

# Unique Value Team (Stream 3)

## Recommendations

THE *Open* GROUP

**SOA Working Group – Unique Value Team**

**Jorge Diaz**

Work Area Chair  
jldiaz@us.ibm.com

THE *Open* GROUP

# Thank You

---

- This subgroup's efforts could not have been completed without the efforts of its members:

Philippe Andre	Ed Harrington
Ali Arsanjani	Harry Hendrickx
Stuart Boardman	Dave Hornford
Frans Boone	David Jackson
Tony Carrato	Judith Jones
Jorge Diaz	Soren Peter Nielsen
Leonard Fehskens	Anil G Rode
Mats Gejnevall	Andras Szakal
Chris Greenslade	Dave Van Gelder

# Agenda

---

- ❑ Background
- ❑ Selection Process
- ❑ Recommendations
- ❑ Early Prioritization Efforts
- ❑ Next Steps

# Background

---

- ❑ The Value for the Open Group stream is one of the three initial subgroups started from the Open Group SOA Workgroup.
- ❑ The main goal of the subgroup is to establish a set of areas which the Open Group could benefit the industry in the context of SOA.
- ❑ From the beginning it was recognized that it would be limited in duration, once this presentation is delivered in the April Washington D.C. conference, this subgroup is to be considered completed.

# Selection Process

---

- ❑ There were 10 recommendations selected.
- ❑ Eight are described in subsequent slides (two of them: **SOA Definitions** and **Case Studies** already have been implemented as work areas).
- ❑ The process of selection was as follows:
  - Topics were volunteered by members of the subgroup and general SOA workgroup.
  - The various inputs were collected into a spreadsheet, containing descriptions.
  - Members provided comments on the items. This was documented within the spreadsheet.
  - Members reviewed spreadsheet and voted on their preferred selections.
  - Items with more than four positive votes were selected.

# SOA Maturity Model

---

## ❑ **Description**

There is a need for non-vendor specific model that helps identify characteristics of an SOA environment, from a maturity perspective.

## ❑ **Value**

This model can be used by companies wanting to obtain non-vendor specific SOA maturity direction.

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- SOA Maturity Model document

# SOA Reference Model

---

## ❑ **Description**

There is a need for non-vendor specific model that describes the characteristics of a reference SOA environment, from an architectural perspective.

## ❑ **Value**

This model can be used by companies wanting to refer to non-vendor specific reference.

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- SOA Architecture Model document

# SOA Relation to EA (TOGAF)

---

## ❑ **Description**

This effort will position SOA and EA (TOGAF), describing where they align and where they differ.

## ❑ **Value**

Ease up confusion regarding the relationship of two concepts, helping leverage the TOGAF brand more effectively in current SOA-driven marketplace.

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- Guide for implementing an SOA using TOGAF



# Business-driven SOA

---

## ❑ **Description**

There is a lot of emphasis on the technical characteristics of SOA. This effort will focus on the managed evolution of business needs/potential and IT needs/potential.

## ❑ **Value**

Help capture common, cross-vendor understanding of business driver behind SOA.

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- Guide explaining business concepts underlying SOA
- Scenarios for business-driven SOA

# Legacy Evolution to SOA

---

## ❑ **Description**

Legacy systems drive the vast majority of IT solutions worldwide. There is too much out there that is not going to be replaced in the near future. There is a need to show how Legacy can play in an SOA.

## ❑ **Value**

Deliver pragmatic advice on legacy integration with and/or transformation to an SOA environment.

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- Positioning guide on legacy and SOA

# SOA Governance

---

## ❑ **Description**

Describe governance across the lifecycle of an SOA solution. Document relationship with various governance efforts in the industry.

## ❑ **Value**

Clarify position of SOA governance with respect to EA (TOGAF) governance, promote SOA governance best practices

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- SOA Governance from a TOGAF perspective document
- SOA Governance Control areas list

# Ontologies for SOA

---

## ❑ **Description**

An Ontological approach helps establish a more in depth understanding of the relationships existing in an SOA solution, leading to more accurate representation of concepts

## ❑ **Value**

Ontologies allow for the more accurate definition of models

## ❑ **Possible Deliverable**

- Ontology for SOA document

# SOA Key Performance Indicators

---

## □ **Description**

This effort will define concrete indicators that define the advantages of an SOA, and approaches for measuring them.

## □ **Value**

This indicators can be used as inputs to SOA architectures, governance policies and management solutions, helping deliver more accurate control mechanisms.

## □ **Possible Deliverable**

- SOA Key Performance Indicators descriptions
- Method for measuring them

# Early Prioritization Efforts

---

- ❑ Members of workgroup at-large asked to ascertain the items, from this list, that they would like to get involved with.
- ❑ This preference will help define the type of interest and resources available.
- ❑ Further prioritization criteria needs to be established.
- ❑ The following areas received the most votes (others being considered as well):
  - SOA Relationship to EA (TOGAF)
  - SOA Reference Model
  - Ontologies for SOA

# Next Steps

---

- Present in Washington D.C. to:
  - Members at large
  - Open Group board

**\*\* Stream 3 Completed \*\***

- Intention is for a reduced set of the recommendations to help seed new subgroups.
- Subgroups will then work on topics, delivering specific advances during the next IT Architecture Practitioners Conference in **Miami**.