

needed to better target countermeasures (build high walls only around the gold chest) and increase efficiency (build walls only slightly higher than a man can jump). Today's research in this area faces a severe lack of empirical data on attackers and their motives since companies that fall victim to an attack do typically not disclose such information. Future work should address the empirical side of this problem by improving the collection, reliability and communication of both, attack and countermeasure related data.

Issue 4.: Evaluating the effectiveness of a security system with security metrics: The effectiveness of a security system is difficult to measure without a baseline for data comparison. Research in this area would need to determine an empirically valid baseline and set the guidelines for its evaluation. There are numerous security metrics available to evaluate security systems; however, they need to be improved and tailored for the application in a service bus setting. Little research has yet been done on the effectiveness of such metrics, if/how they help developers to improve software quality and how to choose the right metric for a given evaluation task.

Issue 5.: Seamless integrating a security system in the information workflow: Too many developers still consider security an "add-on" feature. This detachment of security from the overall application can lead to interruptions or breaks in the information workflow between the users and the system. System architects thus face the question of how to make better use of "security by design" principles in order to achieve a seamless integration of security in the overall information workflow. There has not yet been extensive research on how much "seamless" security can contribute to the performance of a business process, i.e. how much it would be worth to pay for.

Issue 6.: Asset management and valuation: In order to manage the security of information assets in a system effectively, the nature and value of the assets needs to be known. On a distributed and dynamic platform like the EngSB information assets can change rapidly, thus static asset management is not enough. Even though there are existing solutions to manage inventories of information assets, the problem of putting a value or price tag on a changing asset remains.

Issue 7.: Security Incident management on a service bus: A security incident in an integrated system can jeopardize the operations of several connected companies at the same time, with consequences hard to predict. In order to manage and remediate the risk from security incidents, the EngSB platform needs to find ways of developing survivability capabilities. On the policy level, existing incident management frameworks (like parts of ITIL [8]) need to be adapted to suit the EngSB environment. Adapting existing frameworks, however, raises the question of how these modifications would align with stakeholder requirements, and the overall EngSB (software) architecture. There is yet little research on the integration of the software side of security incidents with the business side (e.g. how can an organization continue to function when the bus that connects its tools is out of order).

Issue 8.: Continuous compliance: The target users of an engineering service-bus are mostly larger companies which typically fall under some form of compliance regulations like the Sarbanes Oxley Act (SOX). Compliance regulations dictate major parts of organizations' IT service management (ITSM) and security policies, thus also the way companies will (or can) use EngSB. In order for service busses like the EngSB to become successful on a wider scale, future work should investigate whether security design in the EngSB architecture can facilitate companies' compliance efforts.

3. Conclusion

We used Schneier's Security Decision Model, to determine areas of open research issues in the security design and evaluation of an engineering service bus. Many of the described issues pointed towards increasingly value-oriented security approaches that will enable application developers and companies to make better decisions on how and where to target their security efforts. We believe that addressing these open research issues will encourage future work in this area and guide improvement efforts in directions that improve the quality and application of engineering service bus concepts.

References

- [1] R. Anderson and T. Moore, "The economics of information security," *Science*, vol. 314, 2006, pp. 610-613.
- [2] S. Biffel, S.B. Schatten, and A. Zoitl, "Integration of Heterogeneous Engineering Environments for the Automation Systems Lifecycle," *Proc. IEEE Industrial Informatics Conf*, 2009, pp. 576-581.
- [3] S. Biffel, W.D. Sunindyo, and T. Moser, "Bridging Semantic Gaps Between Stakeholders in the Production Automation Domain with Ontology Areas," *Proceedings The 21st International Conference on Software Engineering Knowledge Engineering (SEKE 2009)*, 2009, pp. 233-239.
- [4] T. Moser, S. Biffel, W.D. Sunindyo, and D. Winkler, "Integrating Production Automation Expert Knowledge Across Engineering Stakeholder Domains," *2010 International Conference on Complex, Intelligent and Software Intensive Systems*, 2010, pp. 352-359.
- [5] B. Schneier, "Nonsecurity considerations in security decisions," *IEEE Security & Privacy*, 2007, p. 88.
- [6] The Open Engineering Service Bus, available online at <http://openengsb.org>, 2010.
- [7] N. Oza, S. Biffel, C. Frühwirth, Y. Selioukova, and R. Sarapisto, "Reducing the Risk of Misalignment between Software Process Improvement Initiatives and Stakeholder Values," *Industrial Proceedings of EuroSPI*, 2008, pp.6-9.
- [8] ITIL, "The Open Guide. ITIL Incident Management," 2007, p. Available online at: www.itlibrary.org/index.php?page=Incident_Management.