The layout of your screen is completely customizable by you.
**Architecture and Design of Service-Oriented Systems - Part 2**

**Carnegie Mellon University, Software Engineering Institute, Pittsburgh, PA, 15213**

**Approved for public release; distribution unlimited**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Classification of:</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
<th>Unclassified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Same as Report (SAR)**

**42**

**Unclassified**

**42**

**Unclassified**
Today’s Speaker

Grace Lewis
Senior member of Technical staff
Software Engineering Institute

Grace Lewis has over 20 years of professional software development experience, mainly in industry. Her main areas of expertise include service-oriented architecture (SOA), cloud computing and mobile applications.

Before joining the SEI, Lewis was Chief of Systems Development for Icesi University, where she served as project manager and technical lead for the university-wide administrative systems. Other work experience includes Design and Development Engineer for the Electronics Division of Carvajal S.A. where she developed software for communication between PCs and electronic devices; developed embedded software on the microcontroller that was used on the devices; and provided technical assistance to sales personnel during on-site visits to potential and actual clients.
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Architecture and Design of Service-Oriented Systems: Goals

Present and discuss

• Basic concepts related to software architecture design
• Impact of service orientation on system qualities
• SOA infrastructure design considerations
• Decomposition of an Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) into patterns and tactics as an example of SOA infrastructure
• Principles of service design

Provide a starting point for using quality attribute requirements to design infrastructure and services for service-oriented systems
A software architecture is the earliest life-cycle artifact that embodies significant design decisions: choices and tradeoffs.

Design decisions are made in the context of the architecturally significant requirements.

Architectural design patterns are typically chosen to promote one or two qualities that are important to an organization.

Service-orientation promotes interoperability and modifiability at the expense of performance.

Service-orientation is a starting point that is often augmented by other patterns and tactics to create a complete architectural solution.
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Focus of this Section

- End User Application
- Portal
- Internal System
- External Consumer

SOA Infrastructure
- Security
- Discovery
- Data Transformation

Service Consumers
- Internet

Service Interfaces
- Service A
- Service B
- Service C
- Service D

Service Implementation
- Enterprise Information System
- Legacy or New Service Code

Internal Users
- External System
Integration Approach

There are multiple approaches for integration of service consumers and service providers, e.g.

- Point-to-point
- Hub-and-spoke
- ESB (Enterprise Service Bus)*

* NOTE: Some ESB vendors contend that ESB is not hub-and-spoke. However, ESB is a logical hub-and-spoke topology where components may be distributed to eliminate performance bottleneck or single-point-of-failure (SPOF).
ESB vs. Point-to-Point

Point-to-Point

Services are directly connected to service consumers
Each service consumer must adapt to comply with all connected service interfaces

- Interface technology (e.g. asynchronous vs. synchronous, SOAP vs. REST, versioning)
- Business service interface (e.g. call interface including arguments, semantics, exceptions, versioning)
- Security (authentication, authorization and privacy)

Point-to-point is most acceptable in environments that are

- Small in number of services and consumers
- Homogenous in technology
- Have low pace of change (business and technology)
ESB

Services connect to a common backbone using Web services or other standards or adapters

ESBs manage

- Interface compatibility (technology/service interface and “schema”)
- Service routing
  - Based on content, availability, load or other rules
  - May be dynamically determined
  - May be one-to-many or aggregate from many-to-one
- Data transformations (format and business semantics)

ESBs are most acceptable in environments that
- Are technologically diverse
- Rapidly changing
- Large
ESB 2

Tends to promote a greater degree of loose coupling / independence of connected systems
Advanced tools and techniques are provided for development and management
Specialized development, maintenance and management resources are required
Bottom Line

There is a debate often fueled by vendors with vested interest over whether to

• directly integrate applications, or
• use an ESB strategy

There is no single right answer

Most organizations have some of each
## Point-to-Point vs. ESB Tradeoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Point-to-Point</th>
<th>ESB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modifiability</strong></td>
<td>Changes to a service induce change to all service consumers</td>
<td>Service consumers and providers may change independent of each other. Compatibility is managed within the ESB for certain changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance</strong></td>
<td>Tends to perform better (no transformation and routing layers)</td>
<td>Additional layers affect performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>Authentication and authorization between services and consumers must be managed on a case-by-case basis</td>
<td>Allows central management of security for each service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Point to Point vs. ESB Tradeoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serviceability</th>
<th>Point-to-Point</th>
<th>ESB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem determination is spread across services—there is no central point to manage connectivity</td>
<td>Centralized service interface management provides opportunity to centrally log/audit interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Strong coupling between consumers and services may result in complex failure modes and unintended dependencies</td>
<td>Additional components add complexity and introduce failure modes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loosely-coupled approach improves overall reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td>Consumer and service need to both support agreed-upon message protocols and data formats</td>
<td>ESBs are designed to support diverse connection mechanisms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Point to Point vs. ESB Tradeoffs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Point-to-Point</th>
<th>ESB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serviceability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protection is spread across services—there is no central point to manage connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong coupling between consumers and services may result in complex failure modes and unintended dependencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Loosely-coupled approach improves overall reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interoperability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consumer and service need to both support agreed-upon message protocols and data formats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Enterprise Service Bus (ESB)

There is no consensus on what constitutes an ESB, although there is a wide agreement on many of the responsibilities:

- Some consider ESB a product: “middleware product that connects and mediates all communications and interactions between service consumers and services, usually based on standards*”
- Some do not consider ESB a product, but rather a pattern for which there are multiple vendor and open source implementations — or you could implement your own

In practice, it is common to start from a vendor or open source implementation and then to add extensions or customizations to meet business needs

Enterprise Service Bus (ESB) 2

Business goals for using an ESB

• Reuse of IT assets
• Agility for adding, changing and removing business partners
• Realignment of responsibilities through business reorganizations
• Integration with legacy systems

From a general perspective, an ESB is designed to reduce the complexity of connecting services with their consumers

From a technical perspective, an ESB is a complex integration pattern that can be broken down into several less complex supporting patterns and tactics

• These tactics and patterns have known influence on quality attributes
Enterprise Service Bus (ESB)

How do ESBs work? The VETRO Pattern

Enterprise Service Bus (ESB)

- Validate
- Enrich
- Transform
- Route
- Operate

| Example | XML Document | Verify that it is a well-formed XML document and conforms to a particular schema or WSDL document that describes the message | Add additional data to the message to make it more meaningful and useful to a target service or system | Convert message to a target format | Route message based on content or environment conditions | Invoke the target service or interact in some way with the target system |

ESB Patterns: Broker

The Broker architectural pattern is responsible for translating protocols and data format*

Supports the interoperability driver

Architectural Tactics

• Abstract common services (modifiability)
• Adherence to defined protocols (interoperability, modifiability, developer usability)
• Use of an intermediary (modifiability)
• Restricted communication paths (modifiability)

* Source: Thomas Erl. SOA Design Patterns. 2009
ESB Patterns: Broker

Broker Manager is invoked to handle translations

Service Consumer A request uses SOAP 1.2 and XML data

Service Consumer B

ESB

Protocol Bridge translates from SOAP 1.1 to SOAP 1.2 and vice versa

Data Format Transformer translates from XML to CSV and vice versa

Service C understands SOAP 1.1 and CSV data

The Hub controls all message flow

Service Consumer A

Service Consumer C

Service D

Broker Manager

Broker

Protocol Bridge

Data Format Transformer

Hub

Logging

Internal DB

Key

Component End point Call and Return Database Subscribe to Event ODBC \ JDBC

Service B

Architecture and Design of Service-Oriented Systems - Part 2 © 2013 Carnegie Mellon University
ESB Patterns: Routing

The Routing architectural pattern is responsible for using runtime factors (current logical conditions, business rules or utilization) to route messages and to allow dynamic composition of services*

Supports the scalability driver

Architectural Tactics

- Abstract common services (modifiability)
- Load balancing (performance, scalability)
- Runtime binding (modifiability)
- Component replacement (modifiability)

* Source: Thomas Erl. SOA Design Patterns. 2009
ESB Patterns: Routing

Routes messages based on business rules, service load or message content.

Monitors and records service response times, usage rates, and throughput handled by each service.

Applies rules to message content to determine its destination.

Multiple instances of service C to handle large request volumes.

Multiple instances of service D depending on content, e.g. language, consumer location.
ESB Patterns: Asynchronous Queue

The Asynchronous Queue architectural pattern provides an intermediate buffer that allows service providers and consumers to be temporally decoupled*

Supports the reliability driver

Architectural Tactics

- Adherence to standard protocols (modifiability, interoperability and developer usability)
- Increase available resources (performance)

* Source: Thomas Erl. SOA Design Patterns. 2009
ESB Patterns: Asynchronous Queue

Provides guaranteed message delivery, recording of messages, and support for asynchronous service invocation.

Call back endpoint for asynchronous requests.

Long running asynchronous service.

Key:
- Component
- End point
- Call and Return
- Database
- P Publishes event to S
- Subscribe to event
- Asynchronous call
- ODBC \ JBDC
ESB Patterns: Metadata Centralization

The Metadata Centralization architectural pattern provides a registry for service metadata to be formally published or registered to allow for service discovery by developers of service consumers.

Architectural Tactics

- Adherence to standard protocols (modifiability, interoperability and developer usability)
- Use of an intermediary (modifiability)
- Maintain existing interface (modifiability)

* Source: Thomas Erl. SOA Design Patterns. 2009
Service Provider Perspective

Service Provider registers services

Service metadata is validated against established rules and service description templates

A mandatory element of service metadata is service location

This step is probably the last step of a larger process to promote Logic Centralization and Service Normalization

Key

Component → End point → Call and Return → Database → ODBC / JDBC → Reference
ESB Patterns: Metadata Centralization

Service Consumer/Developer Perspective

- Service Consumer Developer queries the Service Registry at design time.
- Service Consumer Developer writes code to invoke discovered services.
- Services are invoked by Service Consumer at runtime.
Summary

An ESB can be broken down into several supporting tactics and patterns.

These patterns and tactics have a known influence on software quality attribute scenario response measures.
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Focus of this Section

End User Application
Portal
Internal System
External Consumer

SOA Infrastructure

Service A
Service B
Service C
Service D

Enterprise Information System
Legacy or New Service Code
External System

Internet

Service Consumers
Infrastructure
Service Interfaces
Service Implementation

Internal Users

Security
Discovery
Data Transformation
Principles of Service Design*

Standardized Service Contracts
Loose Coupling
Discoverability
Reusability
Autonomy
Statelessness
Composability
Abstraction

Main Question: How to determine what type of functionality makes a good service?

* Source: Thomas Erl. SOA Design Patterns. 2009
Service Identification: The Strategic Perspective

Two common approaches

- **Top-Down:** starting with business process inventory
  - Business processes to support business goals are identified.
  - Shared steps between business processes are identified as service candidates.
- **Bottom-Up:** starting with legacy system inventory
  - Systems with capabilities to support business goals are identified as migration candidates.
  - Key capabilities are identified as service candidates.

In practice it is usually a combination of both

- Service prioritization is done based on relationship to business goals for SOA adoption
Service Identification: The Technical Perspective

Common criteria for service selection

- Strategic reuse
- Functionality or data that is private and requires access control
- Functionality that needs to be highly reliable and/or highly available
- Functionality that needs to be run concurrently
- Functionality that will be accessed often (scalability)

In practice, a combination of the strategic and technical perspectives will lead to a good service portfolio

- Service prioritization should be done based on relationship to business and technical goals for SOA adoption
Service Design

Creating service layers responsible for abstracting logic based on functional type can improve reuse and promote agility

- Layers that represent generic logic (not related to functional context)
- Layers that represent single-purpose logic (related to functional context)

Three typical service layers are

- Utility
- Entity or data
- Process or task
Utility Service Layer

Provides reusable utilities services for use by other services in the inventory

Goal is to maintain strict separation of utility-based functions and specific business functionality to avoid replication of the utility-based functions across the service inventory

Examples of utility services

- Notifications
- Logging
- Auditing
- Authentication
- Data transformation
Entity or Data Service Layer

Provides services associated with the processing of business entities
Goal is to maintain strict separation of entity-based functions and specific business functionality because business entities are generally more stable

- Businesses processes change whenever organizations change the way they do business, but the entities that are operated on change less frequently

Entity services are derived from a logical or enterprise data model

- Granularity is not always determined by the underlying data model
  - Some services may operate on multiple entities and some entities may be operated on by more than one service

Examples of entity services

- Employee
- Customer
- Sales Order
- Invoice
Process or Task Layer

Usually created after the entity and utility services have been defined

- A process service will typically be a composition of business logic plus invocation of entity, utility and process services

Separating the process layer from the other layers promotes service inventory agility for business process changes

- Separating the task-specific functionality from the task-agnostic utilities reduces redundant implementation of the utilities
- The goal is to change only the process-layer internal logic and recompose with the other layers
- Separating the business entities from the specific tasks reduces governance challenges
  - The business entity expertise and the business process expertise often reside in different groups
Summary

The design of individual services has a huge impact on overall system quality

• Stateless services can be replicated to promote scalability
• Services that are discoverable potentially allow for runtime binding (modifiability)
• Services that use a standardized service contract promote interoperability

Defining services requires careful consideration

• Is the functionality useful in other contexts?
• Constraints may eliminate certain candidates, e.g. regulations, technology availability

Logically grouping services into layers can reduce the complexity of compositions and promote reuse

• Utility, entity or data, and process or task layers are a good place to start
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Summary

Quality attributes have the strongest influence on architectural design decisions

- Quality attributes requirements can be captured as scenarios

SOA is a design pattern that promotes interoperability and modifiability

- SOA is not a complete architecture
- It is often combined with other patterns and tactics

There are many ways to design service-oriented systems

- A service-oriented design can be as simple as a small set of services that are integrated point-to-point
- A service-oriented design can include a complex infrastructure that helps enterprises manage rapidly evolving business processes in more agile ways
As projects continue to grow in scale and complexity, effective collaboration across geographical, cultural, and technical boundaries is increasingly prevalent and essential to system success. SATURN 2012 will explore the theme of "Architecture: Catalyst for Collaboration."