programming based approach for the prediction of the response time of Web Services Compositions. This new approach occurs through the automatic generation of a linear program whose number of variables and constraints is polynomial in the number of elements used to represent the Service Composition. The equations of the linear program are based on well known aggregation rules for service composition and a new modeling that we introduced for handling communication within Web Services.

## Categories and Subject Descriptors

H.4 [Information Systems applications]: *Workflow management*; B.8 [Performance and reliability]: *Performance Analysis and Design Aids*

## General Terms

Theory, Performance, Algorithms

## Keywords

QoS prediction, Web Services Composition, BPMN

---

\*This research was funded by HP Brasil under the Baile Project and from the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013 under grant agreement number 257178 (project CHOReOS-Large Scale Choreographies for the Future Internet). Yanik Ngoko is supported by the FAPESP foundation of the State of São Paulo.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

MGC2012, December 3, 2012, Montreal, Quebec, Canada.  
Copyright 2012 ACM 978-1-4503-1608-8/12/12 ...\$15.00.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, we are interested in estimating the Quality of Services (QoS) of Web Services Composition (WSC). As stated in many other previous work [Cardoso et al. 2004, Zeng et al. 2004] such a task is primordial in the design of efficient middleware for service composition management. Our actual work is part of a middleware project<sup>1</sup> where QoS estimation must serve for optimal service selection and online planning during the execution [Issarny et al. 2011]. The service composition that we are interested in can be described as BPMN choreography of services, viewed here as multiple BPMN orchestration processes that communicate [Weske 2007]. On these compositions, we focus on the design of a fast and automatic approach for the estimation of the Service Response Time (SRT) that can be expected from a user request.


The SRT estimation of WSC has been investigated in previous work [Cardoso et al. 2004, Zheng et al. 2010, Zeng et al. 2004, Xiangpeng et al. 2007, Goldman and Ngoko 2012]. A common aspect in these studies is that the QoS of a composition is computed based on a set of aggregation rules that state how to infer the QoS of the composition from the one of its service constituents, considered known. We will assume in this work that this assumption holds.

Despite the abundance of work on QoS prediction for services composition, we believe that few match our needs. This is made clear when considering WSC with a business process viewpoint. In this vision, WSC belong to two classes: composition that corresponds to a single enterprise business process and those corresponding to multiple communicating enterprise processes [Weske 2007]. While most work on QoS prediction deal with the first case, it is the multi-processes case of interest in this paper.

There are at least two key differences between the single and multi-process cases. The first one is that the multi-processes introduce at least two communication levels: service communication within a process (for e.g communication in a LAN) and communication between processes (for e.g inter-LAN communication). Most of work on QoS prediction ignore the communication cost. While this assumption can hold when having a single enterprise process (with a fast enterprise network), it is not a reasonable assumption when considering multiple processes and therefore networks. A second difference between these two types of processes appears when considering their BPMN graph representation (see Figure 1). While in the first case, we might have structured graphs [Polyvyanyy et al. 2011] where a Web

---

<sup>1</sup>www.choreus.eu



**Figure 1: Single and multiple BPMN processes for composition of services.** *A, B, C, D, E* and *F* correspond to Web Services operations. The notations are based on the BPMN collaboration diagram.

Service operation has only one predecessor, in the second, the graph is by nature unstructured because of precedences induced by inter-processes communication. This observation is of importance because as claimed in [Zheng et al. 2010], most work on QoS predictions are based on structured graphs [Cardoso et al. 2004, Goldman and Ngoko 2012].

In this paper, we consider the prediction of the SRT for WSC corresponding to multiple communicating business processes. As stated previously, it is common to base the QoS computation on a set of aggregation rules. We proceed in the same way here. As aggregation rules, we will use the ones proposed in single process prediction [Cardoso et al. 2004, Goldman and Ngoko 2012], together with new ones that we derive from an interpretation of inter-process communication. Our main contribution is a polynomial time algorithm (in the number of services) that generates from aggregation rules a linear program whose solution is the SRT for the service composition to evaluate. This proposal suggests two steps for SRT prediction: the linear model generation followed by its resolution, using a linear solver.


Our contribution differs from previous work on QoS prediction for services composition on two points. The first is that we consider a modeling of multi-process composition based on BPMN notation for the description of collaboration process [Weske 2007]. The second is that we take into account communication and propose new semantics inspired by work done in distributed and parallel computation [Banikazemi et al. 1999]. This is a major difference when considering other work on QoS prediction with linear programming [Zeng et al. 2004].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose a model for WSC. In Section 3 we define our semantics for SRT prediction and in the Section 4, we explain how to estimate the SRT. We conclude in Section 5.

## 2. MODEL

In this work, we represent a WSC as a Hierarchical Service Graph (HSG) [Goldman and Ngoko 2012]. Such graphs consider three abstraction layers for any services composition: business processes, Web Services and machines layers.

The business processes layer that we will also refer as the **operations graph** describes concurrent business processes. We specify this graph using the BPMN notations for collaboration process. As a result, an operation graph as illus-



**Figure 2: Views of a Web Service Composition**

trated by Figure 2b) is made of operations (e.g *A – D* in Figure 2b), interconnected within a business process or pool by BPMN connectors (e.g AND split connector in Figure 2b) and communicating between pools with messages exchanges (e.g between *C* and *E*).

In a general case, operations can belong to multiple Web Services existing in multiple instances on various machines [Goldman and Ngoko 2012]. For the purpose of simplification, we will assume that any operation belongs to a unique Web Service and business process. Moreover, any Web Services exist in one instance on a single machine.

Our approach for QoS prediction is deeply related to the structure of the operation layer. In a formal manner, we define an operations graph by a tuple  $G_o = (P, O, C, E_{ocp}, E_{oc}, E_{oo})$  where:  $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_h\}$  is the set of pools,  $O$  the set of WSs operations and  $C$  the set of BPMN connectors (we considered the AND, XOR and OR connectors). The connectivity of the operations graph is given by the sets  $E_{oc}, E_{ocp}$  and  $E_{oo}$ . Since,  $G_o$  captures a business process, it is an directed graph. Here,  $E_{oc}$  describes precedence constraints between operations and connectors,  $E_{ocp}$ , states for each operation and connector its pool and  $E_{oo}$  describes messages connections between operations of separated pools. We will make various restriction on graph connectivity. For introducing them, let us first consider the following definitions.


### 2.1 Some definitions

**Definition 1 Pool operations graph:** Given an operations graph  $G_o = (P, O, C, E_{ocp}, E_{oc}, E_{oo})$ , we define the pool operations graph for the business process  $P_i$  as  $G_o[P_i] = (O \cup C, E_{oc}[P_i])$  where  $E_{oc}[P_i]$  is the subset of  $E_{oc}$  containing all elements of the pool  $P_i$ .

**Definition 2 Scope:** Let us consider a pool operations graph  $G_o[P_i] = (O \cup C, E_{oc}[P_i])$  and an element  $x \in O \cup C$ . **a)**  $x$  is in the scope of a split connector  $y \in C$  if  $x$  and  $y$  are in the same pool and there exist a **path**  $\mu = (y, y_1), (y_1, y_2) \dots (y_l, x)$  from  $y$  to  $x$  in which the number of split connectors having the type of  $y$  ( $x$  excluded) is greater than the number of join connectors of the same type. **b)** In the case where the path  $\mu = (y, y_1), (y_1, y_2) \dots (y_l, x)$  is the shortest possible one from any split connector whose  $x$  is in the scope, we say that  $x$  is *closely in the scope of*  $y$ .

In Figure 3b), the operations *A, B, C, D* are in the scope of the AND split connector and, *B* and *C* are closely in its scope.

**Definition 3 Sending and receiving operations :** Given two operations  $o_u$  and  $o_v$ , if  $(o_u, o_v) \in E_{oo}$ , then we will say that the operation  $o_u$  sends in its execution a message to  $o_v$ . We will also qualify  $o_u$  in this case as a **sending** operation and  $o_v$  as a **receiving** one. With these elements, we for-




**Figure 3: Example of authorized and non-authorized joins**

multate in the next section the structural restriction that we make on the connectivity.

## 2.2 Structural restrictions

**H<sub>1</sub>:** Pool operations graphs are obtained by composing the restricted set of generic structures of Figure 4. Here,



**Figure 4: Set of generic subgraph patterns**


each  $G_i$  refers either to a subgraph built from a composition of these generic structures, or to a single operation.  $G_{1^*}, \dots, G_{n^*}$  refer to subgraphs having a unique node without predecessors and a unique one without successors. Finally, let us remark that in the proposed patterns, for each subgraph having a split OR connector, there must be a corresponding join OR connector.

**H<sub>2</sub>:** Within each pool, there is a unique node without predecessors. This node will be called the *initial pool node* while nodes without successors will be called *terminal nodes*.

**H<sub>3</sub>:** All elements that are in a branch leading to a same XOR (resp. AND) join connector must all be in the scope of a same XOR (resp. AND) split connector. Thus, we can say that there is no violation of restriction **H<sub>3</sub>** on the graphs of Figures 3a) and 3b), whereas in 3c), there is a violation since  $B$  and  $C$  lead to an XOR join connector although they are executed within an AND split.

**H<sub>4</sub>:** Any receiving operation must be linked to exactly one sending operation. This leads us to consider two categories of communication: one-to-one communication, in the case where for a sending operation there is a unique receiver and, one-to-many communication, where a sender has multiple receivers.

**H<sub>5</sub>:** If a couple  $(o_u, o_v)$  belongs to  $E_{oo}$  then  $o_u$  and  $o_v$  belong to different pools



**Figure 5: Type of communication**

**H<sub>6</sub>:** A receiving or sending operation must not be in the scope of an XOR, or an OR connector.

**H<sub>7</sub>:** In the set of pools  $P = \{P_1, \dots, P_n\}$ , there is a subset  $P' \subseteq P$  of  $h-1$  pools such that the initial node of any graph  $G_o[P_i], P_i \in P'$  is a receiving operation. For the unique pool  $P^* = P \setminus P'$ , the initial node cannot be a receiving operation.

With the rule **H<sub>7</sub>**, we assume that the execution of a request will always start in the pool  $P^*$  and will reach the other pools by message exchanges.

The motivation behind the rule **H<sub>6</sub>** is to avoid deadlock situations where a receiving operation can infinitely wait for a non executed sending operation.

We described the HSG model that we will use for WSC representation. In the next section, we will propose a semantic model for SRT computation on such graphs.

## 3. EXECUTION SEMANTICS

Our semantical proposal consists of two set of aggregation rules based on the connectivity of the operations graph. The first set states how to aggregate SRT on a pool operations graph. The second takes into account communication between pools.

### 3.1 Aggregation rules for a pool

For computing the SRT that can be expected from a pool operations graph, we adopt the aggregation rules defined in [Goldman and Ngoko 2012, Cardoso et al. 2004]. Here, each operation  $x \in O$  is associated with a mean SRT that we will denote  $T(x)$ . The SRT led by connectors is set as null.

On the generic subgraphs of Figure 4, we present in Table 1 the rules that we will use. Here,  $T(G_i)$  denotes the SRT that can be expected from a subgraph  $G_i$ . On a generic XOR split graph, a request can be routed towards one subgraph  $G_1, \dots, G_n$ . We suppose that there is a probability  $p_i$  for each of these possibilities. For a loop subgraph, we assume that there is a maximal number of loops  $n_l$  and a probability  $p_{li}$  to loop  $i$  times. Finally, for an OR split/join, we assume for simplification that the request can only be routed to the subgraph  $G_1, G_2$  or simultaneously, to both. Each routing occurrence, has a known probability  $p_{or1}, p_{or2}$  and  $p_{or||}$ .

Sequence	AND Split	AND Join
$T(G_1)+T(G_2)$	$\max\{T(G_1), \dots, T(G_n)\}$	$\max\{T(G_1^*), \dots, T(G_n^*)\}$
XOR Split	XOR Join	LOOP
$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \cdot T(G_i)$	$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i \cdot T(G_i^*)$	$\sum_{i=1}^{n_l} p_{li} \cdot \{T(G_1^*) + \dots + T(G_n^*)\}$
OR Split/Join	$p_{or1} \cdot T(G_1) + p_{or2} \cdot T(G_2) + p_{or  } \cdot \max\{T(G_1), T(G_2)\}$	

**Table 1: SRT aggregation on subgraphs patterns**

### 3.2 Communication semantics

Given a sending or receiving operation  $A$ , we consider that its execution comprises two parts: an **operational part**

of cost  $T(A)$  and, a **communication part** where message exchanges occur. On sending operations, we assume that the operational part is always executed before, while we have the inverse on receiving operations.

For modeling the costs of the communication part, we adopt the one port model without recovering [Banikazemi et al. 1999]. Assuming that an operation  $A$  sends a message to  $B$ , this model proposes a decomposition of the communication in: a **sending** phase, where the machine on which  $A$  is engaged in the sending of information on communication links, a **routing** phase ( $T(A, B)$ ), where information go from the machine of  $A$  to the one of  $B$  and, a **receiving** phase where the machine on which  $B$  is run, gathers the sent information. The time duration of these phases is respectively denoted by  $T_{Send}(A, B)$ ,  $T(A, B)$  and  $T_{Recv}(A, B)$ .

In the time evaluation, we will interpret one-to-many communication as series of one-to-one communication. On Figure 5b for example, the total time required for  $A$  to send information on the link will be  $\sum_{i=1}^n T_{Send}(A, B_i)$ . More, the reception cannot be completed for any operation  $B_i$  before  $\min_{1 \leq u \leq n} \{T_{Send}(A, B_u) + T(A, B_u) + T_{Recv}(A, B_u)\}$  time units.




Figure 6: Exchange of information between  $A$  and  $B$ , starting at the date  $d_0$  and ending at  $d_3$

At this point, we presented a modeling of our service composition and requests execution semantics. In the next, we will present our approach for QoS prediction.

## 4. SRT PREDICTION

We propose automatically generating linear program (LP) from SRT prediction for any service composition. Its solution gives the SRT of the considered service composition.

### 4.1 Algorithm for LP generation

For generating LP, with each element  $x \in O \cup C$ , we associate a real variable  $t_x$ . The LP objective function targets the minimization of the objective value denoted by  $Z(LP)$ . The idea in the LP generation is to define a set of constraints on each variable  $t_x$  and  $Z(LP)$  (according to the aggregation rules) such that if LP is executed, then  $Z(LP)$  will contain the mean SRT.

The constraints definitions for any node  $x$  are based on two concepts: the reachability subgraph  $RG(x)$  and the reachability probability  $p_a(x)$ . We define  $p_a(x)$  as the probability for a request started in the initial pool node where  $x$  is located to reach it. In Figure 7 for instance,  $p_a(C)$  is the probability for a request started on  $g_1$  to reach  $C$ . By definition,  $p_a(C) = 1$ . We define  $RG(x)$  as the subgraph of  $G_o$  that comprises all paths leading to  $x$ , starting from the initial pool node. In Figure 7 for instance,  $RG(D)$  is given by the subgraph, in the dashed box, containing  $g_1, A, g_2, D$ .

It is important to notice that a subgraph  $RG(x)$  might not fulfill the structural restrictions defined for operation graphs.  $RG(D)$  for instance has a split connector with only one successor. In such situation, we consider in  $RG(x)$  that this connector is a virtual operation, with a null SRT value.

The LP generation is based on the two reachability concepts introduced below. More precisely, let us suppose that from aggregation rules, we have the mean SRT  $T(RG(x))$  for a request to traverse  $RG(x)$ . The LP generation is done in two main stages. The first stage objective is to generate constraints for setting in variables  $t_x$ , the value  $p_a(x).T(RG(x))$ . Based on these *partial cumulated* SRT, the second stage defines constraints on  $Z(LP)$  such as to cumulate the values  $t_x$  on terminal nodes in order to return the mean SRT.




Figure 7: Example of operations graph. In dashed box, we have  $RG(D)$ .

For setting the values  $p_a(x).T(RG(x))$  in  $t_x$ , we consider again two-sub stages depending on the fact that an element of  $RG(x)$  is or is not involved in communication between pools. Therefore, the general steps of the LP generation process are given in Figure 8. These steps will be discussed in the next sections.

1. Computation of reachability probabilities;
2. Generation of intra-pools constraints;
3. Generation of inter-pools constraints;
4. Generation of the constraints defining the global SRT.

Figure 8: Stages for LP generation

### 4.2 Computation of reachability probabilities

We will compute reachability probabilities on each arc  $(u, v) \in E_{oc}$ . As input, we assume that on each arc  $(u, v)$ , we have the conditional (or relative) probability  $p_r[(u, v)]$  for a request to be routed on  $v$ , knowing that it reached the connector whose  $v$  is closely in the scope. At first glance, this input assumption may seem different from classical ones used in QoS prediction. However, this is not the case. Indeed, let us consider an arc  $(u, v)$ , such that  $v$  is strictly in the scope of an XOR split connector  $c$ . If the  $i^{th}$  branch of  $c$  is the one leading to  $v$  and has a probability  $p_i$  to be executed, then by definition,  $p_r[(u, v)] = p_i$ . In the same way, if  $v$  is closely in the scope of an AND split connector, we have  $p_r[(u, v)] = 1$ . Finally, in the case where for an arc  $(u, v)$ ,  $v$  is not in the scope of a connector, we assume that  $p_r[(u, v)] = 1$ . More globally, we can easily relate the conditional probabilities  $p_r[\cdot]$  to the classical ones  $p_i$  and  $p_{ori}$  (see Section 3.1) used in aggregation rules.

The reachability probabilities are derived from the conditional ones. We will distinguish between three cases. In the first case,  $u$  does not have any predecessor, then we set

$p_a[(u, v)] = p_r[(u, v)]$ . In the second,  $u$  is not a join connector and has a predecessor  $u'$ . We define:

$$p_a[(u, v)] = \begin{cases} p_a[(u', u)] & \text{if } u \in O; \\ p_r[(u, v)].p_a[(u', u)] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In Figure 7, this gives:  $p_a[(g_2, E)] = p_r[(g_1, A)].p_r[(g_2, D)].p_r[(g_2, E)]$  and  $p_a[(g_4, J)] = p_r[(G, H)].p_r[(g_4, I)]$ . Finally if  $u$  is a join connector, with the predecessors  $u'_1, \dots, u'_m$  then, we have:

$$p_a[(u, v)] = \begin{cases} p_a[(u'_i, u)] & \text{if } u \text{ is an AND Join connector;} \\ \sum_{i=1}^m p_a[(u'_i, u)] & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the definition of reachability for the arcs  $(u, v)$ , we ignored cases where a request can be routed to multiple branches (with OR connectors). For capturing this, we assume that for each OR join connector  $v$ ,  $p_{or||}(v)$  defines the probability for a request to be routed simultaneously on both branches leading to  $v$ . Again, one can notice that this input also exists in classical aggregation rules.

### 4.3 Generation of intra-pool constraints

In intra-pool constraints, we ignore the communication between operations. These constraints aim at setting in each variable  $t_x$  the value  $p_a(x).T(RG(x))$ . Here, constraints are generated based on arcs of the operation graph. For each  $(u, v) \in E_{oc}$  we will generate an equation  $Eq$  as follows:

**C1:** [ $u$  does not have a predecessor]:  $Eq \leftarrow t_u \geq T(u)$ ;

**C2:** [ $u, v \in O$ ]:  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq t_u + p_a[(u, v)].T(v)$ ;

[ $u \in O \cup C, v \in C$ ]

**C3:** If  $v$  is an XOR join that closes a loop (there is  $(v, s) \in E_{oc}$  and a path  $(s, y_1), \dots, (y_n, u)$  of  $E_{oc}$ ), then  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq \sum_{i=1}^{nl[v]} p_{li}(t_v - t_s) + t_s$ ; Here,  $nl[v]$  is the maximal index of looping stage;

**C4:** If  $v$  is a split connector then  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq t_u$ ;

[ $u \in C, v \in O \cup C$ ]

**C5:** If  $u$  is a join connector then  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq t_u$ ;

**C6:** If  $u$  is a split then  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq p_r[(u, v)].t_u + p_a[(u, v)].T(v)$ ;

[ $v$  is a join connector whose predecessors are  $u_1, \dots, u_n$ ]

**C7:** If  $v$  is an AND JOIN  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq t_{u_i} \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ;

**C8:** If  $v$  is an XOR JOIN but does not close a loop  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq \sum_{i=1}^n t_{u_i}$ ;

**C9:** If  $v$  is a OR JOIN we generate  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq \sum_{i=1}^2 t_{u_i} + p_{or||}(v).tm(u_1, u_2)$  and  $Eq \leftarrow tm(u_1, u_2) \geq \frac{t_{u_i}}{p_r[(u_i, v)]}, i = 1, \dots, 2$ ;

The application of our constraints on the graph of Figure 7, will give the equations listed in Figure 9.

1. $t_{g_1} \geq 0$	7. $t_{g_3} \geq t_D$
2. $t_A \geq t_{g_1} + T(A)$	8. $t_E \geq p_a[(g_3, E)](t_{g_3} + T(E))$
3. $t_B \geq t_{g_1} + T(B)$	9. $t_F \geq p_a[(g_3, F)](t_{g_3} + T(F))$
4. $t_{g_2} \geq T(A)$	10. $t_H \geq t_G + T(H)$
5. $t_C \geq t_{g_2} + T(C)$	11. $t_J \geq p_a[(g_4, I)](t_{g_4} + T(I))$
6. $t_D \geq t_{g_2} + T(D)$	12. $t_J \geq p_a[(g_4, J)](t_{g_4} + T(J))$
13. $t_G \geq T(G)$	14. $t_{g_5} \geq t_I + t_J$

Figure 9: Intra-pools constraints on the example 7

### 4.4 Generation of inter-pools constraints

The approximation of  $T(RG(x))$  proposed in intra-pools constraints might be incorrect since we neglect here communication. These values will be corrected with the generation of inter-pools constraints. For this, let us recall that we have two type of communication between operations: one-to-one

communication and one-to-many communication. For each type of communication, we generate the constraints as follows.

**One-to-one communication:** we have an arc  $(u, v) \in E_{oo}$ . Since  $u$  is an operation, then we know that from intra-pool constraints, there is a generate equation with the syntax  $t_u \geq rhs(u)$ . Here  $rhs(u)$  is the right hand side of the equation. For handling messages, we will add the equations:

**C10:**  $Eq \leftarrow t_u \geq rhs(u) + T_{Send}(u, v)$ ;

**C11:**  $Eq \leftarrow t_v \geq t_u + T(u, v) + T_{Recv}(u, v) + T(v)$ ;

The idea in these equations is that an arc  $(u, v)$  states that  $u$  will end its execution after the termination of all its predecessors (after the time  $rhs(u)$ ) added to message sending cost. More, the receiving on  $v$  can start only if the message is available and its predecessors have been all executed. In these constraints, probability values do not appear because we only admit message exchanges done by operations on which a user request will be routed with an absolute probability of 1.

**One-to-many communication:** we have  $(u, v_1), \dots, (u, v_n) \in E_{oo}$ . Then, we will generate the following equations:

**C12:**  $Eq \leftarrow t_u \geq rhs(u) + \sum_{i=1}^n T_{Send}(u, v_i)$ ;

**C13:**  $Eq \leftarrow t_{v_i} \geq rhs(u) + H(n).E[T_S] + T(u, v_i) + T_{Recv}(u, v_i) + T(v_i)$ .

Here,  $H(n) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{2}{n} + \dots + 1$  and  $E[T_S] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{Send}(u, v_i)$

In comparison to the one-to-one case, the main changes in these equations is the time required for an operation to start the reception. The challenge in its computation is that we do not have the order in which the sending will occur. We approximate it as follows.  $u$  will make a sending to each operation  $v_i$  that will lead to a mean sending time of  $\bar{T}_{Send}(u, V) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n T_{Send}(u, v_i)$ . Since at a moment only one sending is done, any operation  $v_i$  can be at any position between 1 and  $n$  in the order of sending. If an operation is at the position  $j$ , then the reception for it can start after approximately  $j.\bar{T}_{Send}(u, V) + T(u, v_i)$  time units. Admitting that the operation has an equiprobability to be at any position  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we have the formula.

From messages constraints, we derive the equations of Figure 10.

15. $t_B \geq t_{g_1} + T(B) + T_{Send}(B, G)$ ;	16. $t_G \geq t_B + T(B, G) + T_{Recv}(B, G) + T(G)$ ;
17. $t_H \geq t_G + T(H) + T_{Send}(H, D)$ ;	18. $t_D \geq t_H + T(H, D) + T_{Recv}(H, D) + T(D)$ ;

Figure 10: Inter-pools constraints in the example 7

### 4.5 Constraints generation for the objective value

The generation of these constraints aims at cumulating the minimal partial costs set in variables  $t_x$  by the other constraints. These constraints are generated pool by pool. Let us suppose that for a pool operations graph  $P_i$ , we have the terminal nodes  $u_1, \dots, u_e$ . We will create for each split connector  $c_i$  a set  $S_{c_i}$  containing the terminal elements that are in its scope. This gives us a global set  $S = \{S_{c_1}, \dots, S_{c_m}\}$  that we will denote as the **terminal set cover**. We then choose arbitrarily one set  $S_{c_i}$  such that the  $c_i$  connector does not comprise another connector  $c_j \in \{c_1, \dots, c_m\}$  in its scope. If  $c_i$  is an AND split, we generate the equation  $t_{S_{c_i}} \geq t_{u_j}, \forall u_j \in S_{c_i}$ . If  $c_i$  is an XOR split, we generate the equation  $t_{S_{c_i}} \geq \sum_{u_j \in S_{c_i}} t_{u_j}$ . After this generation, we create

a node  $h(S_{c_i})$  whose associate time variable is  $t_{S_{c_i}}$  and replace all elements of  $S_{c_i}$  in the sets of  $S$  by  $h(S_{c_i})$ . We next remove  $S_{c_i}$  from  $S$  and start again the process.

At the end, the terminal set cover will contain a unique set  $S_f$ . We will then set the constraint  $t_{P_i} \geq t_{h(S_{c_u})}, \forall h(S_{c_u}) \in S_f$ . We recall that  $P_i$  refers to the pool on which we are generating constraints. After the generations of objective values for each pool, we generate the constraints  $Z(LP) \geq t_{P_i}, \forall P_i$ . The objective function of our linear program consists of minimizing  $Z(LP)$ .

In applying this principle on the example 7, we will consider the terminal set cover  $S = \{S_{g_1}, S_{g_2}, S_{g_3}, S_{g_4}\}$  where:  $S_{g_1} = \{B, C, E, F\}$ ,  $S_{g_2} = \{C, E, F\}$ ,  $S_{g_3} = \{E, F\}$ ,  $S_{g_4} = \{g_5\}$ . The set eliminations will generate the equations of Figure 11. We end here the presentation of our algorithm

19. $t_{S_{g_3}} \geq t_E + t_F$	20. $t_{S_{g_2}} \geq t_C$	21. $t_{S_{g_2}} \geq t_{S_{g_3}}$	22. $t_{S_{g_1}} \geq t_B$
23. $t_{S_{g_1}} \geq t_{S_{g_2}}$	24. $t_{P_1} \geq t_{S_{g_1}}$	25. $t_{S_{g_4}} \geq t_{g_5}$	26. $t_{P_2} \geq t_{S_{g_4}}$
27. $Z(LP) \geq t_{P_1}$	28. $Z(LP) \geq t_{P_2}$		

Figure 11: Objective function equations 7

for the generation of LP. Since, we are interested in fast predictions it is important to consider its complexity. We have the following result.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Given a graph  $G_o = (P, O, C, E_{ocp}, E_{oc}, E_{oo})$ , the linear program that we will generate has at most  $O(n)$  variables and  $O(n)$  equations where  $n = |O \cup C|$ .*

**PROOF.** Any element of  $O \cup C$  and any pool has one variable to which it is related in the linear program. Since the number of pools is lower than  $n$ , we have at most  $2|O|$  variables. The constraints in the linear programming can be related to pools or to the objective function generation. Since, constraints from pools are denoted  $C_i, i \in \{1, \dots, 13\}$ , we can easily there is a positive integer  $\alpha$  bounding the number of equations issued from this constraints to  $13 \cdot \alpha n$  equations.

We have three type of objective function constraints. The first type has the form  $t_{S_{c_i}} \geq rhs(S_{c_i})$ . Since for each set  $S_{c_i}$ , the number of such equations cannot exceed the outgoing degree of the connector  $c_i$ , we have at most  $n$  equations of this form (when we consider all sets of  $S$ ). The second type of objective constraints has the form  $t_{P_i} \geq rhs(P_i)$ . The number of such equations is bounded by the maximal outgoing degree of a connector in the pool  $P_i$ . Thus, the total number of such equations cannot exceed  $n$ . Finally, we have at most  $|P|$  equations  $Z(LP) \geq t_{P_i}$ . Since we cannot have more pools than operations and connectors ( $|P| \geq n$ ), we have the proof.  $\square$

The above result shows that in the mean case, we can expect from a linear solver a solution for SRT in polynomial time.

We did a preliminary evaluation of our approach on 20 examples provided by a discrete time simulator (**ChoreoSim**<sup>2</sup>). Due to space limitation, we can not provide testing details. However, our preliminary results show that using linear programming, we can compute SRT with a precision close to the one obtained by a fine simulation.

## 5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduced a new approach for SRT prediction on complex services composition that in a business process viewpoint can be considered as choreographies of

<sup>2</sup><http://ccsl.ime.usp.br/wiki/index.php/ChoreoSim>

services. This approach is based on classical aggregation rules for SRT prediction and a new communication model. Our main contribution is an algorithm that on WSC, generate a linear program that when solved, return the SRT of the service composition.

For continuing this work, we envision two main issues. The first is to enlarge the set of possible BPMN constructs in the definition of WSC. The second issue is to extend our model to other QoS parameters like the price, reliability or availability of service composition [Cardoso et al. 2004]. Finally, we intend to refine our communication modeling for including more aspects related to Web Services network protocols (SOAP, REST) [Josuttis 2007].

## 6. REFERENCES

- [Banikazemi et al. 1999] BANIKAZEMI, M., SAMPATHKUMAR, J., PRABHU, S., PANDA, D. K., AND SADAYAPPAN, P. 1999. Communication modeling of heterogeneous networks of workstations for performance characterization of collective operations. In *Proceedings of the Eighth Heterogeneous Computing Workshop*. HCW '99. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 125–133.
- [Cardoso et al. 2004] CARDOSO, J., SHETH, A., MILLER, J., ARNOLD, J., AND KOCHUT, K. 2004. Quality of service for workflows and web service processes. *Web Semantics: Science, Services and Agents on the World Wide Web* 1, 3, 281 – 308.
- [Goldman and Ngoko 2012] GOLDMAN, A. AND NGOKO, Y. 2012. On graph reduction for qos prediction of very large web service compositions. In *International Conference on Service Oriented Computing (SCC)*. IEEE Press, Hawaii, USA, 258–265.
- [Issarny et al. 2011] ISSARNY, V., GEORGANTAS, N., HACHEM, S., ZARRAS, A., VASSILIADIS, P., AUTILI, M., GEROSA, M. A., AND HAMIDA, A. B. 2011. Service-oriented middleware for the future internet: state of the art and research directions. *J. Internet Services and Applications* 2, 1, 23–45.
- [Josuttis 2007] JOSUTTIS, N. 2007. *Soa in Practice: The Art of Distributed System Design*. O'Reilly Media, Inc.
- [Polyvyanyy et al. 2011] POLYVYANYYY, A., GARCÍA-BAÑUELOS, L., FAHLAND, D., AND WESKE, M. 2011. Maximal structuring of acyclic process models. *CoRR abs/1108.2384*.
- [Weske 2007] WESKE, M. 2007. *Business Process Management: Concepts, Languages, Architectures*. Springer.
- [Xiangpeng et al. 2007] XIANGPENG, Z., CHAO, C., HONGLI, Y., AND ZONGYAN, Q. 2007. A qos view of web service choreography. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on e-Business Engineering*. ICEBE '07. IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 607–611.
- [Zeng et al. 2004] ZENG, L., BENATALLAH, B., H.H. NGU, A., DUMAS, M., KALAGNANAM, J., AND CHANG, H. 2004. Qos-aware middleware for web services composition. *IEEE Trans. Softw. Eng.* 30, 5, 311–327.
- [Zheng et al. 2010] ZHENG, H., YANG, J., AND ZHAO, W. 2010. Qos analysis and service selection for composite services. In *Services Computing (SCC), 2010 IEEE International Conference on*. Miami, USA, 122 –129.