

A Survey of Trust Evaluation Methods

Erden Sacan

Department of Computing,
Faculty of Science,
Macquarie University
Sydney, Australia

erden.sacan@students.mq.edu.au

Abstract

Trust and reputation management systems are essential parts of open networks. For example if party A is planning to download files from party B in a P2P network, reputation management system can provide information about trustworthiness of party B by collecting reputation information from other parties.

There is a demand for trust evaluation from P2P networks, e-commerce applications, service oriented computing and multi-agent systems, which have different needs. Therefore it is not realistic to look for one all-round perfect solution that fits every network, service or application. In this paper we focus on trust evaluation criteria of these networks to classify different trust methods by considering their different trust parameters (user ratings, time, amount of transaction, etc.), the ranking sensitivity (binary, etc.) and mathematical architecture and then analyse the trust evaluation requirements of different areas.

1 Introduction

Many areas in the world of computer networks are in need of trust evaluation and there is a variety of methods to rank trust in these fields. It is even hard to talk about a single definition of trust; it varies from field to field.

Trust in a network can simply be defined as; ‘Trust represents an agent’s estimate of how likely another is to fulfill its commitments.’ [Griffiths, 2006] or ‘Trust is defined to be the firm

belief in the competence of an entity to act dependably, reliably and securely within a specific context.’ [Grandison and Sloman, 2000]

The high level of trust of a party in an open P2P network may be equal to a minimum level of trust for an e-commerce transaction. In a P2P file sharing network, a transaction can be ranked as simply successful or not (1 or 0). Nevertheless in an e-commerce transaction we need to know much more than that (quality of product? delivery time?) to decide about a reputation value. For each type of network we need the criteria for evaluating trust, to do it efficiently and to be able to offer the right features.

Therefore, in this paper we will discuss different trust evaluation methods under sections for different types of networks. Then we will provide analysis of trust evaluation needs of these networks.

We decided to analyse four major areas in application, in the scope of this review; e-commerce applications, peer-to-peer networks, service oriented computing and multi-agent systems. Trust issues in social networks will be out of the scope of this review.

In section 2, we will give chosen examples of successful solutions to trust evaluation needs of these areas and we will explain why they have been successful. In section 3, we will clarify the differences between trust evaluation requirements of these areas.

2 Trust Evaluation Methods

In this section, we will analyse major examples of trust evaluation methods under the areas they are focused in.

2.1 E-commerce

People use Internet more and more to access information about products or services they are interested in or purchasing those products and services. One of the most successful online business models, eBay [ebay.com, 2009], is dealing with numerous customers, buyers and sellers, and a huge number of transactions. To deal with this huge traffic eBay keeps its reputation mechanism simple.

After a transaction occurs, both sides of the transaction can rate each other by selecting +1 (positive), 0 (neutral) or -1 (negative) as the feedback rating. This rating value then is being added to the total "Feedback Score" of the buyer or seller. These feedback scores are being kept and calculated centrally by eBay.

Time factor on the ratings is kept really simple too. Ratings older than 6 months are being ignored by the system. In addition, if the same user rates the same seller more than once in one week time, the average is calculated by using those ratings. Nevertheless that average affects seller's rating total by either +1 or -1.

Binary reputation system of eBay is dependent on ranking characteristics of parties. If parties rank each other on how much the product's quality meets the advertised quality [Dellarocas, 2001] the reputation mechanism can work well and be accurate. If the binary reputation system is not using the right parameter to rate the parties, it wouldn't be successful (For example, because the seller has little control on the price, it is not a parameter of rating)

Even though eBay doesn't force the parties to rate each other, empiric studies show that around half of the parties in eBay rates the transaction after it is completed. Although this provides a good number of feedbacks, a remarkably small number of parties provide negative scores after a transaction (1% to 2%). [Resnick, Zeckhauser & Swanson, 2006] Buyers are afraid of being harassed by e-mails from the seller. In addition, sellers often contact with buyers to solve conflicts and convince them not to give negative rating. eBay hasn't implemented any mechanism to stop these or doesn't have a culture that encourages negative ratings.

This structure might be easy to maintain and cheap to run but it doesn't provide enough information about the seller for many buyers. eBay has an additional detailed seller rating system which takes delivery time and item quality into

account, however because it is not enforced, it is not practically functional.

Reputation mechanism requirements are different within online businesses. Some need more complex systems, such as PeerTrust [Xiong and Liu, 2003], to provide more detailed and more accurate trust information to their users. For example, binary ratings might not be sensitive enough for some applications and they might need parties to rate each other out of 5, in different aspects.

In an e-commerce environment some possible trust parameters would be;

Amount of satisfaction: This value would show how much the seller met the promised quality of service or product.

Delivery time: This value shows whether or not the service or product has been delivered on time.

Number of transactions: In eBay structure a seller may keep increasing its reputation by selling more, even if it gets negative feedbacks. If the calculation of trust takes number of transactions into account, this would be stopped.

Source party credibility: This basically shows how reliable or how biased the source of the feedback is. Sources with higher credibility have bigger effect on the total trust value.

Transaction context: The importance of transactions might be different in a business. For example bigger transactions might value more in terms of trust calculation.

Community context: The community of the environment might have different drivers. In some communities, it would be effective to reward accurate feedbacks.

By taking these factors into account, a reputation system might provide sufficient information and tackle the issue of parties giving intentional incorrect feedback.

2.2 P2P

It has been suggested that there are five main features of peer-to-peer reputation systems:

Self-policing: No central management

Anonymity: The reputation value wouldn't give out any information about user's real ID.

No profit to newcomers: The reputation system should value long-term good services of parties; it shouldn't encourage parties with short-term bad reputations to switch to a new account to take advantage of it.

Minimal overhead: The system shouldn't need too much calculation work, bandwidth or storage space.

Robust to malicious collectives: The system should be resistant against fraud attempts, such as creating multiple accounts to vote itself or a group of users positively voting each other continuously. [Kamvar, Schlosser&Molina, 2003]

In such distributed systems, if there is no central decision mechanism, parties decide which parties they want to interact with.

Many models use polling algorithms to collect information about a party. It simply works by sending a broadcast to neighbours and collecting replies. It is a simple way of doing this but it uses a lot of bandwidth and takes more time to process replies. There are many different approaches to these problems from different reputation system models. [Yu, Sing and Sycara, 2004]

In their earlier model, Wang and Varadharajan suggest a system that calculates the probability of achieving a successful transaction with target party according to binary trust feedbacks about the target party. The system calculates the probability of target party's trust value being in a given scope, dependent on the feedbacks given by other parties, by using Gauss Distribution [Wang and Varadharajan, 2004].

Because of the dynamic structure of P2P networks, feedback age becomes an important variable. Sporas is a decentralized reputation mechanism [Zacharia&Maes, 2000] which can be adapted to focus on the changes in user's behaviour in time. To do that, it checks the date of ratings and gives a higher value to newer ratings. In addition the new users in the system get the lowest possible rating, which answers the need in P2P systems mentioned above. If there is more than one rating between two parties, the system keeps record of only the newest.

The credibility of parties who are ranking the target peer is a major variable that needs to be taken into account. For example, a comprehensive trust model, Trust², does that by eliminating or decreasing the values of recommendations from parties with low credibility, provides a less noisy pool of reputation values [Wang and Varadharajan, 2005]. The credibility of a party is measured by calculating the deviation of its recommendations within the mainstream of recommendation values. If this deviation is high, that means a low credibility.

The more a party gets interacted with the target party, the more its recommendations about that peer become accurate and reliable. This is defined as 'confidence of a party'. It also looks at how old a recommendation is. Fresher recom-

mendations worth more within the calculation of total trust value.

Another model is calculating credibility of the advising parties by weighted majority algorithm according to the accuracy of ratings they provided in the past about other parties. This approach balances effect of exaggerated ratings [Yu, Sing and Sycara, 2004].

In this model, parties help each other to find the witness parties to gather information from more accurate sources. They provide referrals to each other, names and addresses of parties which have experience with the target party.

In some P2P environments parties would be interested in not only the success but also the quality of the transaction. Fuzzy logic can be suitable for trust in this manner, because it makes it possible to mathematically deal with unclear terms by converting qualitative comments to quantitative measures by defining value intervals for different aspects such as quality [Griffiths, Chao and Younas, 2006]. Trust methods that are using fuzzy logic will be analysed in detail in the following section.

2.3 Service Oriented Computing

Quality of service (QoS) is the major component of decision making in service oriented computing. Some models use trust and reputation techniques to decide between offered services within the network and foresee the future quality of service.

When a simple ranking mechanism is used in SoC, it is possible for malicious parties to exploit the system by distributing false ratings. Thus, a trust mechanism should check the trustworthiness of information providers.

QoS-based service selection calculates a trust value called "QoS reputation" for each party in the network. This reputation value is calculated [Vu, Hauswirth & Aberer, 2005] by:

1. Finding trusted parties by looking at the accuracy of the prior reports they provided
2. Marking them as honest
3. Marking all reports provided by them as honest
4. Comparing unmarked reports to find dissimilar reports to honest reports and marking them cheating
5. Comparing unmarked reports to find similar reports to cheating reports and mark them cheating.
6. Calculating QoS reputation by looking at the number of honest and cheating reports..

It improves the accuracy of trust evaluation on the information provided by parties. Nevertheless, it doesn't solve the problem of having new parties which has just a few reports about them or the parties with a big number of incomparable reports about them.

Cooperative interactions include more aspects than transaction success. For example one party may promise to deliver a certain service at a given quality, in the given timeline for a given price. In this situation, while judging this party, all these 3 dimensions should be taken into account. Therefore the trust evaluation system in such environment should provide these dimensions.

Fuzzy logic helps imprecisely defined classes such as "the class of tall men", "low quality" or "very high price" to be defined in a mathematical manner and become a part of calculations [Zadeh, 1965]. It works as a bridge between linguistic way of thinking of human and maths equations. It gives a system ability to deal with uncertainty and imprecision effectively such as this qualitative formula;

If T=new and Z=expensive then x=very good

Wang and Varadharajan's later framework uses fuzzy logic in a more comprehensive way. The model is built up on rules. Such rules can change the formula to be used, dependent on the type of event occurring. [Wang, Varadharajan, Lin, Wong, 2008]. It doesn't allow a new user to gain high trust values even if they provide extremely good services in the beginning. The formulae used in this model encourage providers to keep the quality of services high in the long run.

Even if two parties have exactly the same trust value, it's still possible that they would have different reputation levels (one "very good", the other "good") For example; two service providers: one "very new", the other "very old" in the network, have the same reputation value, which is "very low"(see Table 1 below). With the same reputation score, the new party gets the trust value of 2, however, the old one gets the trust value of 0.

<i>T</i>	Very low	Low
<i>t</i>		
Very new	Low as new (2̂)	Medium as new (3̂)
New	Low as new (2̂)	Medium as new (3̂)
Medium	Low (2̂)	Low (2̂)
Old	Very low (1̂)	Low (2̂)
Very old	Extremely low (0̂)	Very low (1̂)

Table 1 [Wang, Varadharajan, Lin, Wong, 2008]

As it is mentioned above, the curve of reputation value doesn't allow new user to gain reputation quickly. Whereas for the old one an "average" value means whether the provider has been at that level for long time or started to struggle in the market. Thus "average" for a new provider actually means a better reputation value than the old one has. Therefore this model calculates reputation by using level of trust and time variables.

2.4 Multi-Agent Systems

MAS use mostly automated agents to run researches to solve problems (software design, trade) distributed among different domains. Because of this multi-domain structure, trust methods may have problems accessing sources for feedback. FIRE [Huynh, Jennings&Shadbolt, 2006] model proposes a system that combines four different sources of trust information;

Interaction trust: Prior direct experiences with the target party

Role based trust: What are the relationships of target party with other parties, is it a member of a trustworthy group?

Witness reputation: Experiences of other parties with the target party

Certified reputation: The target can collect third-party references to provide information about itself

Therefore if a change happens in the network at the time of trust evaluation request, the impact on the accuracy of trust value would be tolerable by the support of other sources.

Another model, M_{DT-R} [Griffiths, 2006] uses 'risk of cooperating' feedbacks to calculate a reputation value. In such network, it is assumed that all parties are allowed to be a member of the network, offer services and resources and do connections. Thus, M_{DT-R} does not use trust values to evaluate how secure to connect to other parties. Instead, the model uses trust to evaluate the cost, quality, following timeline ability and success of cooperation with that particular party.

It takes the amount of changes in trust value into account as well. If a new trust value from a party is much greater or much less than the existing trust value of target peer, it affects the total trust more.

3 Trust Evaluation Requirements

In this section, we will list our findings about trust evaluation needs of E-commerce, P2P, SoC and Multi-Agent networks. We will provide the

differences between these fields, in terms of reputation mechanism success criteria.

3.1 E-commerce

To validate the information on a service or product from a particular party, it is possible to use opinions of a number of other parties about the target party. In addition, it is possible to validate the trustworthiness of those opinions in the same way.

In e-commerce networks the parties generally seek detailed information about a particular party before getting involved in a transaction with it, such as:

- The quality of products it is selling
- How timely the delivery is
- In terms of replying customer questions, how agile it is
- How many successful transactions it had in a given time period
- How big these transactions are

3.2 P2P

P2P file sharing networks are very big in size and have a very dynamic structure. Therefore, in general a transaction history between two specific parties does not exist.

Binary rating systems work very well for file sharing systems. Because in this type of systems the major thing to consider is whether the file being shared is the correct the version or not.

In P2P networks there are parties sharing resources, sending queries to each other to check the availabilities, if it is positive they start transferring the resource. In a typical file sharing network, such as Gnutella or BitTorrent, there are good and bad parties. Good ones join the network to contribute to the resource sharing; they download and upload related resources. Whereas bad ones join the network to upload malicious resources, advertising purposes or simply slow down the network. In such environment there is a need of a reputation mechanism that would assist distinguishing good parties from bad ones. In a nutshell, trust methods that are focusing in P2P networks can consider offering these features;

- Decentralised reputation feedback collection about target party
- Taking credibility of feedback provider parties into account
- Assigning absolute minimum reputation value to new entrants
- New(fresh) feedbacks should weigh more than old ones

3.3 Service Oriented Computing

Service oriented computing provides integration or development of business systems using multiple sources through web services architecture. For example, development of an application software can be distributed among different service providers through a service oriented network.

Service selection mechanisms are being used in service oriented computing (such as cooperation design processes, multi-supplier supply chains) to find the most relevant provider based on the requirements of searcher party.

In such systems, each party in the network is an independent decision maker. In addition, each party has its own needs in terms of quality, cost and timeline of the service or resource. Every party in the network may offer a service or resource to other parties. These services and resources have a variety of quality and cost. To keep the system up and running these parties must work together.

Since every party is independent about the service or resource it provides, every transaction, purchase, connection or transfer of data has a risk of unsuccessfulness. Such as not meeting the needs of buyer party by bad quality resource, highly priced resource, not providing the service in promised timeline or failing to provide the service at all. In addition, these two parties generally are members of different security domains. Therefore these features can be considered in SoC trust methods;

- The cost of service
- The quality of service
- Timely delivery of service
- Flexibility to work in different domains, under different rules

4 Multi-Agent Systems

In such networks because parties are owned by different stakeholders, in theory each rating would present a different personal view. In addition, because of the size of such networks, it is not practically possible to calculate the trust of a party by searching through entire network. Therefore trust evaluating methods that are using composite techniques and sources (such as trustworthy group memberships, certificates) at the same time appears to be an effective solution for open multi-agent systems.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we discussed trust evaluation requirements of four major computer network fields; e-commerce, peer-to-peer networks and service oriented computing.

E-commerce networks are in need of centralized reputation systems which would allow them to have control over the reputation information traffic. In addition such systems provide a higher availability and stability for the users who are constantly in need of reputation information. Such systems appear to be costly to run but if the solution can be kept simple like the eBay example in this review this cost can be limited.

Whereas P2P networks are in need of decentralized reputation systems which would give them the flexibility they need. In service oriented systems it is hard to setup certain rules and expect all parties to follow them. In addition this area needs more detailed ranking levels (for example: to compare cost, timing, availability – out of 5), therefore binary ranking methods are not suitable.

Peer-to-peer file sharing networks are too big to control centrally. In addition, because of the number of transfers at a given time, it is highly probable to find online and available sources to provide reputation information about target peers. Decentralized systems appear to be more open to fraud attempts but reputation mechanisms have precautions such as credibility and references.

To conclude, it is not possible to have a trust evaluation method that would suit every type of computer network. Trust evaluation methods should have network-type-specific features to answer varying requirements.

Reference

- C. Dellarocas (2001). 'Analyzing the economic efficiency of eBay-like online reputation reporting mechanisms'. In EC '01: Proceedings of the 3rd ACM conference on Electronic Commerce, pp. 171-179, New York, NY, USA. ACM Press.
- Tyrone Grandison, Morris Sloman (2001). 'A Survey of Trust in Internet Applications'. IEEE Communications Surveys and Tutorials, Fourth Quarter 2000 :3-4
- Nathan Griffiths (2006). Enhancing peer-to-peer collaboration using trust. Expert Systems with Applications :849–858
- Nathan Griffiths, Kuo-Ming Chao, and Muhammad Younas. (2006). 'Fuzzy Trust for Peer-to-Peer Systems.' In Proceedings of the 26th IEEE international Conference workshops on Distributed Computing Systems (July 04 - 07, 2006). ICDCSW. IEEE Computer Society, Washington
- T.D. Huynh, N.R. Jennings, and N.R. Shadbolt 2006. 'An integrated trust and reputation model for open multi-agent systems.' Autonomous Agents and Multi-Agent Systems 13, 2 (Sep. 2006)
- How feedback works, eBay, viewed 21st March 2009, <http://pages.ebay.com/help/feedback/howitworks.html>
- S. D. Kamvar, et al. (2003). 'The EigenTrust algorithm for reputation management in P2P networks'. In WWW '03: Proceedings of the 12th international conference on World Wide Web, pp. 640-651, New York, NY, USA. ACM Press.
- P Resnick, R Zeckhauser, J Swanson, K Lockwood (2003). 'The Value of Reputation on eBay: A Controlled Experiment'.
- Le-Hung Vu, M. Hauswirth, K. Aberer (2005). 'QoS-based Service Selection and Ranking with Trust and Reputation Management', 13th International Conference on Cooperative Information Systems, Agia Napa, Cyprus.
- Yan Wang, Kwei-Jay Lin, Duncan S. Wong, Vijay Varadharajan. (2008). 'Trust management towards service-oriented applications'. Service Oriented Computing and Applications.
- Yan Wang and Vijay Varadharajan. (2005). 'Trust2: Developing Trust in Peer-to-Peer Environments.' In Proceedings of the 2005 IEEE international Conference on Services Computing - Volume 01 (July 11 - 15, 2005). IEEE Computer Society, Washington
- Yan Wang and Vijay Varadharajan. (2004) 'Interaction Trust Evaluation in Decentralized Environments'. E-Commerce and Web Technologies :144-153. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg
- L. Xiong & L. Liu (2004). 'PeerTrust: Supporting Reputation-Based Trust for Peer-to-Peer Electronic Communities'. IEEE Transaction On Knowledge and Data Engineering 16(7):843-857.
- Bin Yu, Munindar P. Singh, Katia Sycara. (2004). 'Developing Trust in Large-Scale Peer-to-Peer Systems'. In 1st IEEE International Conference on Mobile Ad-hoc and Sensor Systems.
- G. Zacharia & P. Maes (2000). 'Trust Management Through Reputation Mechanisms'. Applied Artificial Intelligence 14(9):881-907.
- L. A. Zadeh (1965). 'Fuzzy sets'. Information and Control 8(3):338-353.